

Durham E-Theses

The control and administration of training colleges from the McNair report (1944) to the education (No. 2) Act, 1968, with special reference to the policies of the A.T.C.D.E

Booth, Ian George

How to cite:

Booth, Ian George (1981) *The control and administration of training colleges from the McNair report (1944) to the education (No. 2) Act, 1968, with special reference to the policies of the A.T.C.D.E*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/5954/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

ABSTRACT

The Control and Administration of Training Colleges
from the McNair Report (1944) to the Education (No. 2) Act, 1968,
with special reference to the policies of the A.T.C.D.E.

Ian George Booth

This thesis attempts to answer five main questions. What were the problems of the control and administration of the training colleges between the McNair and Robbins Reports which caused the colleges to place such great importance on the Robbins' proposals for changes in the system? Why were the Robbins' recommendations rejected? Why was there a controversy over the membership of the Weaver Study Group? Why did the Weaver Report and the Education (No. 2) Act, 1968, take the form they did? What part did the A.T.C.D.E. play in these developments?

Chapter 1 outlines the framework of the system of control and administration of the colleges and the changes that were taking place in the system between 1944-61. Against this background, Chapter 2 traces the development of A.T.C.D.E. policies and the reactions of representatives of the providing bodies to the policies. Chapter 3 examines the evidence of the main interested parties to the Robbins Committee, the Committee's proposals and the lines of the impending debate. Chapter 4 analyses the reasons for the rejection of the Robbins' proposals. Chapter 5 discusses the controversy over the membership of the Weaver Study Group. Chapter 6 presents a detailed analysis of the main issues within the Weaver Study Group. Chapter 7 describes the initial action taken on the Weaver Report and the causes of the A.T.C.D.E.'s growing concern with the response of some L.E.As to the Weaver Report. Chapter 8 follows the passage of the House of Lords' Bill through the Lords and Commons and the A.T.C.D.E.'s campaign to secure the most generous interpretation of the Weaver proposals and that instruments as well as articles of government should be subject to the Secretary of State's approval.

THE CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION OF TRAINING COLLEGES
FROM THE McNAIR REPORT (1944) TO THE EDUCATION (NO. 2) ACT, 1968
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE POLICIES OF THE A.T.C.D.E.

Ian George Booth

A thesis submitted for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Durham

School of Education
1981



The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

17 MAY 1984

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

	Page
Title Page	
Summary of Contents	i
List of Figures	iv
List of Appendices	v
Acknowledgements	vi
Abbreviations	vii
Preface	1
CHAPTER 1: THE FRAMEWORK OF CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION 1944-61: THE BACKGROUND TO THE A.T.C.D.E.'S EMERGING POLICIES	4
The Ministry of Education and the Colleges	6
Finance	12
The Universities and the Colleges	19
The Government of Colleges	24
Conclusions	43
CHAPTER 2: TOWARDS THE FORMATION OF A.T.C.D.E. POLICY ON THE CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION OF TRAINING COLLEGES	44
College Government	44
Overall Structure of Control and Adminis- tration	49
The C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges	52
Testing Policy	59
Academic Boards	68

	Page
CHAPTER 3: THE ROBBINS REPORT: McNAIR REVISITED	75
Establishing the Robbins Committee	75
The Evidence: Functions and relationships with the universities	80
The Evidence: Administration and Government, A.T.C.D.E. policies, reactions and alternative policies	89
Schools of Education: the Robbins Committee divided	118
The Lines of the Impending Debate	129
CHAPTER 4: SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION REJECTED	134
Initial Reactions to the Report	134
Response and Counter Response	141
Towards a Government Decision	154
Reactions to the Government Statement outside Parliament	163
CHAPTER 5: TOWARDS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WEAVER STUDY GROUP	170
Initial Proposals	170
Preliminary Discussions	174
University Representation on the Study Group	178
CHAPTER 6: THE WEAVER STUDY GROUP AND REPORT	185
<u>Section A: Preliminary Considerations</u>	185
Membership and Purpose	185
Atmosphere, attitudes and standpoints	187
Procedures	191
<u>Section B: Issues, Debates and Recommendations</u>	194
Educational character and general running of the college: Governing Bodies	194
Establishment and appointment of teaching staff	199
Non-academic staff	203
Leave of absence	209

	Page
Finance	213
The Composition of Governing Bodies	245
The Constitution of Governing Bodies of L.E.A. colleges	263
Academic Boards	273
The Servicing of Governing Bodies of L.E.A. colleges	286
Students	297
<u>Section C: Conclusions</u>	300
CHAPTER 7: INITIAL ACTION ON THE WEAVER REPORT	303
Press Reception	303
The A.T.C.D.E. and the Weaver Report	307
Recommendations for Action	311
A.T.C.D.E. Pressure for Action	314
D.E.S. Circular 2/67 and Partial Progress	318
The Revised Teacher Training Regulations and Growing Areas of A.T.C.D.E. Concern	331
CHAPTER 8: THE EDUCATION BILL AND THE EDUCATION (NO. 2) ACT, 1968	336
The Education Bill in the Lords	336
Progress in the Submission of Schemes	345
The Bill in the Commons	349
Conclusion	366
Appendices	369
Bibliography	448

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
<u>CHAPTER 6</u>		
Fig. 1	List of headings for virement purposes suggested for Maintained Colleges by Mr. N. Doodson and Mr. J.B. Woodham	226
Fig. 2	Revised list of fifteen headings for virement purposes suggested for Maintained Colleges which forms APPENDIX B to the Weaver Report	237
Fig. 3	Three Possible Models for the Composition of Governing Bodies suggested by the Secretary of the Study Group	251
Fig. 4	Interest Groups and their Numerical Representation Agreed by the Study Group	252
Fig. 5	Harvey's Original Formula for the Composition of Governing Bodies of Voluntary Colleges	258
Fig. 6	Harvey's Revised Formula for the Composition of Governing Bodies of Voluntary Colleges	259
Fig. 7	Composition of the Governing Body of a Voluntary College	262
<u>CHAPTER 8</u>		
Fig. 1	Analysis of replies received from principals on progress in the implementation of the Weaver Report up to Nov./Dec. 1967	347

LIST OF APPENDICES

		Page
ONE	Draft Instrument of Government for Voluntary Teachers Training Colleges	369
TWO	Minutes of the meeting of the A.T.C.D.E. Committee on the Government of Training Colleges held on 2nd May, 1956	380
THREE	Appendix 2 to the Minutes of the meeting of the A.T.C.D.E. Committee on the Government of Training Colleges of 6th February, 1959	382
FOUR	Extract from the A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel Document C 14th October, 1960	390
FIVE	Document C, A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel 12th May, 1961	392
SIX	Local Authority Associations' Letter, 23rd December, 1963, to the Prime Minister	399
SEVEN	Extract from the A.T.C.D.E.'s Letter, 3rd February, 1964, to the Prime Minister	403
EIGHT	Secretary of State's Statement on the Future of Training Colleges	405
NINE	Extracts taken from "The Government of Colleges of Education"	407
TEN	Annex to Circular 2/67	417
ELEVEN	Model Scheme of Government for Voluntary Colleges of Education	419
TWELVE	Extracts from the Weaver Study Group Paper SGG/10	440
THIRTEEN	Extracts from the First Report of the Committee on Non-Teaching Staff in Maintained Colleges of Education	445

Acknowledgements

I should like to express my thanks to the many people who helped in the production of this thesis, especially at a time when colleges were preoccupied with more immediate problems.

The A.T.C.D.E. records were readily made available at the Association's London headquarters. Dame Beryl Paston Brown, Miss Joan D. Browne and Mr. K. Gerald Collier gave valuable advice on the policies of the A.T.C.D.E. and the events in which they were involved. Canon James Robertson was most helpful in discussing the problems of voluntary colleges and in tracing relevant documents at Church House. Mr. I. Lawson helped to clarify points on the financing of voluntary colleges and Mr. A.D. Jackson gave perceptive insights on the workings of local education authorities. Useful information was supplied in correspondence with Mr. Gerwyn Lewis, Mr. Malcolm Lee and Mr. M.M. Spencer. Many colleagues at the former College of the Venerable Bede and Neville's Cross College gave freely of their time to discuss problems. Thanks are also due to the librarian at the D.E.S. Library for retrieving Ministry and D.E.S. letters to colleges from some 'unknown' store.

Finally, I would like to thank my supervisor, Mr. R.F. Goodings, and Miss K.E. Gordon who typed this thesis.

Abbreviations

A.C.E.O.	Association of Chief Education Officers
A.E.C.	Association of Education Committees
A.E.O.	Association of Education Officers
A.M.C.	Association of Municipal Corporations
A.T.C.D.E.	Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education
A.T.O.	Area Training Organisation
C.A.T.	College of Advanced Technology
C.C.A.	County Councils Association
C.H.U.D.E.	Conference of Heads of University Departments of Education
C.I.D.	Conference of Directors of Institutes of Education
D.E.S.	Department of Education and Science
G.C.E.	General Certificate of Education
Hansard	Parliamentary Debates, Official Report
I.L.E.A.	Inner London Education Authority
L.C.C.	London County Council
L.E.A.	Local Education Authority
N.U.T.	National Union of Teachers
P.G.C.E.	Postgraduate Certificate in Education
W.J.E.C.	Welsh Joint Education Committee

PREFACE

A new appointee to a college of education in the late 1960s or early 1970s would have become aware, very quickly, of the importance attached by members of staff to the Weaver Report¹ and, in the case of staff in L.E.A. colleges, to the Education (No. 2) Act, 1968.² Clearly, both were regarded as significant landmarks in the development of the administration of the colleges. Yet at the same time, in many colleges, a new appointee would have sensed a lingering residual feeling of disappointment that the financial and administrative proposals of the Robbins Report³ in respect of the colleges had not been implemented and that the Weaver Report was "the colleges' consolation prize".⁴

But what were the problems of the control and administration of the colleges between the McNair⁵ and Robbins Reports which caused the colleges to place such great importance on the Robbins' recommendations? Why were the Robbins' proposals rejected? Why was the Weaver Study Group established and why was there a controversy over the membership? Why did the Weaver Report and the

-
- 1 D.E.S., Report of the Study Group on the Government of Colleges of Education (London, H.M.S.O., 1966).
 - 2 The Education (No. 2) Act, 1968, (1968 c. 37, 3rd July, 1968).
 - 3 Higher Education, Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63, Command 2154 (London, H.M.S.O., 1963).
 - 4 J.P. Parry, 'The Idea of a College of Education', Education for Teaching, No. 72, February, 1967, p. 19.
 - 5 Board of Education, Teachers and Youth Leaders (London, H.M.S.O., 1944).



Education (No. 2) Act, 1968, take the form they did? What was the part played by the A.T.C.D.E. in these developments and how influential were the Association's policies?

Several general books on teacher training and the administration of education published recently refer briefly to these problems and provide some answers. They are referred to in the text and bibliography. W.R. Niblett, D.W. Humphreys and J.R. Fairhurst in The University Connection (1975) have also related the role played by the institutes of education in these developments. Perhaps the best insight into the problems of the colleges during this period, however, remains W. Taylor's, Society and the Education of Teachers (1969), whilst A.A. Evans', The Government of Colleges of Education provides an excellent outline chronicle of the A.T.C.D.E.'s role in the events between the Robbins Report and the Education (No. 2) Act, 1968. J.D. Browne's more recent history of the A.T.C.D.E., Teachers of Teachers is somewhat disappointing in the coverage of this topic. As yet, however, there is no satisfactory detailed historical account of the events which took place between the McNair Report and the Education (No. 2) Act, 1968, or of the policies and role of the A.T.C.D.E. in these developments. It is hoped that this thesis will go some way towards filling this gap, although it is recognised that some aspects of this topic have not been covered adequately, partly due to the limitations of a thesis and partly due to the inaccessibility of some material.

The main sources of material on which this thesis is based are: the records of the A.T.C.D.E., now deposited in the Modern Records Centre of the University of Warwick; the papers and minutes of the

Weaver Study Group made available by a member of the Weaver Committee; papers relating to the Church of England Colleges in the archives of the College of St. Hild and St. Bede, Durham and Church House, London; the minutes of the A.E.C. published in Education; Ministry and D.E.S. letters to colleges, available on request at the D.E.S. Library, Elizabeth House, London; relevant Acts, Regulations, Circulars and Administrative Memoranda; relevant debates in the Commons and Lords available in Hansard; and the published minutes of the Committee on Higher Education and Select Committee on Education and Science, Session 1969-70, Teacher Training. Full details are given in the text and bibliography.

CHAPTER 1

THE FRAMEWORK OF CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION 1944-61: THE BACKGROUND TO THE A.T.C.D.E.'s EMERGING POLICIES

During the nineteen fifties, the A.T.C.D.E. became increasingly concerned with the recasting of the system of control and administration of the training colleges. The Association's emerging policies for reforming the system reflected four major interrelated areas of growing tension within the training college sector, although some of these tensions were by no means new to the training colleges or even peculiar to the training college sector.

Firstly, the policies were indicative of a growing feeling of dissatisfaction and frustration among many members of the Association, and especially among many principals, with the complexities, disparities and anomalies in the structure and functioning of the controlling and administrative system. Secondly, they reflected the rising academic aspirations of many colleges, yet at the same time they were symptomatic of a sense of inferiority within the training college sector: that the colleges were only doubtfully recognised as part of the mainstream of higher education and were controlled and administered in a way which was out of keeping with institutions of higher education which had a national function. Thirdly, they stemmed from demands for staff participation in policymaking at the college level, for greater institutional autonomy for the colleges and for greater freedom for staff to manage their own academic

affairs. Fourthly, they were a response to changes that were taking place in the system.

To understand the detailed characteristics of the A.T.C.D.E.'s emerging policies, it is necessary, first of all, to examine the main features of the administrative context of the colleges. The broad structure of the system was based partly on the ad hoc and piecemeal developments which had taken place before 1944¹ and partly on the proposals of the McNair Report,² with the formal responsibilities for the control and administration of the colleges shared mainly between the Ministry of Education, the providing bodies, the institutes of education and the governing bodies of the colleges in a complicated network of interlocking relationships. Fundamentally, the system reflected two major dichotomies in the provision and work

-
- 1 For the historical developments before 1944, see: R.W. Rich, The Training of Teachers in the Nineteenth Century (Cambridge University Press, 1933); L. Jones, The Training of Teachers (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1924); P. Sandiford, The Training of Teachers in England and Wales (Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 1910); A. Tropp, The School Teachers (London, Heinemann, 1957); Sir L.A. Selby-Bigge, The Board of Education (London, Putnam, Second Edition, 1934); N.U.T., The Training of Teachers and Grants to Intending Teachers (London, N.U.T., 1939); T.C.A., Memorandum on the Training of Teachers (University of London Press, 1939); P.H.J.H. Gosden, The Evolution of a Profession (Oxford, Blackwell, 1972); W.R. Niblett, D.W. Humphreys and J.R. Fairhurst, The University Connection (Windsor, N.F.E.R., 1975); H.C. Dent, The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975 (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1978); and J.D. Browne, Teachers of Teachers, A history of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1979).
 - 2 Board of Education, Teachers and Youth Leaders, Report of the Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education to consider the Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders (London, H.M.S.O., 1944). Referred to hereafter as the McNair Report.

of the colleges which had never been easy to reconcile and continued to remain problematic. Firstly, although in many respects the colleges had emerged as national institutions, mainly for religious, political, financial and administrative reasons, and the way in which the provision of schools had developed, the colleges had been, and continued to be, directly provided, maintained and governed either by Voluntary Bodies or individual L.E.As. Secondly, the majority of the colleges were monotechnic institutions with the purpose of providing students with a concurrent course of both initial professional training for teaching in either the county or voluntary schools and an extension of their general and personal education. Thus in providing a contingent service in meeting the demands of the schools, the colleges had an association with the world of the school, and in providing for a student's personal education, the colleges had an association with the world of higher education.¹

The Ministry of Education and the Colleges

Although the Ministry of Education had no powers to provide or administer directly any training colleges, the Ministry possessed potential, if not always effective, authority and controls over almost every aspect of the provision and work of the colleges.

1 Thus, as W. Taylor remarks, "the uncertain position of the educator of teachers, poised between the world of the school and that of the university, belonging to neither, vulnerable to criticism from both". See, W. Taylor, Society and the Education of Teachers (London, Faber and Faber Ltd., 1968), p. 12.

Under Section 1 of the Education Act, 1944, the Minister was charged with the duty of promoting the education of the people of England and Wales and the progressive development of institutions devoted to that purpose, and of securing the effective execution by local authorities, under his control and direction, of the national policy for providing a varied and comprehensive educational service in every area.¹ In respect of this duty, under Section 62 of the Act, the Minister was required to:-

"make such arrangements as he considers expedient for securing that there shall be available sufficient facilities for the training of teachers for service in schools, colleges and other establishments maintained by local education authorities, and for that purpose the Minister may give to any local education authority such directions as he thinks necessary requiring them to establish, maintain or assist any training college or other institution or to provide or assist the provision of any other facilities specified in the direction."²

The effect of Section 62 was to clarify and strengthen the previous somewhat tenuous statutory role of the Central Authority in the provision of teacher training. In doing so, the Act was in line with the recommendation of the McNair Report that the Central Authority should "assume the obligation, not of taking over the existing training colleges or of establishing new ones, but of ensuring that training institutions, adequate in number and quality, are available and are fused into a national training system".³

1 The Education Act, 1944, 7 and 8 Geo. 6, c. 31, Section 1(1).

2 Ibid., Section 62.

3 McNair Report, para. 155. The extent to which the Ministry created a national training system or took much interest in the quality of teacher training is debatable.

This did not preclude local authorities or Voluntary Bodies from taking initiatives in approaching the Minister directly or through the institute of education for sanction to establish colleges. Furthermore, even where the initiative for the establishment of a college was to come from the Ministry, the approach to the L.E.A. concerned was always through a process of consultation, negotiation and consensus rather than by direction.¹

The source of the Ministry's wider controls over both voluntary and L.E.A. colleges, however, remained the Training of Teachers Grant Regulations. Both types of college were heavily subsidised by central exchequer grants and under Section 100 of the Education Act, 1944, the Minister was required to make regulations setting out conditions on which the grants would be payable. Under the Training of Teachers Grant Regulations, the Minister had power over the continuing existence of a college, and he possessed controls over such matters as college buildings and equipment, the size and character of a college, the length and broad character of the training college course, the number and qualifications of the teaching staff and the conditions of entry for students. The colleges also had to be open to inspection.

The style of the regulations until 1959 followed the pattern that had been set when they had been recast in 1926 in response to the developing concept of partnership between the Board and the

1 See, Select Committee on Education and Science 1969-70, Teacher Training (London, H.M.S.O., 1970), Vol. 1, Qu. 199, Qu. 161 and Qu. 162.

L.E.As in the administration of education.¹ Whilst some of the regulations imposed specific conditions on the colleges, others were framed in the form of more general statements allowing the providing and governing bodies of the colleges or the institutes of education discretion to decide how the conditions could best be met, subject where necessary to the approval of the Ministry. Thus within the Ministry's broad policies in teacher training and the provision of the colleges, the Ministry normally tended to act as a checkpoint on, rather than exercise detailed control over, the development of individual colleges. The trend, however, was for the regulations to become more prescriptive in character. In 1959, as a result of the introduction of the block grant, the regulations were recast into two sets of regulations² and the powers which the Minister needed to discharge his proper responsibilities for the standards of training and, in particular, for the national supply of teachers were explicitly stated.³

The Ministry's overriding areas of concern for the colleges lay in the fields of teacher supply and finance.⁴ In respect of the former, the Ministry was not only required to try to equate overall supply with demand, but also to attempt to balance the

1 See, Board of Education Circular 1377, Revision of the Regulations for the Training of Teachers: 1926, 4th June, 1926; and Sir L.A. Selby-Bigge, The Board of Education (1934), pp. 168-174 and pp. 254-255.

2 Viz. Training of Teachers (Local Education Authorities) Regulations, 1959, S.I. 1959 No. 395, March 10, 1959, and Training of Teachers (Grant) Regulations, 1959, S.I. 1959 No. 396, March 10, 1959.

3 See Ministry of Education Circular 354, The Training of Teachers (Local Education Authorities) Regulations, 1959 and The Training of Teachers (Grant) Regulations, 1959, March 24, 1959.

4 For finance, see section below.

proportion of teacher training places between the voluntary and L.E.A. colleges, between the number of men and women in training, between the primary and secondary sectors of education, and between specialist skills at the secondary level. In doing so, the Ministry had the advice of the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers,¹ although this was a very different kind of body from the one proposed by the McNair Committee.² Nevertheless, the final responsibility for decisions on teacher supply rested with the Ministry, and the colleges were frequently requested to modify and adapt their range of courses to meet changes in demand, sometimes without adequate consultation and at short notice.³ Whilst the colleges remained monotechnic institutions, however, it was inevitable that changes in the demand for teachers, which in some respects were difficult to predict, were liable to have far-reaching implications for their work and provide an element of instability in their development.

-
- 1 For general accounts on the membership, role and work of the N.A.C.T.S.T., see M. Kogan and T. Packwood, Advisory Committees and Councils in Education (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974); W.R. Niblett, D.W. Humphreys, The University Connection (1975); J.D. Browne, Teachers of Teachers (1979); and D. Hicks, 'The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers 1949-65', in British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. XXII No. 3, October 1974, pp. 249-60.
 - 2 McNair Report, paras. 156-161.
 - 3 See for example, Ministry Letters to Training Colleges: R.476(13)/6, 31st Oct. 1947; R.539/66, 12th Jan. 1951; R.476/263, 19th Feb. 1952; R.476/295, 19th June 1956. The most dramatic change came with Training College 14/60, G.539/517, 1st October, 1960, when the Ministry announced that the character of training in general colleges, taken as a whole, should be such that 85% of all students should be capable of teaching in primary schools, 15% being trained specifically for secondary work (compared with the existing figures of 63% and 37%).

There is no evidence, however, of the Ministry imposing the policies on supply on the colleges in a dictatorial way. The policies were generally mediated through the institutes of education.¹ The institute mechanism provided a measure of openness in policy implementation,² involved the colleges in the planning of the development of training facilities at an area level, and gave the colleges a degree of freedom and initiative in how they would respond to the policies. The Ministry, however, kept a tight control of the approval of the provision of specialist courses³ and exercised a final sanction on the upper limit of expansion of, and any proposed changes in the character of, a college. Whilst the colleges might protest at specific Ministry policies and whilst the Ministry might be prepared to make concessions, there was always sufficient response to the policies for the Ministry to be satisfied with this somewhat laissez-faire approach.⁴ Even so, there were occasions when the Ministry dealt

1 Ministry of Education, Education in 1948, Cmd. 7729, pp. 55-57. The institutes role in area planning was given more formal recognition in the Training of Teachers (Local Authorities) Regulations, 1959, regulations 6 and 13.

2 This was regarded as important by the A.T.C.D.E. and principals as some principals were not represented on governing bodies, and even where they were, often decisions made about the college were taken by the providing rather than the governing body.

3 For example, 'wing courses' in physical education, science, mathematics or heavy crafts established in general colleges.

4 See Select Committee on Education and Science, Session 1969-70, Teacher Training (London, H.M.S.O., 1970), Vol. 1, Qu. 1321-1332, and Qu. 1479-1485. As Millins remarks, "Colleges might wryly aver that immediacy of command by the D.E.S. is unimportant, given its virtual certainty of control". P.K.C. Millins, 'The Department of Education and Science', in S. Hewett (ed.), The Training of Teachers: A factual survey (London, University of London Press Ltd., 1971).

directly with a college or implemented a policy through the providing bodies without prior consultation with the institutes.¹ There were also instances of the Ministry bringing pressure directly, or through providing bodies, on colleges to adopt specific policies: pressures which were not always easy to resist. With the need to expand colleges in the late nineteen fifties, there were indications that the Ministry intended to exercise a closer supervision of which colleges would be allowed to expand.²

Finance

Under the Grant Regulations of 1946,³ L.E.As could claim 100% grant on the establishment, equipment and maintenance of their colleges, 40% drawn from a pool contributed by all L.E.As in proportion to their maintained school population and 60% from central funds.⁴ Although the introduction of block grants under the Local Government Act, 1958, brought changes in the pooling arrangements,⁵ this did not materially alter the financial position of the L.E.As providing colleges.

1 Not always to the disadvantage of an individual college.

2 Training College Letter No. 10, R.562/12, 24 September, 1958, para. 3.

3 The Education (Local Education Authorities) Grant Regulations, 1946, SRO 1946, No. 1215, 23 July 1946.

4 The 40% contributed by the L.E.As was in recognition that teacher training was a common service.

5 See, Local Government Act, 1958, 6 and 7 Eliz. 2, c. 55. See also, Ministry of Education, Administrative Memorandum 11/59, Arrangements for Pooling Educational Expenditure, August 13, 1959.

Whilst capital expenditure on new premises, or enlargements, or alterations of existing premises was subject to the approval of the Minister, unless otherwise directed, the control of maintenance expenditure largely rested with the L.E.As providing the colleges with the Ministry ex post facto drawing the attention of colleges to any wide variations in expenditure on the scrutiny of accounts. This led to variations in the financing of L.E.A. colleges with some L.E.As treating their colleges more generously than others, depending on their attitudes to pooled finance.

Although the L.E.A. colleges might have been treated more uniformly under the direct grant system used to finance the voluntary colleges, L.E.A. colleges on average received more favourable treatment than voluntary colleges. The main problems in the financing of L.E.A. colleges were perhaps at the college level.¹

Indeed, in 1957 the Ministry informed L.E.A. colleges that a Cost Investigation Unit had been established by the Ministry to inquire into the costs of various elements of the education service and to try to help L.E.As and other responsible bodies with advice derived from analyses and detailed costing. As a measure of the Ministry's growing concern both at the high costs, in real terms, of certain training colleges and the wide variations in expenditure between one college and another, for which the Ministry felt that there was no obvious explanation, the first task given to the Unit was to carry out an inquiry into the costs of training colleges.²

1 See below, section on the Government of Colleges.

2 Ministry of Education, Training College Letter No. 515, R.544/36, 30 July 1957. A pilot experiment had already been undertaken by the Ministry.

In an attempt to bring pressure to bear on L.E.As to secure a more uniform level of financing in L.E.A. colleges, in 1958 the Ministry began to circulate an annual statement showing the costs per student in all colleges in England and Wales maintained by local education authorities.¹ There can be no doubt, however, that the Ministry was more concerned with curbing the expenditure of the more generous local authorities than with raising the level of expenditure of the less generous.

The initial impact of this practice, however, was disappointing to the Ministry. An analysis of the range of costs at general training colleges for the three years 1957-58 to 1959-60 indicated not only a continuing very wide range in the total costs per student but also under virtually every head of expense. Whilst the Ministry accepted that variations in costs as between one college and another were inevitable because of their individual circumstances, nevertheless it was felt difficult to justify the wide variations.² In a letter to the local authorities, L.E.As were asked to study the analysis with great care. It was pointed out that the fact that most colleges were in the process of being increased in size and at the same time being brought up to standard as regards premises meant a considerable increase in the total expenditure in maintaining them. Thus it was of great importance

1 Ministry of Education, L.E.A. Letter No. 6, R.463/314, 25 June 1958. The first set of costs related to the financial year ended 31 March 1957.

2 Ministry of Education, L.E.A. Letter No. 1/61, R.463/348, April 1961, para. 2.

that all possible economy should be exercised and any substantial variation in any particular case from the general level of cost throughout the country should be capable of the fullest justification in the light of the circumstances of the college itself and the level of work which it was undertaking. It was emphasised that the Ministry would continue to raise with individual colleges and authorities any matters which appeared, on scrutiny of the accounts, to require further explanation, but authorities maintaining a college in which costs appeared to be above the general level of expenditure were asked to review the situation and satisfy themselves that the level incurred was justified.¹

Whilst, in effect, the Ministry could only attempt to influence the maintenance expenditure of L.E.A. colleges on an ex post facto basis, the Ministry exercised direct controls over both the capital and maintenance expenditure of voluntary colleges. Under the Training of Teachers Grant Regulations, 1946, the Ministry paid to voluntary colleges, at an approved rate, student tuition fees and, in the case of resident students, boarding fees less any parental contributions. The Ministry would also contribute 50% towards approved capital expenditure of not less than £500 on the improvement, extension and replacement of existing accommodation, but not to the founding of new voluntary colleges.² The 1959 regulations provided for the continuance of the 50% grant towards the improvement and

1 Ministry of Education, L.E.A. Letter No. 1/61, R.463/348, April 1961, para. 3.

2 The Training of Teachers Grant Regulations, 1946, S.R.O. 1946, No. 630, 29 April 1946.

replacement of existing accommodation, and also enabled the Ministry to contribute 75% towards approved capital expenditure on the enlargement of colleges or the provision of new colleges in connection with the expansion programme.¹

The maintenance grant payable by the Ministry was composed of the tuition and boarding fees in respect of recognised students negotiated between the college authority and the Ministry. The fees normally represented the estimated expenditure for the academic year divided by the estimated number of students,² with the Ministry exercising detailed, if not always accurate, control over the estimates. The grant was normally paid in three instalments. The money was spent at the discretion of the college authority, although the college had statutory and legal commitments to meet. Deficits attributable to an increase in salaries or inflation were usually met by the Ministry: other deficits were met if approved. A college was not allowed to accumulate a balance unless agreed to by the Ministry for a specifically stated purpose. Whilst there was some variation in the maintenance grants as between one voluntary college and another, because the Ministry had an overview of the financing of the voluntary colleges as a whole, the variations were not as great as in the L.E.A. sector.

1 Training of Teachers (Grant) Regulations, 1959, S.I. 1959, No. 396, 10 March 1959. Also see, Ministry of Education, Circular 354, 24 March 1959, The Training of Teachers (Local Education Authorities) Regulations, 1959 and The Training of Teachers (Grant) Regulations, 1959, para. 16.

2 Ministry of Education letter to voluntary colleges, R.523/41, 23 May 1951. Until 1951, the voluntary colleges were financed on a triennial basis.

As a result of rising costs and the expansion of teacher training, in 1961 the Ministry announced a new procedure for the financing of the maintenance expenditure of voluntary colleges which gave the Ministry greater controls over the finances of the voluntary colleges and restricted the colleges powers of virement. As from the beginning of the financial year, 1st August, 1961, the grant was to be paid on the basis of approved nett expenditure and not to be calculated directly from the fees. The grant was to be paid in monthly instalments of 8% of the approved sum, and the balance (based on actual expenditure) was to be payable when the college's accounts for the year had been received and approved.¹

Scrutiny of the estimates was to continue to form the Ministry's main point of control. Estimates were to be submitted by the 30th April in each year stating the number of students on which the estimates were based. If the number of students actually in attendance exceeded the number on which the estimates were based or if some other new factor arose, the Ministry was prepared to consider a supplementary estimate in the autumn term and was prepared to re-assess the grant payable when due cause was shown. Where the number of students was substantially less than the number used for the purpose of the April estimate, the Ministry would also require a revised estimate in October, and at other times during the year when fresh circumstances arose.²

1 Ministry of Education, Training College Letter 2/61, R.463/328(3), 21 March 1961, para. 2.

2 Ibid., para. 3.

In scrutinising the estimates submitted, the Ministry would have regard to the level of expenditure in respect of the college in previous years, the general level of costs in training colleges in the country as a whole, any variations in wages and prices, and any special factors peculiar to the particular college. Where the expected expenditure on any item showed a substantial variation from the estimates approved in the previous year, the college was required to furnish an appropriate explanation at the time the estimates were submitted. For guidance, the colleges were provided with a statement of the cost per student at each voluntary college for the year 1958-59, and similar statements were to be provided annually.¹

The Ministry also announced that the estimates and accounts would be divided into five groups: Employees; Running Expenses; Provisions; Lodgings and School Practice Expenses; and Supplies and Services, Establishment Expenses, and Miscellaneous Expenses. It was intended in due course that virement would be allowed between the items included in the same group but not normally between one group and another, and that the total approved estimates for each group should not be exceeded without prior consultation with, and the approval of, the Ministry. The Ministry would not be prepared to consider meeting a deficit unless this was done. For the first year of the system the virement rule was to be waived and colleges were free to incur expenditure

1 Ministry of Education, Training College Letter 2/61, R.463/328(3), 21 March 1961, para. 4.

within the total as they thought fit. The colleges were warned, however, that if they had reason to suppose that the total would be insufficient, they should report the facts to the Ministry and not assume that a supplementary grant would be forthcoming unless they did so.¹ The no virement rule between the groups was introduced in 1962-63, but not without difficulties for some colleges.²

The Universities and the Colleges

At the time of the appointment of the McNair Committee, the majority of the colleges were only tenuously associated with the universities through the Joint Board Examination Scheme. The main purpose of the Joint Boards, which usually consisted of representatives of the colleges and the university(ies) in an area, although in some cases L.E.As were also represented, was to supervise the work and examinations of the colleges and recommend students to the Board of Education for qualified teacher status. Ultimate control of the syllabuses of the colleges, however, remained with the Board of Education, and the Inspectorate continued to play a part in the assessment of practical teaching. The extent to which the Scheme accorded freedom to the colleges in framing their own syllabuses varied from one Joint Board to another. Whilst the majority of colleges valued the Scheme, some colleges regarded it as merely replacing one form of control over

1 Ministry of Education, Training College Letter 2/61, R.463/328(3), 21 March 1961, para. 7.

2 See Ministry of Education, Training College Letter No. 2/63, 15th January 1963 and College Letter 4/65, 11th March 1965.

their work by another.¹ The Scheme was also disappointing in other respects.²

The McNair Committee were in agreement that whilst the Board of Education must remain responsible for recognising teachers as "qualified teachers" and should remain responsible for ensuring that courses of training as a whole were properly balanced as regards professional and general subjects, syllabuses should not be submitted to the Board of Education for approval.³ The members of the McNair Committee were also agreed on the need to secure a pattern of area organisations to supervise the work and plan the development of colleges, but they were divided on how this should be achieved. Five of the members, Sir Fred Clarke, Sir Frederick Mander, Mr. Morris, Mr. Thomas and Mr. Wood, felt that the responsibility for teacher training at the area level should rest with the universities because of their recognised standards and standing in the educational world, the respect they commanded of all the partners concerned and their established independence was

-
- 1 For a full account of the structure, work and problems of the Joint Boards, see T.C.A., Memorandum on the Training of Teachers (1939), Chapter V; J.D. Browne, Teachers of Teachers (1979), Chapter Two; and W.R. Niblett, D.W. Humphreys and J.R. Fairhurst, The University Connection (1975), Chapter 3.
 - 2 See D.W. Humphreys, The Relationships between the Training Colleges and the Universities before McNair (Lyndale House Papers, University of Bristol Institute of Education, 1965), p. 22; and McNair Report, para. 165.
 - 3 McNair Report, paras. 298 and 299. The Report states: "We wish the colleges, as integral parts of the area training authority, to have the maximum incentive to develop their work in response to the demands made on them. Growth is not likely to be healthy unless it is rooted in the colleges themselves."

powerful enough to resist the encroachments of centralisation.¹

The colleges in the university area, together with the university department of education, would form a University School of Education. The School would be governed administratively, subject to the ultimate control of the university, by a Delegacy representative of the university, the affiliated training institutions and the local education authorities. The School would be directed educationally, subject to the control of the Delegacy, by a Director appointed by the university and a Professional Board consisting primarily of university teachers and representatives of teachers in the affiliated institutions who were granted the title of "Recognised Teacher in the School". Training colleges would be affiliated to the School subject to the Delegacy being satisfied with their staff, buildings, internal organisation and financial position. They would retain their identity in that they would continue to have their own governing bodies and enrol their own students, but they would lose some of their autonomy in that the approval of the Delegacy would be required to the appointment of the principal or senior member of the staff.² It was further suggested that the colleges affiliated to the School might eventually be financed by a block grant to the School.³

1 McNair Report, para. 170.

2 McNair Report, para. 177. It is not clear what would happen to colleges not accepted for affiliation, or the status of staff in affiliated institutions who were not granted the title of "Recognised Teacher in the School".

3 *Ibid.*, para. 178.

The other five members of the McNair Committee, Dr. Fleming, Mrs. Hichens, Sir Arnold McNair, Miss Ross and Mrs. Stocks, favoured the continuance of the Joint Board Scheme with certain modifications, fearing that too close an association between the universities and the colleges might distort the work of the colleges and swamp the universities with a large number of training college students. It was argued that "the training colleges value the connection with the universities established by these Joint Boards and the attendant Boards of Studies and that they would welcome closer contact with the universities, provided that it takes the form of a partnership between equals and does not lead to the universities having a predominant influence in the training of the students in training colleges."¹

In the event, a modified version of the School of Education scheme was adopted.² The universities accepted responsibility for the training of teachers, but instead of establishing Schools of Education they set up Institutes of Education. Briefly, each institute of education had a governing body, whose members normally included representatives nominated by the senate, the Director and Secretary of the Institute, college principals and staff represent-

1 McNair Report, para. 188.

2 For a full account of the complicated negotiations and problems see, W.R. Niblett, D.W. Humphreys and J.R. Fairhurst, The University Connection (1975), Chapters 5, 6 and 7. Cambridge adopted a modified version of the Joint Board Scheme.

atives, and representatives of L.E.As, college governors and teachers. Below the governing body was the Professional (Academic) Committee which was composed of the Director (usually as Chairman), the principals of the colleges and representatives of the staffs of the colleges and of the university. In a few cases L.E.A. officials were also included. The primary function of the Professional Committee was to administer the scheme of examination for the award of the teacher's certificate. To this end it established Boards of Studies in each of the subjects, composed of college lecturers on the subject together with relevant subject lecturers of the university, which considered syllabuses and schemes of assessment for the colleges before recommending them to the Professional Committee for approval. Assessors from the Ministry normally attended meetings of the governing bodies and of the Professional Committee.¹

Although there were variations in the extent to which the college membership of the various boards and committees of the institutes permitted full consultation and participation, co-operation between the colleges and the institutes was usually amicable. The extent to which common examination papers and syllabuses were required for certain subjects in all colleges in an institute varied not only between institutes but also between subjects within the same institute. On the whole, however, there

1 For a full account of the structure and work of the institutes see, M.V.C. Jeffreys, Revolution in Teacher Training (London, Pitman, 1961) and 'Institutes of Education from McNair to Robbins', in Aspects of Education, Journal of University of Hull Institute of Education, December 1965. Also see W.R. Niblett, D.W. Humphreys and J.R. Fairhurst, The University Connection (1975), Chapter 8.

was a large measure of freedom for colleges to experiment and devise new courses on an individual basis. As Taylor remarks, in the Boards of Studies "the principle that dog does not eat dog" helped to ensure more autonomy for the colleges than might otherwise have been the case.¹

Of the various external agencies concerned with the control and administration of the colleges, generally, the colleges found the institutes the most acceptable. Not only did the institutes accord the colleges a large measure of freedom and autonomy in their academic work, but the institutes were also seen as a tangible connection of the colleges with the world of higher education and a means of furthering the academic ambitions of the colleges.

The Government of Colleges

Although the McNair Committee was anxious to raise the status of training colleges, the McNair Report gave scant attention to the government of colleges. The advocates of Schools of Education merely mentioned that the colleges should continue to have their own governing bodies but that they would lose some of their autonomy.² The proponents of the Joint Board Scheme noted that

1 W. Taylor, Society and the Education of Teachers (1968), p. 87.

2 McNair Report, para. 177(f). The School of Education proposal does not make clear how the colleges would continue to be provided or who would establish new colleges. Nor does it make clear the nature and functions of the governing body of a college.

in some areas the universities were represented on the governing bodies of training colleges and recommended that the practice should be extended to all colleges.¹

The White Paper of 1943, *Educational Reconstruction*, had stressed the desirability "that any legislation should prescribe the status of the Local Education Authority in relation to all types of secondary schools and that steps should be taken to give authoritative definition of the status and powers of the Governing Body".² No mention, however, was made of the government of training colleges, although the White Paper was critical of the "narrow traditions" of some colleges.³ Nor did the Education Act, 1944, refer to the government of colleges. The Act set out specific conditions for the management of primary schools and the government of secondary schools. Further detailed guidance on the government of maintained secondary schools was given in a White Paper entitled "*Principles of Government in Maintained Secondary Schools*".⁴ The Central Authority, however, seems to have had no specific policy on the government of training colleges and the Training of Teachers Grant Regulations merely continued to state that colleges were to be governed and conducted under suitable rules.

1 McNair Report, para. 190(e).

2 Board of Education, Educational Reconstruction (Cmd. 6458) (London, H.M.S.O., 1943), para. 61.

3 *Ibid.*, para. 104.

4 Board of Education, Principles of Government in Maintained Secondary Schools (Cmd. 6523) (London, H.M.S.O., 1944).

The absence of any clear Central Authority policy on the government of colleges was no doubt attributable to the fact that the McNair Committee's deliberations were taking place at the time the Education Bill was being framed and was passing through Parliament. It was clear that the Board did not wish to pre-empt the Committee's proposals or the subsequent negotiations on the recommendations.¹ Even so, although the question of the future of the colleges had been settled by 1950, it was not until 1955 that the Ministry began to show a tentative interest in college government.

In the absence of any precise statutory requirements and general guiding principles,² it was inevitable that there should continue to remain a widely diverse and anomalous pattern of arrangements for college government with significant discrepancies between voluntary and L.E.A. colleges, and between one college and another.

In respect of voluntary colleges, it had always been necessary to have a 'body' at the college level to be responsible for the maintenance, administration and finances of the college, for implementing the Central Authority's regulations and policies on teacher supply, and for safeguarding, where appropriate, the rights

1 See Educational Reconstruction (1943), para. 104.

2 Even where there were in the case of schools it was not always easy for the Ministry to secure their observance. See G. Baron and D.A. Howell, The Government and Management of Schools (London, Athlone Press, 1974).

and interests of the foundation providing the college. The governing bodies of voluntary colleges were, in fact, legal entities in their own right with definite constitutions.¹ In the case of church colleges, each denominational group of colleges were related in differing ways and degrees of formality to a central parent agency.² Whilst, from time to time, a denominational group and central parent agency might plan collectively how they would respond to Ministry policies, especially in the light of available finance for capital projects,³ and whilst the Ministry might deal with a denominational group of colleges collectively through the central parent agency on some policy matters, nevertheless, the colleges remained essentially independent self-governing institutions.

Within the Ministry's regulations and policies on supply, any conditions set out in the legal document constituting the college, and in the case of church colleges any agreed collective

-
- 1 There were variations in the precise legal basis. This could take the form of a schedule to a conveyance, lease, deed of appointment or other instrument under which the property was held in trust for a training college, or a scheme under the Charitable Trusts Acts for the regulations of a training college. The governing body of Goldsmith's College was a delegacy of London University.
 - 2 C.E. colleges - Council of the Church Training Colleges; R.C. colleges - Catholic Education Council; Methodist colleges - Methodist Education Committee; and British and Foreign Society colleges - British and Foreign Schools Society.
 - 3 See for example, the papers of the Church of England Church Assembly on the reconstruction of Church of England Colleges and the Capital Financing of Church Training Colleges.

policies, the governing bodies of voluntary colleges exercised a wide range of responsibilities and enjoyed some measure of autonomy in the running of their colleges. Such responsibilities included the appointment and dismissal of staff;¹ the framing of their own estimates and freedom to spend within the approved estimates;² the admission of students;³ the granting of staff leave of absence; the determination of the size and character of the college; and the general provision of the curriculum.

As might have been expected, the composition of governing bodies of voluntary colleges varied from college to college. In the case of church colleges, the majority of the membership was composed of representatives of the providing body(ies) and other persons with strong church interests, sometimes including persons associated in some way with the foundation of the college, representatives of subscribers and representatives of the former students' association.⁴ Some governing bodies made provision for the membership of university and L.E.A. representatives. Whilst the functions of the governing bodies had changed over the years, the structure of the membership of some colleges had changed little, if at all.

-
- 1 Subject to the conditions of the Trust Deeds and Schedule 1 of the Training of Teachers Grant Regulations.
 - 2 See above, section on finance.
 - 3 Subject to Schedule 1 of the Teacher Training Grant Regulations.
 - 4 Between 1907 and 1926, the Teacher Training Regulations had imposed restrictions on the membership of governing bodies of voluntary colleges not recognised before 1st August, 1907. The instrument of government was not to require a majority of the governing body to belong, or not to belong, to any particular religious denomination.

In respect of L.E.A. colleges, there was no specific requirement for L.E.As to appoint governing bodies for training colleges.¹ The governing body, however, of an L.E.A. college was usually a sub-committee of the Education Committee which might serve more than one college or even more than one type of institution.² The membership was usually dominated by L.E.A. representatives and could change dramatically with local election results. Provision was sometimes made for the co-option of representatives from the university to which the college was associated. Whilst all L.E.As contributed to the finances of the colleges, neighbouring L.E.As were rarely represented on governing bodies.

The powers and responsibilities delegated to the governing body on such matters as the preparation of estimates, the spending of money within approved estimates, the appointment of staff and the general oversight of the curriculum varied from L.E.A. to L.E.A.³ In any case, they were exercised subject to the procedures, the standing orders and style of administration of the local authority providing the college and any relevant requirement of local government legislation. The decisions of the governing body might not only be subject to review by the Education Committee,⁴

1 The requirement for colleges to have governing bodies lapsed in 1926.

2 Unless the governing body was constituted as a sub-committee, it was doubtful if any powers to act could be delegated to it.

3 As did the powers delegated to Education Committees. Where few powers were delegated to an Education Committee, few powers could be delegated to a sub-committee.

4 In some cases, college governing bodies were a sub-committee of a sub-committee, e.g. Further Education and their decisions might also be subject to review by the sub-committee.

but also by the Finance Committee, which also controlled the estimates of the college, by the Establishments Committee and ultimately by the Council. The responsibility for major decisions on the size and character of the college rested with the L.E.A. proper rather than the governing body. Whilst the L.E.As took a great pride in their colleges, the quality and style of government of a college in the L.E.A. sector depended very much on the style of the local authority providing the college.

In neither the voluntary nor L.E.A. sector was there any clear general pattern of delegation of responsibility to the principal and staff. Whilst the principal was usually responsible for the day-to-day management and internal academic work of the college, the freedom of the principal to act, especially in matters with financial implications, and the role of the principal in the appointment of staff varied from college to college. Although it was usual for the principal to attend governing body meetings, in very few cases was the principal actually a member of the governing body.¹ Furthermore, since the majority of colleges were small institutions, there was rarely any formal and regular mechanism for the staff to take part in college policy-making.

1 This did not mean that principals could not exercise a great deal of influence on college policy. Much depended on the personality of the principal. In the case of some L.E.A. colleges, the governing body only fulfilled nominal duties and much of the planning and administration was in the hands of the Chief Education Officer and the principal.

The first significant move to reform college government came from the Council of Church Training Colleges. In 1948, the Council issued a model instrument of government for Church of England colleges.¹ The objective of the Council was to encourage Church of England colleges to reconstruct the membership of their governing bodies to approximate more closely to that of university bodies.² Whilst the membership of the reconstituted governing bodies would still retain a large and dominant representation of Church of England interests, it was suggested that the membership should be widened to include elected or nominated representatives of the university to which the college was directly associated; representatives of the L.E.As in whose field the college worked and the local authority in whose area the college was situated and, if considered advisable, representation from the principal and other members of staff. In addition, it was suggested that co-opted members should take up to one quarter of the total number of governors.³ The model laid down precise procedures for the appointment and terms of office of governors and the conduct of meetings.⁴ Furthermore, the model attempted to clarify the role of the principal in relation to the governing body in respect of

1 Draft Instrument of Government for Voluntary Teachers Training Colleges, issued by the Council of the Church Training Colleges, February, 1948. See APPENDIX ONE.

2 Ibid., I. The Governors, para. 2 (Note 1).

3 Ibid., I. The Governors, para. 2.

4 Ibid., I. The Governors, paras. 3-10.

the academic work of the college,¹ the appointment of staff² and the general running of the college.³ The Council, however, had no powers to enforce Church of England colleges to adopt the model in part or in whole. Whilst the nineteen fifties saw Church of England colleges restructuring their college government on the pattern set out in the model, in some colleges there was strong opposition to the idea of staff representation and, in some cases, even to the representation of the principal.⁴

In 1955 a change in the Training of Teachers Grant Regulations indicated that the Ministry was beginning to take an interest in college government. In addition to stating that colleges had to be governed and conducted under suitable rules, Regulation 5 also required colleges to have a suitably constituted governing body. At this stage the Ministry's approach to the problem was somewhat tentative and almost apologetic. In explaining the change in the Regulations in Administrative Memorandum, No. 520, it was pointed out that the Minister had no complete or detailed knowledge of the existing arrangements which colleges had generally made for the government of training colleges and it was not his intention in making the new regulation to exercise detailed oversight. The new

1 Ibid., II. College Organisation, para. 19.

2 Ibid., II. College Organisation, para. 12(b).

3 Ibid., II. College Organisation, paras. 11-23.

4 R.J. Harvey, "Authority in Training Colleges", speech given to the Church of England Standing Conference on Church Colleges, October, 1959.

regulation had in part a technical purpose: to make it possible, in a few special cases where difficulties arose, for a governing body of a local education authority college which was not constituted as a sub-committee of the authority to be prescribed under Section III of the Local Government Act, 1948, for the purposes of payment of travelling expenses to members of staff. But it was also the Minister's view that not all governing bodies were constituted as to best be able to perform the duties of a governing body and the regulation also had the purpose of emphasising this need. In the Minister's view the status of a training college demanded a specially constituted governing body with appropriate membership. The Memorandum, however, did not define how a governing body should be constituted, what was a suitable membership or what were the proper functions of a governing body. It seems that the Ministry hoped the effects of the Memorandum would be to encourage local authorities to review the arrangements for the government of their colleges.

At the same time that changes were taking place in the government of Church of England colleges, changes were also taking place in the government of some L.E.A. colleges. In a survey carried out by the A.T.C.D.E. in 1956/57,¹ out of 52 replies received from the principals of L.E.A. general colleges, in the case of 19 colleges the principal had become a member of the governing body, but only in London and Middlesex were they accorded voting powers; in 26 cases the principals considered that their

1 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Meeting, 1 January 1958, Document F.

colleges were conducted under suitable rules; in 37 cases the principal was fully consulted about the government of the college in such matters as the size of the college; and in 20 cases the principal was fully consulted about the estimates and capital expenditure, including 14 instances in which the principals drew up the estimates. In respect of authority delegated to the principal to spend within the estimates, few replies were received. In one case the principal had complete discretion; in one case it was limited to £250; in two cases it was limited to £50; and in four cases to £10.

Further surveys carried out by the A.T.C.D.E. during the period 1956-60 also revealed that it had become common in most L.E.A. and voluntary colleges for the main responsibility for the selection of lecturers to rest with the principal, although the pattern for making appointments varied,¹ and that with the growth in the size of colleges, some colleges had adopted more formal procedures for staff consultation, including in a few cases formally constituted academic boards.²

It was clear, however, that the move towards a more liberal pattern of government with great^{er} devolution of powers and responsibilities to the principal and staff could only be slow, piecemeal and partial without any clear initiatives taken at the centre. With the introduction of the three year course, the

1 A.T.C.D.E. Principals' Panel, 12 October 1956.

2 See Chapter 2, section on Academic Boards.

growing pressure for an inquiry into higher education provision, the expansion of the colleges and the introduction of the block grant, the problem of college government was becoming an urgent matter.

In 1959, the Minister once again stressed the importance of properly constituted governing bodies. Whilst the Training of Teachers Regulations, 1959, continued to state that every training college must have a suitably constituted governing body,¹ the Regulations also stated that the rules made for the government and conduct of every training college shall in particular define the powers delegated to the principal and provide for the discipline of the students.² Once again, however, the Ministry seemed reluctant to take any decisive action on the matter. Circular 354 re-affirmed the Minister's intention not to exercise a detailed control over the arrangements for the government of training colleges and his view that a training college should have a specially constituted governing body with appropriate co-opted membership. The Circular stated, "The introduction of the three year course and the current programme of expansion make the proper constitution of governing bodies all the more important, and he asks all college authorities to review the existing arrangements in the light of these considerations". The Minister was also impressed with the need for suitable rules to define the

1 Training of Teachers (Local Education Authorities) Regulations, 1959, S.I. 1959 No. 395, March 10, 1959, regulation 7(1).

2 Ibid., regulation 7(2).

duties and responsibilities of the different bodies and individuals concerned with the running of a training college.¹

The import of the developments which were taking place in the colleges was also taken up by Mr. R.J. Harvey, the Secretary of the Council of the Church Training Colleges, at the Church of England Standing Conference of Church Training Colleges in October, 1959.² Harvey welcomed the changes that had already taken place in the government of Church of England colleges, especially the extension of membership to include representatives of L.E.As, universities and institutes of education. He noted that in most cases, but not all, the principal was a full member, and in a few cases other members of the staff were also members, or at least attended meetings. Whilst he considered that the changes were a step in the right direction, he argued that there was still a great deal of difference between one governing body and another. He questioned whether the changes had gone far enough in any college and whether most governing bodies were prepared for the changes which were taking place.

He considered that a possible definition of the functions of a governing body might be: to keep in close touch with the ordinary work of the college, while leaving its running effectively to the principal and staff; to have sufficient informed knowledge to be able to decide matters of major policy; to keep the needs of the

1 Circular 354, The Training of Teachers (Local Education Authorities) Regulations, 1959 and the Training of Teachers (Grant) Regulations, 1959, para. 11.

2 R.J. Harvey, "Authority in Training Colleges", October, 1959.

Church before the college and the needs of the college before the Church; and to provide an effective link between the college and the outside - particularly university, county and L.E.A.

On the question of internal contacts, he argued that the principal must obviously be present at governing body meetings and must be a member in his own right. Nevertheless, it was impossible to maintain that the principal could always represent the opinion of the staff and therefore it followed that there should be a reasonable representation of senior staff on the governing body to inform governors what was happening in the college. Thus the governing body would bring together the practical and professional knowledge of college affairs possessed by the principal and staff and the more general experience and external contacts of the other members. He also considered that it was important for a governing body to delegate as much responsibility as possible to the staff and that there should be a linked chain of responsibility - students, staff, governing body.

On the theme of contacts with outside bodies, he acknowledged that a good deal had already been done to widen the membership of governing bodies especially in relation to university, institute of education and L.E.A. membership, although in a few colleges this element still needed to be considered. He emphasised, however, that where colleges were discussing a closer association with universities, one of the points the universities would look at was how the college was governed, especially in relation to staff responsibilities and contacts with outside bodies. He argued that

a training college would be judged not only on academic standards, but also on the composition of its governing body, particularly in respect to staff representation.

He felt that voluntary colleges were in a more advantageous position than L.E.A. colleges to undertake a review of their college government. He stressed the importance of action in view of what he believed to be a current of opinion which increasingly favoured Local Authority as against Voluntary Education. He implied that whether church colleges would keep their proportion of teacher training places in the expansion of teacher training depended on the colleges emerging as adult institutions able to attract first class men and women as principals, staff and students.

It would seem that the Ministry regarded the response of L.E.As to Circular 354 as disappointing and in July, 1960, the Ministry sent a confidential letter to L.E.As setting out detailed guidance on college government.¹ The letter stated that it was not the Ministry's intention to conduct any national review of the changes that had taken place since the issue of the Circular, but stressed the importance of the matter at a time when changes were taking place in the training course and many colleges were in the process of, or were being considered for, major expansion.²

1 L.E.A. Letter No. 7/60, R.436(3)/23, 26th July, 1960.

2 Ibid., para. 2. It is not clear whether the phrase "were being considered for" expansion was intended to imply that the Ministry was going to take into account the arrangements for college government in selecting colleges for expansion. Harvey seemed to think that this would be the case (see above).

The Ministry accepted that the governing bodies of most L.E.A. colleges would be constituted as sub-committees of the authority and in some cases they would report through another sub-committee. But whatever arrangements of this kind were adopted, it was the Minister's view that the status of a training college demanded a separate governing body.¹ Whilst the Ministry was prepared to concede that in a few cases one governing body might appropriately govern more than one training college, it was considered that the grouping under one governing body of a training college with one or more establishments of further education could hardly lead to effective government.²

In respect of the membership of governing bodies, it was pointed out that the pooling of expenditure on the maintenance of local education authority training colleges reflected their national character. Consequently, it followed that the members of a governing body need not be solely representative of the single maintaining authority. Rather, the membership should reflect the college's function, its range of courses and its place in the community.³ In addition to representation of the L.E.A. providing the college, it was suggested that the membership could well include: persons, including university representatives, nominated by the

1 It is not clear what other kinds of arrangements the Ministry had in mind, if any. As has already been observed, unless governing bodies were constituted as sub-committees of the L.E.A. it was doubtful if any powers could be legally delegated to them.

2 L.E.A. Letter No. 7/60, para. 3.

3 Ibid., para. 4.

institute of education of which the college was a constituent member; persons with a broad knowledge of, and contacts in, education, or with qualifications or experience in the subjects of which the college makes a strong feature; persons representative both of the kinds of schools from which the students came and of those which they used for teaching practice and in which most of them take first posts; and persons nominated by neighbouring local education authorities.¹ It was considered that a governing body was unlikely to function effectively if it consisted of more than 20 members.²

It was noted that in some colleges the principal was a member of the governing body. Where this was not the case, it was considered that the principal should normally be invited to attend all meetings.³

In framing the rules for the government and conduct of colleges, it was suggested that the aim should be the maximum devolution of powers, from the authority to governors and from governors to principal, which was consistent with the degree of responsibility which must be retained at each level. It was argued that even the best constituted governing body was not likely to function effectively if it was not given an active and responsible part to play, because able and busy people would not serve on it, or would not attend meetings.⁴

1 L.E.A. Letter No. 7/60, para. 5.

2 Ibid., para. 7.

3 Ibid., para. 6.

4 Ibid., para. 8.

On the organisation and conduct of the college, it was acknowledged that it was for the L.E.A., in consultation as necessary with the Ministry and institute of education, to determine the general character of a college, and that the institute would be specially concerned with the content of the college course. Subject to this, it was felt that the general oversight of the conduct of the college could appropriately be undertaken by the governors, and its detailed management by the principal.¹

In respect of expenditure, it was argued that governors could very properly be empowered to spend, without reference, within the limits of approved annual estimates so framed as to leave them reasonable discretion in such matters as the maintenance of the buildings and necessary expenses of the course.²

On the question of the appointment of staff, it was recognised that L.E.As might wish to retain responsibility for the determination of total college staffing establishments within their own hands. But individual appointments within an establishment should be made by the governors with some appropriate delegation to the principal in the matter of the selection of staff. It was also recognised that special considerations might sometimes apply to non-teaching staff at L.E.A. colleges because such staff could be employed at a wide range of educational establishments and might form part of a career service in an authority's employment. Even so, it was felt desirable that the governors should play a part in their appointment

1 L.E.A. Letter No. 7/60, para. 9.

2 Ibid., para. 11.

and that such staff should be responsible to the principal for the performance of their duties.¹

Whilst it was noted that admissions policy would reflect the general character of the college and be subject to any advice received from the institute of education or Ministry, within these broad limits, it was recommended that the governing body should be responsible for admissions with the principal being entrusted with a wide discretion. It was also emphasised that it was most desirable that rules for student discipline should lay down clear procedures defining the responsibility for disciplinary action, suspension, dismissal and reports and appeals to the governors.²

The letter also commended the establishment of academic boards and boards of studies in individual subjects.³

Although the letter was a step in the right direction in the reform of college government, it was essentially cautious in approach tending to follow trends which were already happening in some colleges. There can be no doubt that the Ministry was anxious to bring about changes in college government, but the letter indicated an unwillingness and hesitancy on the part of the Ministry to intervene directly on this matter. In any case, given the statutory structure and the complicated pattern of local authority administration, the scope for Ministry action was limited.

1 L.E.A. Letter No. 7/60, para. 12.

2 Ibid., para. 13. In respect of discipline, the Ministry was more concerned with problems that had been created for itself by appeals cases.

3 Ibid., para. 10.

Conclusions

Thus, as has been shown, colleges had to operate in a diffuse and complicated system of administration and controls. Their work could be subject to changes at short notice, there was a division in financial and academic administration, and a diverse and anomalous pattern of college government. Whilst the colleges carried considerable responsibilities for the process of teacher training, they often carried little responsibility for administrative and quasi-academic decisions which affected the process. Furthermore, in spite of the changes that were taking place in college government, the system was hardly consonant with the growing ambitions of the colleges for status as institutions of higher education as traditionally understood.

The fundamental problems of the administration and control of the colleges lay in the fact that the colleges were monoteknic institutions providing a contingent service, in the historical way in which the colleges had been provided and the way in which college authorities interpreted their responsibilities for the colleges, and in the traditional attitudes towards the nature of the functions of the colleges. Whilst it was not difficult to recognise the problems or to propose rational solutions, given the wide range of interests involved in teacher training, the pluralistic nature of political and social values and the claims of all interested parties to a measure of autonomy, it was, however, difficult to find solutions acceptable to all parties and even more difficult to implement them.

CHAPTER 2

TOWARDS THE FORMATION OF A.T.C.D.E. POLICY ON THE CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION OF TRAINING COLLEGES

College Government

Following the publication of the Ministry's revised Training of Teachers Grant Regulations in 1955, the A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee resolved to set up a sub-committee (Committee on the Government of Training Colleges) of the Association's Conditions of Service Committee "to investigate, through a national enquiry, and to consider the policy of the A.T.C.D.E. on the government of training colleges and on the functions and responsibilities of the Principal of a training college."¹

Whilst the Association was determined to take advantage of the revised Regulations to influence Ministry policy on the government of training colleges, it found itself in an ambivalent situation. The Association was pressing for the introduction of the "Three Year Course" and wished to secure the support of the colleges' providing bodies for this policy. Thus the Association was reluctant to take any action which might antagonise the providing bodies².

In the early discussions within the Association during 1956-57, the Executive Committee and the Committee on the Government of Training Colleges soon reached agreement on such matters as:

1 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 28 October 1955, Minute 47.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Committee on the Government of Training Colleges Minutes, 2 May 1956, Minute 5(iv).

each college should have its own individual governing body; the principal should be a full member of the governing body; the members of the academic staff should have their role in the planning of the academic affairs of the college formalised through the establishment of an academic board; and that the governing body should include representatives of the institute of education and of the university concerned¹. The question of other staff representation on the governing body, however, was the subject of some controversy². The Association confirmed its commitment to securing staff representation on governing bodies but it seems that there was some doubt as to whether such a policy objective was politic in the immediate future.

-
- 1 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 22 February 1957, Minute 157. Also see A.T.C.D.E. Committee on the Government of Training Colleges Minutes, 12 December 1956, Minute 14.
 - 2 The Committee on the Government of Training Colleges had originally proposed, "that there should be as far as possible social contact between the members of the governing body and the staff of a college" (A.T.C.D.E. Committee on the Government of Training Colleges Minutes, 12 December 1956, Minute 14(vi)). This suggestion was referred back to the Committee on the Government of Training Colleges by the Executive Committee with the request to consider the question of staff representation on the governing body (A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 22 February 1957, Minute 158). The Committee on the Government of Training Colleges subsequently proposed that, "with regard to staff representation on the governing body of a college, the ultimate objective shall be as in universities, the representation of staff on the governing body. Interim measures leading in this direction include complete social and professional access to members of the governing body, and the presence of staff at the meetings of the governing body in a consultative capacity, on special occasions such as departmental appointments etc." (A.T.C.D.E. Committee on the Government of Training Colleges Minutes, 14 May 1957, Minute 22).

Consequently it was decided as a matter of interim policy to pursue the more modest aim of obtaining for members of the staff of a college "complete social and professional access to the governing body in a consultative capacity"¹.

At the Executive Committee meeting on 31st May, 1957, the following amended recommendations of the Committee on the Government of Training Colleges was adopted as an interim criteria policy:

- "1. (i) That the governing of the affairs of a college shall be entrusted to a properly constituted governing body which should have no other responsibilities, and should meet whenever possible in the college itself.
 - (ii) That the Principal should be a member of the governing body of his college.
 - (iii) That the governing bodies of colleges should include representatives of the institutes of education and of the universities concerned.
 - (iv) That each college should have an academic board consisting of members of staff, meetings of which should be presided over by the Principal and which should have access to the governing body of the college.
 - (v) The selection of students and matters relating to academic policy should be the responsibility of the Principal.
 - (vi) That once the estimates for a college have been fixed the Principal should have freedom to spend within the estimates.
2. That, with regard to staff representation on the governing body of a college, the ultimate objective shall be as in the universities, the representation

1 The A.T.C.D.E. Salaries Committee appear to have been opposed to even this modest aim and wanted references to the position of the staff in relation to the governing body excluded from interim policy statements. The Salaries Committee was prepared to concede, however, that staff consultation on the staffing establishment of a college could be valuable in some cases and that notification of the staff of ultimate agreements on staffing establishments was essential (A.T.C.D.E. Salaries Committee Minutes, 27 March 1957).

of the academic staff on the governing body. Interim measures leading in this direction include complete social and professional access to the governing body in a consultative capacity."¹

The Executive Committee also agreed that the Committee on the Government of Training Colleges should invite the Directors of Area Training Organisations to a meeting to discuss the government of training colleges as it was affected by the existence of Area Training Organisations. This meeting eventually took place on 24th September, 1957. Furthermore, the Executive Committee agreed that the Committee on the Government of Training Colleges, when the time seemed opportune, should put forward the policy of the Association at meetings with various interested bodies².

The setting up of a Lecturers' Panel within the A.T.C.D.E. in 1958 provided lecturers with a more effective voice in the Association's policy-making structure and led to renewed demands that the policy on staff representation on governing bodies should be reconsidered³. The Lecturers' Panel argued that lecturers could give valuable help to a governing body. Moreover, the views of the staff could not always be made known through the Principal⁴.

1 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 31 May 1957, Minute 244. In view of later discussions it is interesting to note under (v) that responsibility for academic policy was given to the principal and not the academic board.

2 Ibid.

3 For an account of the changes in the A.T.C.D.E. internal structures see J.D. Browne, Teachers of Teachers (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1979), Chapter Ten.

4 A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel Minutes, 2 January 1958, Minutes 2-4.

Consequently the Panel urged the Association to try to ensure that the governing body of each training college should include among its members a lecturer, or lecturers, chosen by the lecturers of the college concerned.¹

The Executive Committee was unmoved by this plea and refused to modify the accepted policy. This stance was supported by the Principals' Panel which considered that priority should be given to securing the membership of the principal on the governing body of his college.² The Committee on the Government of Training Colleges also endorsed this approach.³ All three bodies felt that in the short term lecturers' interests would be best served through the establishment of academic boards.⁴ The Lecturers' Panel seems to have conceded this point and discussions within the Panel now centred on the structure and functions of academic boards.

1 A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel Minutes, 2 January 1958, Minute 5.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Principals' Panel Minutes, 10 October 1958, Minutes 32 and 33.

3 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 30 May 1958, Minute 370.

4 Given the constraint of the situation re. the "Three Year Course" and the fact that in some colleges principals were not members of their governing bodies, the Executive Committee's refusal to change policy seems to have had some justification. But the Executive Committee's stance also reflected the stronger influence of principals vis-a-vis lecturers on the Association's policy. It is poignant to note that the Principals' Panel took little interest in the detailed planning on academic boards at this time.

Overall Structure of Control and Administration

The growing interest in the late nineteen-fifties in the restructuring of local government prompted the A.T.C.D.E. to widen the considerations on the control and administration of colleges. The Association also shared in the general anxieties expressed by other educational interest groups, including L.E.As, about the change to the financing of Local Authorities by a Block Grant System.¹ In 1957 the Principals' Panel expressed "deep concern" at the impending change², and the Executive Committee declared strong opposition to the Block Grant System. The Executive Committee feared that "in times of financial stringency strong pressure will be exerted by non-providing Authorities on those Authorities which do administer Training Colleges"³.

The main emphasis of the discussions within the Association now centred on the appropriate structure for the financing of training colleges as "National Institutions" and the particular problems of the government of L.E.A. colleges. At the Association's Council Meeting on 2nd January, 1959, "the opinion was expressed that the Association should give serious consideration to the position of training colleges in relation to local government and that the present time, when the general principles of local government were being examined, was an appropriate time for the Association to put forward its policy"⁴. Whilst it was accepted

1 For an account of the general campaign against the Block Grant see R.A. Manger, Teachers and Politics (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1970), pp. 73-81.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 25 October 1957, Minute 34.

3 Ibid., Minute 37.

4 A.T.C.D.E., News Sheet, No. 23, January 1959, p. 9.

that many L.E.As governing training colleges were progressive and liberal in their ideas, it was stressed that training colleges were "National Institutions" and that in some cases local pressures were not in the best interests of the colleges. Given the existing structure of local government, it was felt that from the training college point of view administration of local authority colleges by County Councils was to be preferred to that by County Borough Councils. But it was suggested that the ultimate aim of the Association should be to press for the financing of all colleges through a Training College Grants Committee and a move to the university pattern of government.¹

These issues were taken up by the Association's Committee on the Government of Training Colleges at their meeting on 6th February, 1959. The Committee had previously circulated principals, A.T.C.D.E. College Correspondents and Directors of Area Training Organisations to ascertain their views on: preference between County Council or County Borough administration; the proper constitution of governing bodies; and the formation of a Training College Grants Committee. Only sixteen replies had been received by the time of the meeting: thirteen from principals, one from a Director of an Area Training Organisation and two from College Correspondents.² The replies generally favoured County Council to County Borough Council administration on the grounds that County Councils were more liberal in their outlook and delegated more control of the administration of the colleges to the colleges themselves.³ The need for properly

1 A.T.C.D.E., News Sheet, No. 23, January 1959, p. 9.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Committee on the Government of Training Colleges Minutes, 6 February 1959, appendix 2. For the full text of this appendix see APPENDIX THREE.

3 See APPENDIX THREE, section entitled "County Councils preferred to County Boroughs".

constituted governing bodies was also emphasised. Particular areas of contention appeared to be the need to widen the membership of governing bodies to include university and A.T.O. representatives, the cumbersome procedures of finance and undue political interference.¹ There was, however, some ambivalence towards the idea of a Teacher Training Colleges Grants Committee. Some respondents supported the idea on the grounds that it would bring the administration of colleges more into line with that of the universities, lead to the co-ordination of the colleges into a national system thus facilitating long-term planning on a rational basis, bring greater stability to the financing of colleges and result in greater administrative independence for the colleges.² Others found the existing system of finance to be satisfactory and one respondent feared that a closer integration of the colleges into the universities or a paralleling of the university system of administration might lead the colleges to emphasise their academic role to the detriment of being responsive to the actual needs of the schools. The Director of the Sheffield University Institute of Education regarded the idea as not politically feasible, and that "any attempt to prise the control out of the hands of either county borough or county councils would ... be abortive"³.

-
- 1 See APPENDIX THREE, section entitled "Proper Constitution of Governing Bodies".
 - 2 See APPENDIX THREE, section entitled "Training College Grants Committee: (a) Considered favourably".
 - 3 See APPENDIX THREE, section entitled "Training College Grants Committee: (a) Considered undesirable". The fears expressed by the respondent that a closer integration with the universities might lead to colleges emphasising their academic role at the expense of their professional role were re-echoed later by the LEAs in their opposition to the financial and administrative proposals for the colleges in the Robbins Report, Higher Education (Cmd. 2154, H.M.S.O., 1963). Subsequent events were also to prove the accuracy of the Director's predictions.

On the basis of a discussion on these limited replies, the Committee recommended to the Executive Committee that,

"(1) The financial provision for colleges should be in the hands of a central body analogous to the University Grants Committee, in view of the following facts:-

- i. More than ever, under expansion, colleges must be national rather than local.
 - ii. The three year course will bring the work of the colleges closer to that of the universities.
 - iii. The approach to the integration of the colleges into the universities through A.T.Os is accelerating rapidly.
 - iv. The block grant and other modifications of local administration make the change more necessary.
 - v. Local political conditions can interfere with the stability of college policy.
- (2) Each college, as a constituent member of the Area Training Organisation, should have its own appropriately constituted governing body.
- (3) Under the existing system, generally speaking, the larger unit is to be preferred. The wider area provides a more liberal outlook"¹.

The C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges

The Association, now committed to a policy of securing a pattern of administration for the colleges which would reflect their national characteristics and a closer association with the universities, sought support for this policy from the Conference of Institute Directors. This led to the formation of a joint C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E.

1 A.T.C.D.E. Committee on the Government of Training Colleges Minutes, 6 February 1959, Minutes 25, 26 and 27.

Working Party on the Government of Colleges in October 1959.¹

At their first meeting on 9th October, 1959, the Working Party members received a Memorandum setting out A.T.C.D.E. policy.² The Memorandum argued that moves to establish a national system of administration for the colleges was now a matter of urgency. The reasons given for this situation were:

- "(1) The closer association between training colleges and universities makes the establishment of colleges on a national pattern inherently logical.
- (2) The responsibility of A.T.Os for the training of teachers is becoming more and more recognised. This field of responsibility might be enlarged to include administration.
- (3) The institution of the Three Year Course and the plans for the extension of training plant make this a matter of urgency. If the plans are carried out under the present arrangements the situation is likely to harden and any changes will become more difficult.
- (4) The dangers due to the Block Grant system are not likely to be decreased.
- (5) The anomaly by which some colleges are administered according to one set of regulations and some according to another should not be continued indefinitely.
- (6) The present system of government by L.E.As is unsatisfactory in general. Some L.E.As are generous and far sighted and the administration of colleges in their hands works well. In general, however, the machinery of local government is elaborate and under less progressive authorities the administration of training colleges is frustrating and often uninformed. It is sometimes

-
- 1 The membership of the Working Party consisted of:-
A.T.C.D.E. Members: Miss Dymond, Miss R. MacIntyre, Miss E.G. Malloch (Chairman), Mr. E.G. Peirson, Miss H.M. Simpson and Mr. F.I. Venables.
C.I.D. Members: Mr. W.O. Bell, Professor H.C. Dent, Dr. M.M. Lewis, Professor J.W. Tibble and Professor F.W. Wagner.
 - 2 A.T.C.D.E. Memorandum to the Working Party of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. on the Government of Training Colleges (undated).

oppressive in nature. Ministry Regulations, for example, those on governing bodies, are sometimes disregarded and the Ministry has not the power to enforce them"¹.

The Memorandum pointed out that the timing for the announcement of policy decisions was important and delicate. It was felt that there was general goodwill towards the training colleges and the impression of hostility towards the L.E.As must be avoided since none was intended.

On the financing of the colleges, the Memorandum argued that it would be inappropriate for the finances of training colleges to be dealt with by the University Grants Committee since it dealt with the universities which were differently constituted. It was suggested, however, that consideration might be given to two alternatives. Either a Training Colleges Grants Committee might be set up analogous to the U.G.C. to administer the finances of training colleges; or, the existing system by which voluntary colleges were administered might form the basis of a structure for financing the colleges. This system could be modified to allow all colleges to submit their estimates through A.T.Os to the Minister for direct grant from the Treasury. It was argued that A.T.Os would seem the appropriate bodies for this purpose since all interested parties were represented. It was felt that their second alternative was "a practical and feasible one and might prove acceptable to both

1 A.T.C.D.E. Memorandum to the Working Party of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. on the Government of Training Colleges (undated). Of particular interest are the points made under (3) and (6). Under (3) it would seem that the A.T.C.D.E. feared that if the plans for expansion were successfully carried out under the existing system, then this would give added strength to arguments against changes in the system of administration. In the event, this proved to be the case. Under (6), the A.T.C.D.E. were clearly dissatisfied not only with the machinery under which L.E.A. colleges had to work but in many cases the style of administration.

the Ministry and other bodies concerned with the administration of training colleges".¹

By the close of 1960, the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party had drawn up a Memorandum on the Government of Training Colleges² to provide a basis for further discussions both by the two Associations and with representatives of other interested bodies.³ The document was important in three respects. Firstly, it clarified, modified and categorised many of the views currently held within the A.T.C.D.E. and presented them in a coherent format. Secondly, the document was actually used in informal discussions with representatives of outside interest groups and thus made public for the first time, albeit on a very limited scale, the policies being formulated within the A.T.C.D.E. on this issue. Thirdly, the discussions on the document were influential in shaping A.T.C.D.E. policy which was presented to the Robbins Committee.⁴

The C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Memorandum set out the existing structure of the provision of training colleges noting the differences in the financing and government of Voluntary and L.E.A. colleges but pointing

-
- 1 A.T.C.D.E. Memorandum to the Working Party of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. on the Government of Training Colleges (undated). No reason was given why the Association should regard the second alternative on finance as likely to prove acceptable to the Ministry and other interested parties.
 - 2 Memorandum on the Government of Training Colleges prepared by the Joint Working Party of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E., to be found as Document A submitted to the A.T.C.D.E. Committee on the Government of Training Colleges on 18 May 1961. The Memorandum is undated but was probably completed in November/December 1960 judging by the dates of the subsequent meetings with interested parties.
 - 3 Note on Memorandum, being Document B submitted to the Committee on the Government of Training Colleges on 18 May 1961.
 - 4 See Chapter Three.

out the more uniform pattern of control in respect of the academic work of the colleges through the institutes of education. It was argued that difficulties had arisen in the planning of the expansion of the training colleges, and two sources of frustration and delay lay in the division of responsibilities for the finance of the colleges and the separation of the academic and financial supervision of the colleges. A simpler and more flexible system of control was needed which would reflect that the provision of teacher training was a national responsibility. Furthermore, changes were needed in the government of colleges to take into account their national character and their growing status and size.

It was contended that three considerations had to be borne in mind in establishing a new pattern of control and administration. Firstly, the close relationship between a college and the body that founded it needed to be maintained. Secondly, all L.E.As regardless of whether they provided a college or not, should play an important role in the controlling system since they provided finance for the colleges and were the future employers of teachers. Thirdly, the close relationship between the colleges and the universities through the institutes of education should be strengthened because the universities, which fostered high standards of scholarship, had contributed much to the work of the colleges and it was in the national interest that their influence should be extended.¹

The Memorandum put forward three proposals for changes in the existing structure. Firstly, it was proposed that each college should have its own governing body with a large measure of autonomy in the

1 For a less sanguine view of the universities' contribution to training colleges, see: M.V. Jeffreys' article "Institutes of Education from McNair to ... Robbins?" in Aspects of Education 3.

conduct of college affairs. This was essential to attract to the membership of the governing body the kind of people who had a real contribution to make to the life and work of the college. The responsibilities of the governing body should include: general policy-making for the college in consultation with the institute of education and the Ministry; the general oversight of the conduct and curriculum of the college (internal management being delegated to the principal and college academic board); the appointment of the principal and staff; the preparation of annual estimates of expenditure; and the control of expenditure within approved estimates. The membership should reflect the interests concerned with the college's work and include: representatives of the 'providing body', representatives of the institute of education of which the college is a constituent member, the principal and representatives of the college academic board, persons nominated by the university, representatives of local education authorities and co-opted members whose knowledge and experience was such that they could make a positive contribution to the work of the college.¹

Secondly, it was proposed that there should be one channel of administration for all matters affecting the conduct of a college, including finance, and this should be the institute of education. It was argued that since the governing body of an institute was fully representative of all interests involved in teacher training, it was the most suitable body to supervise its individual colleges.²

-
- 1 The membership and functions of the governing bodies in the Memorandum are similar, but not identical, to the pattern set out in L.E.A. Letter No. 7/60.
 - 2 This idea was a clear development of the functions proposed for Schools of Education in the McNair Report. See McNair Report, p. 53, para. 178.

Thirdly, it was proposed that the final control of expenditure should rest with a national body concerned with expenditure over the whole field of teacher training. This might be done by the Ministry of Education with estimates submitted by the institutes; or through an ad hoc committee on the lines of the University Grants Committee. In the case of the latter, it was suggested that since the L.E.As financed their colleges through a 'pool' and exercised no control over expenditure as a whole, there was a strong case for their representation on any committee which might be set up for the purpose of financial control.¹

The Memorandum also included a proposed procedure for establishing a new college. It was suggested that where the possibility of a new college was being considered, the Minister should first hold consultations with the institute of education in the region concerned. The Minister would then invite an appropriate Voluntary Body or a L.E.A. to assume responsibility for its provision. The providing body would then constitute a governing body for the college with an Instrument of Government approved by the Minister. Subsequently, the governing body, in consultation with the institute of education would negotiate with the Minister, through the machinery of the providing body, for the capital necessary for buildings and initial equipment to be raised by loan, repayment would be a charge on the annual maintenance account. A principal would be appointed at an early stage and would assume responsibility for initial planning.²

-
- 1 It is interesting that the Memorandum seemed to accept the continuation of the L.E.A. pool and did not propose that the colleges should be financed directly from Exchequer funds. This point was taken up in discussions with representatives of the voluntary providing bodies. See Pitman and Cunningham below.
 - 2 The proposal for the establishment of a college was later described as an "after-thought", and was subsequently omitted from future documents. It certainly squares oddly with the rest of the document.

Testing Policy

Once the Memorandum was completed, the members of the Working Party took informal soundings of the personal opinions of the representatives of the providing bodies on the document and sought the views of Sir Charles Morris. The Memorandum received a mixed reception and, in particular, much adverse criticism centred on the proposed role for the institutes of education in the financing of the colleges.

The local authority representatives consulted held diverse views. Mr. W.F. Houghton, the Chief Education Officer of the London County Council, reacted strongly against the document and was of the opinion that the L.C.C. would be extremely reluctant to relinquish control over its colleges.¹ Mr. L.W.K. Brown, the Secretary to the County Councils Associations, however, appeared to be very sympathetic and felt that some Education Officers would be entirely sympathetic to the scheme.²

Dr. William Alexander (later Sir William), the Secretary to the Association of Education Committees, gave no indication of how his members might react to the scheme but, characteristically, he was only too ready to share his own views.³ Whilst he was opposed to the

-
- 1 Document D attached to the Minutes of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges, 27 June 1961, being a report of a meeting of Miss Malloch, Miss Dymond and Professor Tibble with Mr. W.F. Houghton on 27th January, 1961.
 - 2 Minutes of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges, 27 January 1961, Minute 52(5).
 - 3 Document A attached to the Minutes of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges, 27 June 1961, being notes of a discussion (recorded by Peirson 23.12.60) between Miss H.M. Simpson, Mr. E.G. Peirson and Dr. W.P. Alexander on 20th December, 1960. A modified version of Alexander's views was adopted as the policy of the A.E.C. Executive Committee for submission to the Committee on Higher Education (Robbins Committee). See Chapter Three. The idea of Regional Councils to administer certain categories of education was not new in educational administration.

C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. proposals, he felt that the whole field of higher education (i.e. all full-time education after 'A' level G.C.E.) was ripe for consideration in terms of organisation and administration, and that the position of the training colleges had to be considered in this context.

Alexander suggested that whereas the individual local authorities were the appropriate bodies for the administration of primary and secondary education, they might not be the best bodies to administer higher education. Consequently, he argued that a smaller number of Regional Councils throughout the country should be set up which would have oversight of all higher education in their areas. Such Councils might be formed either on the initiative of the Government with powers deriving from the centre, or built up from the L.E.As of the region with powers delegated to them by the constituent L.E.As under some general scheme laid down by the Government. The Regional Councils would control the current expenditure of the institutions of higher education within their area with the income being derived in part from the region either by precept on the rates of the component authorities or by a special higher education levy throughout the area. To control the academic work of its colleges, each Council would have academic boards made up of representatives of the constituent colleges, and there would be separate boards for each main category of education provided in the region, e.g. university, technical and training college. One of the main tasks of the Councils would be to evolve a variety of qualifications suited to the needs of the various groups of students but of comparable standard and status. These qualifications might be established at two levels corresponding

to the honours and pass degree standards which were maintained by the universities.¹

To ~~A~~^Effect overall co-ordination, Alexander suggested that a National Advisory Council for Higher Education should be set up. This would be the main policy-making body and one of its most important functions would be to ensure that the facilities for higher education were always adequate to meet the need. At times of expansion it would advise both on the general rate of expansion and as between various types of institution. Like the Regional Councils, the National Council would have a number of standing sub-committees concerned with the various types of provision in the field of higher education.

Alexander was critical of the universities and institutes of education and he was opposed to the idea of the further

1 Alexander launched his policy of Regional Councils at the A.E.C. Conference in Llandudno in June 1961 (see Education, Vol. 117, No. 3049, 30th June, 1961, p. 1454). Following the submission the A.E.C. Executive Committee's evidence to the Robbins Committee, it soon became clear that many L.E.As were opposed to the idea of Regional Councils: see e.g. Walter Hyman's letter to Education, Vol. 118, No. 3071, 1st December, 1961, p. 940 ; and the letter of the Yorkshire Association of Education Committee's to the A.E.C. Executive Committee, Education, Vol. 118, No. 3074, 22nd December, 1961, p. 1074.

integration of the colleges into the universities.¹ He argued that the A.T.C.D.E. had to decide whether to stand by its policy of building up the institute of education within the university framework or to accept that professional training should be a responsibility shouldered by a body separate from, but working in association with, the universities. In any case, he felt that it would not be wise for the Association to press on with

1 Document A attached to the Minutes of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges, 27 June 1961. Alexander argued that the professional training of all teachers should be carried out in the training colleges which were in close contact with the schools. He did not believe it was the proper function of a university to provide professional training. He felt that the university departments of education should give up their responsibility for professional training and concern themselves with courses of further study in education and research, although they might also develop the study of education as a normal subject for a first degree to be taken not only by those who might eventually enter the teaching profession but by other students as well. Nevertheless, he argued that the members of the staff of the university departments of education should be actively engaged in the professional training of the teachers through the colleges. Alexander stressed that one of the most important aims was to secure true unity in the teaching profession but he believed that there were many influential people in the universities, and even in the institutes of education, who were opposed to this.

Peirson believed that Alexander's opposition to the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. scheme was based on two factors:-

- (a) Alexander was now directing his attention to the wider issues of the administration of higher education as a whole and therefore had little time to concern himself with one aspect of it.
- (b) Alexander had no faith in the institutes of education which he believed worked to keep the status of training colleges and the teaching profession low.

the matter at that point in time in view of the projected Government inquiry into the whole field of higher education.¹

In general the representatives of the voluntary providing bodies supported the Memorandum in principle although some reservations were expressed on the specific proposals for the changes in the structure of college government, the financing of the colleges and the setting up of a new college.

Mr. I.J. Pitman of the British and Foreign Schools Society said that he was in complete agreement with the general policy of the Memorandum and that he felt that the time was ripe to introduce changes on the lines suggested. Moreover, he was ready to give his support to any action taken by the A.T.C.D.E. and would be prepared to assist positively if necessary. He argued that the introduction of the Block Grant indicated that the policy of the Government was to delegate more and more responsibility to the L.E.As. Consequently, it was important to take out of their hands the direct control of establishments like training colleges which performed a national function. He suggested that L.E.A. opposition to the Memorandum might be reduced if it were suggested that the whole cost of teacher training should be borne by the Exchequer instead of retaining the existing system whereby approximately 40% fell on the rates. He was less clear, however,

1 The appointment of the Inquiry into Higher Education under the chairmanship of Lord Robbins and its terms of reference were officially announced in the House of Commons on 20th December, 1960 (see Chapter Three). It was already well known before this date that the Government intended to initiate an enquiry into this field of education.

in his ideas of the pattern of control and administration at the national level.¹

Mr. R.F. Cunningham², Secretary of the Catholic Education Council, felt that in general the Memorandum would be acceptable to the Roman Catholic colleges. Although the Roman Catholic colleges did not suffer from the defects of the existing system, they were sympathetic to the difficulties experienced by L.E.A. colleges. He pointed out the unique relationship which existed in most Roman Catholic colleges between the governing body and the college: the college usually being an integral part of a religious order. From the Roman Catholic point of view, it was essential that a large measure of power should be vested in the governing body. Whilst the Roman Catholic colleges would be willing to broaden the basis of their governing bodies, it was important to preserve their special religious character and the rights of the founding bodies. It was recognised, however, that these rights could be safeguarded by Trust Deeds. Cunningham favoured the financing of all the colleges directly from the Exchequer arguing this would simplify the system by obviating the L.E.A. pool. He felt that with the introduction of Block Grants, the Government might be prepared to support such a move. He was not convinced, however, that the institutes of education were the right bodies to undertake regional control. The greatest objection to this proposal was the hard

1 Document B attached to the Minutes of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges, 27 June 1961, being a report of a meeting of Mr. Peirson and Miss Dawson with Mr. I.J. Pitman dated 7 December 1960.

2 Cunningham had previously been in the Civil Service as secretary to Sir Edward Boyle.

bargaining that might go on at the regional level with pressures brought to bear on the local officers. He did not think that financial co-ordination was the task of an Institute Director, nor did he feel happy with the prospect of high powered regional finance officers administering money allocated to a region from a Central Pool. Instead, he preferred control by a central body set up for the purpose, or, as at present in the voluntary sector, control by the Ministry. Furthermore, he was opposed to the proposed procedures for establishing a new college and stated that the Roman Catholic authorities could not accept a situation in which they were unable to initiate proposals for a new establishment.¹

Mr. R.J. Harvey, Secretary of the Council for Church Training Colleges, whilst sympathetic to the scheme, similarly, had doubts about the efficacy of the machinery of the institutes either financially or administratively. He argued that the Church colleges valued their present direct approach to the Ministry on financial matters.²

Mr. G.R. Osborn, Secretary of the Methodist Education Committee, did not feel that there was any need for a change in the government of Methodist colleges. He was not opposed, however, to some national pattern as long as it did not break up the existing system

-
- 1 Document C attached to the Minutes of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges, 27 June 1961, being a report of a meeting of Miss Simpson and Miss Dawson with Mr. Cunningham held on 10 January 1961.
 - 2 C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges Minutes, 27 January 1961, Minute 52(4).

in Methodist colleges with their special link with Methodism.¹

Doubts about the wisdom and expediency of adding financial responsibility to the existing functions of the institutes of education were also raised by Sir Charles Morris, the Vice Chancellor of Leeds University. He felt that it might be more difficult to get the support of the universities for a new scheme of government for the colleges if they were asked to assume some measure of financial responsibility.²

At the meeting of the A.T.C.D.E. Committee on the Government of Training Colleges on 18th May, 1961, the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party's Memorandum was discussed and oral reports on the discussions with the representatives of the providing bodies and Sir Charles Morris were received. In view of the points arising from the discussions and from feelings expressed within the Association³, the Committee concluded that to give the institutes of education financial responsibility for the colleges could complicate rather than simplify the machinery of control and would involve the institutes in difficult problems which they were not designed or equipped to meet. Consequently, it was felt wise to

-
- 1 Document E attached to the Minutes of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges, 27 June 1961, being a report of a meeting with Mr. G.R. Osborn held on 9 December 1960.
 - 2 Document B, Note on the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Memorandum, submitted to the A.T.C.D.E. Committee on the Government of Training Colleges, 18 May 1961.
 - 3 See J.D. Browne, Teachers of Teachers (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1979), p. 115.

reconsider this aspect of the Memorandum and put forward a scheme in which a national body, a Grants Committee for Colleges of Education, would deal directly with the governing bodies of individual colleges.

Subsequently, amendments were made to the Memorandum deleting references to the institutes having financial responsibilities. Instead, it was proposed that the control of expenditure should rest with a national committee which would be concerned with the expenditure over the whole field of teacher training. This body would need to be of sufficient strength to inspire confidence in all concerned and would need to reflect the interests represented on the governing bodies of the colleges but at a national level, viz. L.E.As, Voluntary Bodies, the Ministry of Education, universities, the institutes of education and the colleges themselves. In this new pattern, the institutes would retain their existing functions and in so far as academic developments had financial implications, the institutes' views would be expressed both at the governing body level and through their representation on the national body.¹

The revised Memorandum was approved by the Executive Committee at their meeting on 2nd June, 1961, and it was agreed that the policy of the Association on the "Government of Colleges" be published as soon as it was appropriate to do so.²

1 Document H. The revised version of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Memorandum on the Government of Training Colleges attached to the Agenda for the A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Meeting on 2 June 1961. The revised Memorandum does not make clear the sources of finance for the colleges and in particular whether it was envisaged that the L.E.A. pool would be retained.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 2 June 1961, Minute 38.

The amendments in the Memorandum led to a further discussion on the relationships between the colleges and the institutes of education at the C.I.D./C.H.U.D.E./A.T.C.D.E. Liaison Committee on 11th September, 1961. It was suggested that two alternative futures now lay open to the colleges: either the continuance of the institutes and a closer association with the universities, or in the development of higher education outside the universities. It was agreed, however, that a closer academic association with the universities would dispose of suggestions of narrowness in the teaching profession, and that the institutes provided an administratively convenient unit for maintaining contact with the universities and faculties and exercising vigilance on standards of courses undertaken in the colleges. It was recognised that a closer contact with the universities might mean closer control over the academic courses in the colleges than the previous situation where the colleges had enjoyed unusual freedom in developing their own expertise. Nevertheless, it was felt that the colleges might be willing to accept this situation and the A.T.C.D.E. confirmed its commitment to a policy of seeking a closer academic association with the universities.¹

Academic Boards

Whilst both the Executive Committee and the Principals' Panel had declared their support for the establishment of an academic board within each college as a part of their policy for the reform

1 C.I.D./C.H.U.D.E./A.T.C.D.E. Liaison Committee Minutes, 11 September 1961, Minute 17.

of college government, the Executive Committee appears to have been too pre-occupied with the general characteristics and functions of governing bodies and the financing of the colleges to give serious consideration to the structure and functions of academic boards. The task of providing momentum on this matter then fell to the Lecturers' Panel, which in the absence of the Association's initial support for the immediate membership on the governing bodies, saw academic boards as a means of securing for lecturers a place in the formal structure of policy-making and administration in the colleges.

At a meeting of the Lecturers' Panel in 1958 "the opinion was expressed by many members that a formally constituted academic board, or staff meeting with clearly stated functions and responsibilities, had an important part to play in the running of a college, though the formality of the procedures would probably vary with the size of the college".¹ The findings of a Panel's questionnaire² to lecturers in 1960 were interpreted by the Panel as indicating among lecturers "a positive reaction to the idea that colleges should have a democratic way of managing their affairs" and "strong support (i) for regular and frequent staff meetings, (ii) for each college to have an academic board and (iii) for the delegation of responsibility among members".³

-
- 1 A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel Minutes, 16 October 1958, Minute 9.
 - 2 Document A circulated with the agenda for the meeting of the Lecturers' Panel on 12 May 1960. 545 completed forms were returned. On the issue of academic boards, 267 returns indicated that they were in favour of the establishment of academic boards and 32 indicated opposition.
 - 3 Document B. "Analysis of Lecturers' Panel Questionnaire" circulated with the agenda for the meeting of the Lecturers' Panel, 12 May 1960; section A, "Functions of Staff". This section also points out that "Opinion also favours staff representation on the governing bodies of the colleges as well as the possibility of direct contact with the governing body for all staff members of a college".

From the information¹ collected by the Panel during the course of 1960-61, it appeared that no regular pattern of formal procedures existed among the colleges for staff participation in the administration and policy-making of a college.² In some colleges academic boards or formal staff meetings with clearly defined constitutions, functions and procedures had been established,

-
- 1 It seems that the Panel experienced some difficulty in obtaining information on the practices within the colleges. One of the difficulties arose from the variations in the terminology used to describe bodies fulfilling similar functions, i.e. 'academic councils', 'staff meetings' and 'academic boards'. For example, in an inquiry of institutes of education on the extent to which the colleges in their area had academic boards, a number expressed themselves puzzled as to what were academic boards. None of the institutes could say that any of their colleges had academic boards and a number said that no college had an academic board. (Document C circulated with the agenda for the Lecturers' Panel Meeting on 14 October 1960. The Panel eventually had to concede that few people had a clear idea as to the nature and functions of an academic board (Lecturers' Panel Minutes, 10 February 1961, Minute 57(a)).
 - 2 The information collected was very limited but indicated that there was no regular pattern or widespread tradition of formal structures. For example, the Lecturers' Panel Minutes, 12 May 1960, Minute 49, reported that information had been collected from nineteen colleges: five had academic boards and fourteen had no academic boards. Document C circulated with the agenda for the Lecturers' Panel Meeting on 14 October 1960, reported that St. Matthias College and Bath Academy of Art had academic boards. An academic board had also been in operation at the Cavendish Square College since 1950, and the principal and another member of the board attended governing body meetings. The National Training College of Domestic Science Subjects also had a well established academic board. Meetings were held three times a term, at the beginning, in the middle and at the end, dates having been fixed a year in advance. An agenda was circulated and minutes were kept by a member. The business discussed related to the organisation of the college, the progress of students and general college business. The Document also reported that in some cases there appeared to be an identity of function with full staff meetings, e.g. at Maria Grey College, and in other cases there was a difference of function. The evidence of the Document was supported by discussions within the Panel - see Lecturers' Panel, 10 February 1961, Minute 57(d) "Members of the Panel gave instances of the functioning of academic boards in different colleges and it appeared that there was the widest variety in their constitutions and functions".

although practices varied from college to college.¹ In others there appeared to be no system for general staff participation, or alternatively the only means of general consultation took place through informal staff meetings.² This situation was hardly surprising given the wide diversity in the arrangements for the government of the colleges.

Whilst the Lecturers' Panel accepted that informal staff meetings might fulfil a similar function to academic boards, the Panel felt that it was only through formally constituted academic boards that the right of the staff to have a full say in the working of a college could be established and safeguarded.³ In an attempt to distinguish between the usage of nomenclature and the different functions of academic boards and staff meetings, the Panel set up a sub-committee "to examine fully the question of academic boards in colleges and prepare a statement on the matter for the consideration of the Panel".⁴

The sub-committee reported to the Panel on 12th May, 1961, and recommended:

- "(i) That the Panel endorses the policy of the Association that an academic board should be formed in every college.
- (ii) That every academic board should have a formal constitution with standing orders.

1 For fuller and more detailed examples of academic boards, see APPENDICES FOUR and FIVE.

2 The absence of formal structures did not mean that no consultation took place. No doubt in some of the smaller colleges formal procedures were considered unnecessary.

3 A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel Minutes, 10 February 1961, Minute 57(e).

4 Ibid., Minute 58.

- (iii) That the constitution of the academic board should lay down the composition of the board, regulations for procedures (i.e. publication of the agenda, voting, appointment of chairman, etc.) and the functions of the board.
- (iv) That matters considered by the board would normally include:
 - (a) Curriculum of the college.
 - (b) Organisation of the timetable.
 - (c) Examinations (in some respects this will be a matter for individual departments).
 - (d) Reports on the provision for library equipment.
 - (e) Reports on staffing ratios, the college establishment, etc.
- (v) That staff meetings to consider questions of residence, discipline of students, etc. should be held in addition to meetings of the academic board".¹

The Panel also received a document from Mr. J.C. Wilson setting out the reasons for establishing an academic board at Worcester College.² In introducing his document, Wilson re-emphasised the

1 A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel Minutes, 12 May 1961, Minute 76.

2 Ibid. Document B. The document states: "The idea of constituting an Academic Board sprang from a desire to differentiate, in Staff Meetings, between matters of academic concern and those of a more domestic nature appertaining to the life of the College. Originally Staff Meetings considered a large and mixed agenda and by it attempted to deal with academic details, organisational details and domestic considerations all at the same meeting. It was felt wiser for matters of academic concern to be dealt with on a more formally constituted basis, and to deal with others at times other than Staff Meetings. The Principal and a sub-committee elected from the staff drafted a provisional Academic Board Constitution, having considered the constitution operating in other Colleges. The following Academic Board Constitution (see APPENDIX FIVE) was agreed to, by the Staff, after a series of Staff Meetings. In addition to the meetings of the Academic Board, Staff Meetings are occasionally held. It is our intention to regularise these meetings, at some time in the future, as a function of the Senior Common Room. The Articles of Government for the Colleges provides for the internal organisation of an Academic Board under section 17: An Academic Board, consisting of all members of the full-time staff of the College, shall be established under the Chairmanship of the Principal to advise the Governing Body on matters concerning the work of the college. The Academic Board shall meet at least once in each term and shall submit its views or proposals to the Governing Body through the Principal".

difficulty some members had in distinguishing between the formal function of an academic board and the more informal proceedings of a staff meeting. He suggested that staff meetings should consider such domestic matters as the College Open Day, Dinners, etc. Matters considered recently by the academic board in his college had included timetables, examinations, failure and the re-examination of students, the purchase of a t.v. set, teaching practice arrangements and the interviewing of students.¹

In discussion the members of the Panel raised many questions and points on the appropriate size and composition of an academic board; the relationship of a board to the governing body, the institute of education and external examiners; and the importance of an academic board making clear the responsibility as well as the rights of staff. Some members of the Panel even indicated that their colleagues were not interested in the formation of formal academic boards and felt that the existing arrangements for staff meetings appeared to be quite adequate.²

It was clear from the discussion that many issues had to be resolved and clarified before the Panel could propose a model for an academic board for consideration by the Association. Consequently, it was resolved that the members of the Panel should report back to their colleagues on the discussion on academic boards and as developments took place they should report back to the Panel's sub-committee.³

1 A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel Minutes, 12 May 1961, Minute 78.

2 Ibid., Minute 79.

3 Ibid., Minute 80.

At this stage, the discussions within the Panel were overtaken by the inquiry into Higher Education although for the next few years the Panel continued to monitor the development of academic boards.

CHAPTER 3

THE ROBBINS REPORT¹: McNAIR REVISITED

Establishing the Robbins Committee

By the late nineteen fifties various factors were contributing to a growing pressure for a comprehensive review of the provision of higher education. These included the failure of higher education to expand in quantity and variety to meet the changing demands of the expanding sixth forms; the shift in the balance between university and non-university provision; the need for a coherent government policy on higher education in the light of changes in societal values and the structure of the economy; the problems that were arising from the University Grants Committee dealing directly with the Treasury; the growing demands that universities should be more publicly accountable; and the need to rationalise and co-ordinate the planning of the future development of the whole field of higher education which was comparatively the most costly sector of educational provision.² More specific to the problems of the

-
- 1 Higher Education, Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63 (London, H.M.S.O., 1963, Cmnd. 2154). The Committee and the Report are commonly known, and referred to hereafter in the main text, as the Robbins Committee and Robbins Report. The following abbreviations are used in the footnotes: H.E.E. Pt. 1 for Higher Education Evidence - Part One; and H.E.R. for Higher Education Report.
 - 2 For discussions on the general problems facing higher education at this time, see for example: University Grants Committee, University Development 1962-67 (H.M.S.O., November, 1968, Cmnd. 3820); H.E.R.; R. Layard, J. King and C. Moser, The impact of Robbins (Harmondsworth, Penguin Education Special, 1969); M. Kogan, The Politics of Educational Change (Glasgow, Fontana, 1978); W.O. Lester Smith, Government of Education (Harmondsworth, Penguin Original, 1965).

training colleges were the need to expand teacher training; the question of the future role of the colleges and their possible contribution to other forms of professional training and higher education; their status and pattern of administration; and their relationship with other institutions of higher education, particularly the universities, following the introduction of the three year course in 1960.

The case for an inquiry into higher education was argued in the House of Lords in May, 1960, on a motion put down by Lord Simon of Wythenshawe asking the Government to appoint a Committee to inquire and report on the extent and nature of the provision of full-time education for those over 18, whether in the universities or in other institutions. The motion found strong support from all sides of the House, although in the course of a long and wide-ranging debate little mention was made of the specific problems of the training colleges.¹ Sir David Eccles, the then Minister of Education, was known also to be pressing for an inquiry.²

Towards the end of 1960, the Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Macmillan, announced to the House of Commons that he intended to set up a Committee,

1 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCXXIII, 1959-60, April 26 to May 26, 11th May, 1960, col. 615.

2 J. Stuart Maclure, Educational Documents, England and Wales 1816-1967 (London, Methuen Educational Ltd., Second Edition, 1968), p. 288.

"to review the pattern of full-time higher education in Great Britain and in the light of national needs and resources, to advise Her Majesty's Government on what principles its long-term development should be based. In particular, to advise, in the light of these principles, whether there should be any changes in that pattern, whether any new types of institution are desirable and whether any modifications should be made in the present arrangements for planning and co-ordinating the development of the various types of institution."

Furthermore, he informed the House that Lord Robbins had agreed to accept the chairmanship of the Committee; that the other members had still to be decided, but they would include people with first-hand knowledge of the various aspects of higher education in Great Britain; and that the terms of reference included a consideration of the teacher training colleges.¹

The names of the other members of the Committee were eventually announced in February, 1961, in a written reply to a question from Mr. Gurden. They were Sir David Anderson, Dame Kitty Anderson, Mr. A. Chenevix-Trench, Professor J. Drever, Mr. H.L. Elvin, Miss H.L. Gardner, Sir Edward Herbert, Sir Patrick Linstead, Sir Philip Morris, Mr. H.C. Shearman and Mr. R.B. Southall.² None of the members was actually engaged in teaching in the training colleges although three members had close connections with colleges.

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 632, 1960-61, Dec. 12 to Dec. 21, 20th December, 1960, cols. 1065-66. The Robbins Committee was subsequently officially appointed by a Treasury Minute dated 8th February, 1961 (See H.E.R., p. iii).

2 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 634, 1960-61, Feb. 6 to Feb. 17, 9th February, 1961, Written Answers, col. 104.

Mr. Shearman was the Chairman of the London County Council Education Committee; Mr. Elvin was the Director of the University of London, Institute of Education; and Sir Philip Morris, who was the Vice Chancellor of Bristol University, had served on the McNair Committee and had supported the proposals for the establishment of Schools of Education.

The composition of the Robbins Committee was greeted with disappointment and dismay by the A.T.C.D.E. who feared that the absence of any member with direct experience of college problems might lead to the interests of the colleges being neglected.¹ Letters were sent to the press,² and a deputation attended the Ministry of Education to meet Dame Mary Smieton, the Permanent Secretary, and Sir David Eccles, the Minister. Eccles was apparently slightly uneasy when informing the deputation that Lord Robbins had wanted a small Committee rather than a representative one. The deputation, however, stressed that they had no wish to see a large Committee, but the universities, institutes, technical education, the public schools and the Principality of Wales were represented, whereas the colleges, on which the Minister was relying to some considerable extent for the expansion, were not.³

-
- 1 The Association had reacted in a similar way to the announcement of the membership of the McNair Committee. See J.D. Browne, Teachers of Teachers (1979), p. 61.
 - 2 See Times, 16th February, 1961, p. 13; and Education, Vol. 117, No. 3030, 17th February, 1961, p. 341.
 - 3 J.D. Browne, Teachers of Teachers (1979), pp. 110 and 111; and W. Taylor, Society and the Education of Teachers (1969), p. 73. Browne argues that the failure to give the colleges a direct voice was indicative of the fact that they were not as yet regarded as equal partners in the higher education company.

The A.T.C.D.E.'s case was pressed in the Commons by Messrs. Willey, Gaitskell and King, but with no success. Willey's leading question was, perhaps, unfortunately framed in asking why the membership of the Robbins Committee did not include a "representative" of the training colleges. It was clear, however, that Macmillan was not to be moved on the issue. He shrewdly stressed that the members of the Robbins Committee had been appointed in a personal capacity on the basis of their personal experience and not on a "representative" basis; that Lord Robbins and his colleagues would give the training colleges every opportunity of presenting their views and the inquiry over the whole field of higher education would be searching and impartial; and that Lord Robbins had wanted the Committee to be kept small.¹

Whilst the training colleges were given every opportunity to express their views to the Robbins Committee, the Prime Minister's belief that the inquiry would be impartial was somewhat optimistic in respect of the administration of the colleges, at least in the case of two members. Reading the Minutes of Evidence to the Robbins Committee, Elvin's commitment to the A.T.C.D.E. case against L.E.A. administration becomes abundantly clear, as does his support for the A.T.C.D.E.'s alternative policy of financing the colleges through the mechanism of the institutes of education. Similarly, Shearman was obviously committed to the L.E.As retaining control over their colleges and was always anxious to contain criticisms of

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 634, 1960-61, Feb. 6 to Feb. 17, 16th February, 1961, cols. 1761-2.

L.E.A. administration and to bring out the strengths and advantages of the L.E.A. sector. These views, inter alia, motivated Shearman's "Note of Reservation on Administrative Arrangements"¹ to the Robbins Report. This does not mean that neither Elvin nor Shearman did not have good reasons for supporting their particular lines of policy, but given their backgrounds and associations, it is hardly surprising that they should see the problem of the administration of the colleges from opposite perspectives. Nor is it likely that Sir Philip Morris approached the problem without preconceived ideas.²

The Evidence: functions and relationships with the universities³

Whilst the colleges remained mainly or solely concerned with teacher training, than L.E.As in general, if not individual L.E.As, and the Voluntary Bodies had a reasonable case for retaining control over their colleges, and the Ministry of Education was also likely to want to retain strong controls in respect of the colleges.

1 H.E.R., "Note of Reservation on Administrative Arrangements", by Mr. H.C. Shearman, pp. 293-296.

2 J.D. Browne seems to suggest that in retrospect the A.T.C.D.E. were better off by not having a member on the Robbins Committee. She states, "It is probable that the interests of teachers and their training had, in fact, more powerful advocates in such members as Sir Philip Morris, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Bristol, and Mr. Lionel Elvin, Director of the London University Institute of Education", (Teachers of Teachers, p. 111).

3 For the written and oral evidence, see H.E.E. Pt. 1: Vol. A, Church of England Board of Education, pp. 73-91; A.T.C.D.E., pp. 185-208; Methodist Education Committee, pp. 209-215; Vol. B, A.M.C., pp. 557-570; Vol. C, C.C.A., pp. 725-740; A.E.C., pp. 758-778; Vol. D, A.C.E.O., pp. 1283-1307*; Catholic Education Council, pp. 1347-1356; Vol. E, L.C.C., pp. 1543-1574; Vol. F, W.J.E.C., pp. 1737-1757; and Ministry of Education, pp. 1882-1955.

(* The A.C.E.O. was not a providing body organisation but obviously highly influential on L.E.A. policies).

Consequently, it is necessary to briefly outline how the A.T.C.D.E., the providing bodies and the Ministry of Education saw the development of the colleges.

The A.T.C.D.E. felt that, whilst the colleges should grow in scope and size, it was important to preserve their distinctive character. It was envisaged that a few colleges might become a part of a university and others might continue to train only teachers. The majority, however, would develop into Colleges of Professional Studies providing courses in social welfare and for the varied occupations sharing the concern of teachers with children and young persons, as well as in teacher training.¹ Even so, given the demand for teachers, the A.T.C.D.E. anticipated that most of the colleges would continue to be engaged mainly in teacher training.²

The providing body organisations of the church colleges were clearly committed to maintaining their share in teacher training and felt that their colleges should continue to be concerned mainly or solely with teacher training. The Church of England Council of the Church Training Colleges was prepared to see a small number of Church of England colleges developing either courses leading to pass and general honours degrees or developing other forms of professional training for the social services,³ but on the understanding that they

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Memorandum submitted by the A.T.C.D.E., 20 July 1961, para. 4, p. 186.

2 Ibid., para. 5.

3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Memorandum submitted by the Church of England Board of Education, Part III, Evidence presented by the Council of the Church Training Colleges, section 6, New types of college, p. 81.

would retain their essential purpose of teacher training.¹ It was felt that selected colleges might also provide P.G.C.E. courses² and higher degree courses in Education including an M.A. in Teaching.³ The Catholic Education Council indicated that it would welcome an extension of the role of Catholic colleges to include particular courses for various kinds of social workers where the Catholic teaching on the integrity of the family would have a great contribution to make to their training.⁴ But the fundamental purposes of the Catholic colleges were seen to be the preparation of Catholic teachers for Catholic schools and the specific task of preparing Catholic students for teaching the Catholic religion in Catholic schools.⁵ The Methodist Education Committee pointed out that there were only two Methodist colleges and seemed to be

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Oral Evidence of Church of England Board of Education, p. 87. Dr. Bliss reported that all twenty-six Church of England colleges felt that they must preserve their vocational position and that anything said about diversification was based on the understanding that the essential purpose of the colleges to train teachers would not be destroyed.

2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Council of the Church Training Colleges, section 5(c), p. 80.

3 Ibid., section 5(e), p. 80.

4 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. D, Memorandum submitted by the Catholic Education Council, Part D, section 2(c), p. 1350. The Council seems to have been generally keen to extend the influence of the Catholic Church in higher education.

5 Ibid., section 2(f). It was stressed: "The existence of facilities for the Catholic training of intending Catholic teachers is an essential without which the Catholic schools which the Catholic community has struggled so hard to keep and for which it has made such sacrifices would lose much of their distinctive character and purpose".

opposed to any diversification in their functions. The main concern of the Committee was to ensure that the Methodist colleges should be allowed to retain their role in the training of teachers for all types of school, and the Committee considered that the colleges might also develop P.G.C.E. courses.¹

Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, there was no common policy among the Local Authority Associations. Indeed, there was an apparently wide divergence between the policy of the C.C.A. and the policies of the A.M.C. and the A.E.C. Executive Committee. Whilst the C.C.A. felt that the work of the colleges should be broadened to include the provision of diploma courses in the social sciences, the C.C.A. could not support any proposal that the colleges should become "liberal arts colleges" if this meant that they were to form a permanently lower tier of a graduated provision of higher education.² The A.M.C. and the A.E.C. Executive Committee, however, favoured a move to a largely consecutive rather than concurrent pattern of teacher training which, in effect, involved the transformation of the colleges into either "liberal arts colleges" or specialist professional studies centres.³ The policy of the

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Memorandum submitted by the Methodist Education Committee, paras. 3, 4, 5 and 6, p. 210.

2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. C, Memorandum submitted by the County Councils Association, section on the Future of Training Colleges, p. 729.

3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. C, Memorandum submitted by the Association of Education Committees, pp. 759-761; and, Vol. B, Memorandum submitted by the Association of Municipal Corporations, section on Teacher Training Colleges, pp. 559-560. The A.M.C. envisaged that in the short term only a few colleges would be involved in the experiment of the change-over in teacher training.

W.J.E.C. had similarities to the A.M.C. and the A.E.C. Executive Committee policies but with a significant difference in scale. The W.J.E.C. considered that the existing emphasis of the colleges on teacher training must continue for some years to come, although as soon as the circumstances allowed, a limited number of colleges might be converted into colleges of general education admitting students intending to enter a varied range of professions.¹ The L.C.C. and the A.C.E.O. saw advantages in retaining institutions whose primary concern would be teacher training. The L.C.C. considered that the functions of the colleges within the field of teacher training should be widened,² and the A.C.E.O. felt that some colleges might experiment in providing courses for the social services.³

The Ministry of Education saw the majority of the colleges developing to make a wider contribution to the future pattern of higher education at the undergraduate level. The Ministry argued that the natural course of evolution for some colleges would be assimilation into the universities, but others might develop into academically autonomous university colleges either on their own or in combination with other institutions.⁴ The university colleges

-
- 1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, Memorandum submitted by the Welsh Joint Education Committee, section on Training Colleges, p. 1742.
 - 2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. E, Memorandum submitted by the London County Council, section on Training Colleges for Teachers, paras. 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33, p. 1550.
 - 3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. D, Memorandum submitted by the Association of Chief Education Officers, section on Training Colleges, pp. 1286-87.
 - 4 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, Memorandum submitted by the Ministry of Education, section on "The effect on the training colleges", para. 141, p. 1904. It was envisaged that some colleges would serve a period of tutelage before becoming academically autonomous university colleges: see paras. 142, 125 and 136.

with a predominantly teacher training background would tend to cater largely for aspiring teachers who wished to obtain degrees as well as teacher's certificates, but they would also make extensive provision for students who did not want to commit themselves to teaching as a career before graduating and for men and women who were interested in social work.¹ A few colleges, however, because of their small size or geographical location might not be suitable for development into university colleges, and for the foreseeable future would continue to provide the three year concurrent course for students who were less well-qualified academically or whose needs could best be met by such courses.²

Clearly, the proposals for the possible future diversification of the colleges, on whatever scale, raised potential questions for their administration collectively and individually, for they implied a change in the existing homogeneous nature of the training college sector, a possible differentiation of functions among the colleges and a closer integration of some of the colleges into the wider provision of higher education. Furthermore, there was also the question of the timing and character of any changes in function and administration.

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, Memorandum submitted by the Ministry of Education, section on "The effect on the training colleges", para. 141, p. 1904.

2 Ibid., para. 142.

More significantly, however, for the immediate situation, five points emerged from the evidence related to the functions of the colleges which were to have an important influence on the Robbins Committee's proposals and the following debate on changes in the administration of the colleges.

Firstly, it was generally agreed that with the rising academic standards of the colleges, especially with the introduction of the three year course and the improving entry standards of a growing number of students, the status of the colleges within the field of higher education should be given firmer and more tangible recognition.

Secondly, it was accepted by the A.T.C.D.E., the Ministry of Education and the providing body organisations, although the evidence of the A.E.C. Executive Committee was less clear,¹ that in the immediate future the majority of colleges would continue to be mainly or solely engaged in teacher training. Furthermore, the majority of students in the training colleges would continue to take the three year concurrent course.

Thirdly, there was general agreement among the A.T.C.D.E., the Ministry of Education and the providing body organisations, with the exception of the A.E.C. Executive Committee, that the colleges should develop closer academic relationships with the universities

1 From subsequent events, it seems likely that the majority of the A.E.C. membership certainly did not envisage any immediate changes in the functions of the colleges.

through the institute of education.¹ In particular, suitably qualified training college students should have the opportunity of reading for a degree and professional qualification by following a four year course,² although not every college would be involved in providing degree courses.³

Fourthly, in general, the providing body organisations were opposed to any immediate integration of the colleges into the universities and saw academic and administrative problems as separate issues. Indeed, Alexander even expressed doubts about the wisdom of any responsibility for initial training of teachers being vested in the senates of universities.⁴

Fifthly, qualifications and reservations were expressed on the possible closer academic links with the universities. Although the A.T.C.D.E. saw a closer relationship with the universities as the only desirable way forward in securing the validation of degrees

1 The institutes of education, however, were not regarded without criticism. See H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Council of the Church Training Colleges' evidence, section 7, p. 81; and the oral evidence given by Harvey, *ibid.*, pp. 88 and 90.

2 Some witnesses to the Robbins Committee apparently expressed the view that a degree and a professional qualification should be awarded to all students after a three or four year course: see H.E.R., para. 324, p. 112.

3 This proposal implied stratification both within the training college sector and within colleges offering degree courses. It also raised questions on which subjects would be accepted for degree-level work and which members of staff would be regarded as acceptable for teaching degree-level work. Certainly these problems were later to cause a good deal of friction between some colleges and universities in establishing B.Ed. degrees.

4 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. C, A.E.C. Oral Evidence, p. 777.

in colleges, the Association wished to preserve the colleges' own distinctive approach to teacher training. The members of the Association were well aware of the difficulties that might arise from the university departments and senates being more actively involved in the work of the colleges, the antipathy of some universities to a new type of degree including the study of Education, and the view of some colleges, especially those concerned with mainly practical and professional subjects, that university control of syllabuses was a high price to pay for degrees.¹ Consequently, the Association stressed that there would have to be a clear definition of the responsibilities of the colleges and universities in course planning, teaching and the setting and marking of examinations. The A.T.C.D.E. maintained that the mechanism of the institutes of education, suitably modified, was the best way of forging the academic links with the universities whilst protecting the colleges' own special approach to teaching. It was accepted, however, that the traditional degree standards should apply to degree work in the colleges and that ultimate responsibility for the degrees would rest with the university senate.² Thus, the A.T.C.D.E. policy seemed to be one of wanting to be in the university sector and enjoying the contingent status, but not being of the university sector.

Harvey, for the Council of the Church Training Colleges, argued that the value of a closer relationship with the universities depended on due importance being given to Education as a discipline.

1 J.D. Browne, Teachers of Teachers (1979), pp. 112-113.

2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Memorandum, section on the Development of Institutes of Education, p. 187.

If this was looked upon as inferior to other subjects then the colleges would be worse off by a closer association with the universities. Whilst the Council welcomed a move in the direction of the universities, it was subject to a different atmosphere.¹

Odgers of the Ministry of Education felt that it was important to have reasonable flexibility in the degree syllabuses so that the existing flexibility which the colleges enjoyed would not be wholly removed.² Part stressed that an alternative route should be available for colleges which did not want to be tied to the universities by the means of a degree granting body on the lines of the National Council for Technological Awards.³

The Evidence: Administration and Government, A.T.C.D.E. policies, reactions and alternative policies

The A.T.C.D.E. used the opportunity of the inquiry to press forward the Association's policy on the reform of the administration and government of the colleges. The substance of the A.T.C.D.E.'s first Memorandum submitted to the Robbins Committee was based largely on the revised Memorandum of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges with further modifications in the financial arrangements.

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Church of England Board of Education Oral Evidence, pp. 87-88.

2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, Ministry of Education Oral Evidence, p. 1929.

3 Ibid.

It was argued that the major expansion of teacher training and the aims and nature of the work of the colleges emphasised that teacher training was a national responsibility and that this should be reflected in the pattern of administration. The existing system at the local level, however, was inconsistent, piecemeal and parochial. The powers and constitutions of governing bodies varied greatly as between voluntary and L.E.A. colleges, between one L.E.A. and another, and some colleges had no separate governing body of their own. Though L.E.A. colleges were financed from a national pool contributed by all L.E.As, the L.E.As which did not have a college in their area had very little or no responsibility for the colleges. At the national level, the Ministry of Education was responsible for overall administration and the formulation of policy with the other interests involved represented in a complicated structure of advisory committees.¹

The Association maintained that there was a strong case for the establishment of a Grants Committee for the colleges which might be a sub-committee of the U.G.C. This would negotiate with the Treasury (or a Ministry of Higher Education, if established) and with the governing bodies of the colleges. The latter would need a large measure of autonomy in the conduct of their affairs to enable them to attract governors who would be able to contribute to the work and life of the colleges. At both the national and local levels all the main interests and institutions involved would need adequate representation.²

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Memorandum (20 July 1961), Section F, the Government of Training Colleges, para. 20, p. 189. The reference to the complicated structure of "advisory committees" is obscure.

2 Ibid., para. 21, p. 189.

During the course of the oral evidence, the A.T.C.D.E. representatives confirmed that they wished to see the colleges entirely self-governing institutions subject to consultation with the universities through the institutes of education on academic matters. The former contribution of the providing bodies would be acknowledged by allocating to them a "good" representation on the governing bodies of their former colleges whose membership would be widened to include representatives who had experience of education. The constitution of the governing bodies would be drawn up by agreement at the local level by either the colleges or the institutes, and the membership would include representatives of the university, of the local authorities, of the providing body, and co-opted members from among teachers and people generally interested in education.¹

In response to a question from Shearman on the possible value of the existing variety in the structure and powers of governing bodies, the A.T.C.D.E. representatives pointed out that they were not opposed to variety so long as this was not used to conceal weaknesses in the arrangements. Indeed, they anticipated that there would be some variety arising out of the different nature of the colleges. But what they did want was uniformity in certain matters.²

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Oral Evidence, pp. 200, 201, 202.

2 Ibid., p. 201.

Shearman and Elvin pointed out that in their experience the university institute and the university itself could bring pressure to bear to have the constitution and principles of governing bodies brought into line with what lecturers wanted. Shearman suggested that this might be a better way forward than a complete restructuring of the system. The A.T.C.D.E. representatives, however, considered that this was most unusual and they were sceptical of the success of such an approach. Tibble stated that in his own institute, the colleges were governed through a training colleges sub-committee of the Education Committee and all business was dealt with through the Education Office. Whilst he had tried to secure changes in this situation for about ten years, he had only succeeded to the extent of persuading the local authority to agree to have one or two members of the university co-opted to the sub-committee. He believed that it would be difficult to make further changes in the general situation without some clear direction from the national level.¹

In an attempt to counter-balance the criticisms made of L.E.As, Shearman said that as chairman of an L.E.A. he had the experience in the last twelve to eighteen months of being approached by two colleges asking to be taken over, and the authority had received a great deal of praise. The A.T.C.D.E. representatives conceded that they were impressed by the good authorities, but others had a parochial outlook dominated by an elected majority which swayed the decisions every time on considerations other than educational ones.²

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Oral Evidence, pp. 201 and 202. Clearly institutes could lay down conditions for the membership of the colleges, but the real question lay in how effectively they could impose such conditions.

2 Ibid., p. 202.

As an alternative to the Grants Committee scheme outlined in the Memorandum, Tibble informed the Robbins Committee that the A.T.C.D.E. had considered a three-tiered system in which the institutes would extend their sphere of operation into the financial field. The middle stage had been omitted, however, on the grounds that it was thought to be politically more feasible to secure stronger governing bodies dealing directly with a national body. Robbins and Elvin saw difficulties in the prospect of a national committee constituted on similar lines to the U.G.C. visiting over a hundred different institutions in a comparatively short period, and the A.T.C.D.E. were asked to submit further documentation on the matter.¹

Robbins was clearly impressed by the A.T.C.D.E.'s dissatisfaction with the existing system and asked the Association to provide further detailed written evidence on the nature of their grievance. Elvin used this request to suggest that the A.T.C.D.E. might also bring out more fully the problems of the colleges in having to serve three different authorities: the local authority or voluntary body, the Ministry and the university.²

The subsequent Memorandum³ submitted by the A.T.C.D.E. was a more detailed and sophisticated version of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E.

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Oral Evidence, p. 201.

2 Ibid., pp. 202 and 203.

3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Further Memorandum submitted by the A.T.C.D.E. (21 February 1962), pp. 204-208. The A.T.C.D.E. also submitted details of specific examples of what were considered to be bad practices in L.E.A. colleges, but the Robbins Committee decided not to publish them (C.I.D./C.H.U.D.E./A.T.C.D.E. Liaison Committee Minutes, 10 December 1963, Minute 54).

Working Party's original proposals modified to take into account the discussions that were taking place in the Robbins Committee. In the Memorandum, the A.T.C.D.E. re-emphasised the national characteristics of the colleges and contended that the interests of L.E.As in general in the recruitment and training of teachers would be better served by a system of administration re-organised on a national basis. Nevertheless, it was felt undesirable that the system should be administered directly by a central Ministry and an intermediate stage between the Ministry and the colleges was needed.¹

As far as L.E.A. colleges were concerned, it was argued that they suffered from the hierarchical functioning of local government. The recommendations of the governing bodies might be delayed or reversed by other committees of the authority whose members had no association with the college and might be unaware of its needs. Furthermore, the policy-making of the smaller authorities could be affected by local pressures which had no relevance for the colleges as national institutions. The governing bodies of L.E.A. colleges were largely composed of members of the Council or Education Committee and the membership could be affected by local elections. Moreover, many governors often had little or no experience of higher education. Whilst independent governors might be appointed because of their special knowledge and experience, they were in a weak position politically as they could not represent

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Further Memorandum submitted by the A.T.C.D.E. (21 February 1962), paras. 1, 2 and 3, p. 204.

their views to other committees. Consequently, it was difficult to attract experienced and able people to serve on governing bodies. There were also considerable variations between the authorities in the treatment of their colleges, and in general difficulties often arose over financial and non-academic matters. It was accepted that many local authorities had taken a broad and generous view of their colleges, but even these were hindered sometimes by standing orders and regulations designed in the main for schools.¹

In contrast, the A.T.C.D.E. considered that voluntary colleges had considerable autonomy and responsibility in administration. The main weakness in the administration of voluntary colleges lay in the field of current expenditure where the Ministry exercised detailed control over the colleges' estimates. Since the Ministry could not know, however, the particular circumstances of every voluntary college, the pruning of estimates could be severe and arbitrary.²

The A.T.C.D.E. felt that there were also serious weaknesses at the national level in long-term planning and formulation of policy with inadequate consultation with institutions and organisations concerned with the training of teachers. In consequence, the colleges had been affected by a succession of

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Further Memorandum, paras. 4 and 5, p. 204.

2 Ibid., para. 6, p. 205.

crises and short-term crash programmes imposed on them in such a way as likely to undermine their confidence and morale.¹

To overcome these weaknesses, the A.T.C.D.E. argued that there should be a three tier system of administration with Area Bodies between the Ministry and the colleges. The governing bodies would deal with the Ministry through the Area Bodies which in turn would translate national policy for teacher training into an appropriate policy for each college. Each Area Body would be responsible for checking the annual estimates of expenditure made by their associated colleges in the light of detailed knowledge of their circumstances and submit a co-ordinated statement to the Ministry. The Area Body would not provide finance or exercise detailed control but would act at an intermediate policy level in relation to planning and finance.²

It was suggested that there might be between 10 and 15 Area Bodies each with an average of about 10 to 15 associated colleges. On the basis of the principle that the universities should undertake considerable responsibilities in relation to training colleges, which was emphasised by the members of the McNair Committee who supported the proposal for University Schools of Education, the A.T.C.D.E. argued that the institutes of education, suitably adapted, were best fitted to fulfil the role of Area Bodies rather

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Further Memorandum, para. 17, p. 207.

2 Ibid., para. 7, p. 205.

than ad hoc or joint committees comprising of persons nominated by the Ministry.¹ The institutes, through their existing academic responsibilities for the colleges, had an intimate knowledge of their associated colleges and staff, their aims, traditions and standards of work. Moreover, through their constitutions and relationships with the universities, they had an assured status and independence, and brought together in a working relationship representatives of the university, colleges, L.E.As, Voluntary Bodies and the teachers' associations in their area.²

The financial function would be carried out by an Estimates Committee established by the Delegacy which would be parallel to the Academic (or Professional) Committee with the colleges and the providing bodies having strong representation. A member of the institute staff with financial expertise would act as the secretary of the Estimates Committee. The Committee would report to the Delegacy which would forward the co-ordinated recommendations on the estimates of the colleges to the Ministry, the channel being parallel to, though quite distinct from, that between the universities and the U.G.C. There would be a constant interchange of information between the Academic and the Estimates Committees and

1 Not all of the institutes would become Area Bodies. See H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Further Memorandum, paras. 11 and 12, p. 206.

2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Further Memorandum, paras. 8, 9 and 10, pp. 205 and 206. In fact, the legal position of existing institutes qua A.T.Os was set out in the Training of Teachers (Local Education Authorities) Regulations, 1959, S.I. 1959, No. 395, regulation 4. The existence of A.T.Os was subject to the approval of the Minister, as were their constitutions.

it was anticipated that the financial process would gain much from the critical and informed consideration of the institutes of education which had a knowledge of the academic aims and standards of the colleges.¹

It was acknowledged that the proposals had far-reaching implications for the L.E.As and Voluntary Bodies providing the colleges. The A.T.C.D.E. emphasised, however, that L.E.As and Voluntary Bodies would continue to be represented on the governing bodies of colleges provided by them, that they would have strong representation on the Estimates Committee, and that there would not be a weakening of the relationship between the voluntary colleges and their parent bodies.² The A.T.C.D.E. believed that, provided the responsibilities of the several parts of the system were clearly prescribed, the new arrangements would avoid much of the frustration which principals were liable to suffer under the existing arrangements.³

The A.T.C.D.E. also argued that the institute principle would be readily adapted to allow colleges to develop courses in social work of various kinds.⁴

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Further Memorandum, para. 13, p. 206.

2 The position of the voluntary colleges was regarded by the A.T.C.D.E. as a sensitive and difficult problem. See J.D. Browne, Teachers of Teachers (1979), p. 115.

3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Further Memorandum, para. 14, p. 206. It is noteworthy that the position of the principal was still a dominant feature of A.T.C.D.E. policy and no mention is made in the Memorandum of academic boards.

4 Ibid., para. 15, p. 206.

At the college level, the governing body would be responsible for the preparation of estimates, the control of expenditure within approved estimates, the appointment of the principal and staff, and the proper functioning of the college within the framework decided at the national and area levels. The membership of the governing body would include: representatives of the providing body, of all L.E.As in the area, of the institute of education of which the college was a constituent member and of the college staff (the principal would be an ex officio member); persons nominated by the university; and co-opted members with the knowledge and experience to make a positive contribution to the work of the college.¹

At the national level, it was accepted that the ultimate responsibility for formulating and giving effect to policy must rest with the Ministry of Education (or Ministry of Higher Education) because it was answerable to the Government and Parliament, and because the Treasury would provide most of the funds. Even so, the A.T.C.D.E. insisted that the planning of a consistent policy and programme required skilled staff to do the short- and long-term planning and the continual assessment of progress. Moreover, there needed to be adequate consultation with the training institutions and other interest groups, and some kind of mechanism to enable them to contribute to the planning and formulation of policy. Whilst the A.T.C.D.E. felt that the existing National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of

¹ H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Further Memorandum, para. 16, p. 207.

Teachers was inadequate to fulfil this purpose, and whilst it was hinted that a similarly constituted body to the Central Training Council proposed by the McNair Committee might be the solution to the problem,¹ the Association recommended:-

- "(i) That the Ministry should review the existing arrangements for consultation, bearing in mind among other things the desirability of training institutions being consulted at an early stage about changes in policy and programmes which concern them directly; the desirability of enabling the advisory committee to keep an independent watch on the progress of developments; and the need to bring the proposed Area Institutes clearly into the theatre of consultations.
- (ii) That the Ministry should provide short- and long-term plans for the training of teachers of all kinds for the national system of education; and for youth leaders, social workers of various kinds and similar occupations which might be catered for by expanding some Training Colleges to Colleges of Professional Studies.
- (iii) That the Ministry should formulate and keep up-to-date a consistent policy for the training of all teachers, while allowing colleges as much freedom and scope for initiative as is compatible with national requirements."²

The organisations representing the providing bodies of the Church of England, the Methodist and the Roman Catholic colleges were also critical of the system of policy-making at the national level and were sympathetic towards criticisms of L.E.A. administration. It would seem that they were prepared to accept changes in the system so long as these did not affect the underlying

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, A.T.C.D.E. Further Memorandum, paras. 17 and 18, p. 207.

2 Ibid., para. 19, pp. 207 and 208. Also see para. 21(iv), p. 208.

principles of the self-government of their own colleges and the continuance of a voluntary presence in the provision of teacher training.

The Church of England Board of Education and its Council of the Church Training Colleges and the Methodist Education Committee significantly emphasised in their Memoranda that their colleges were self-governing institutions.¹ The Council of the Church Training Colleges stressed that whilst the governing bodies of Church of England colleges had a strong Church nucleus, they also included representatives of the appropriate university, local authorities and other interests, beside co-opted members. Furthermore, to an increasing extent, principals were ex-officio members and in some cases staff had representation; moves in this direction represented the policy of the Council.² The Methodist Education Committee also pointed out that the principals of their training colleges were members of the governing bodies and the universities had representation.³ Cunningham, for the Catholic Education Council, stated that the administration of Catholic colleges was essentially different from L.E.A. colleges, but he did not give information on the structure of their governing bodies.⁴

-
- 1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Church of England Board of Education Memorandum, Part II, the Training Colleges in the Development of Higher Education, para. 7, p. 77; Council of the Church Training Colleges Evidence, section 3, p. 78; and Methodist Education Committee Memorandum, p. 209.
 - 2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Council of the Church Training Colleges Evidence, section 3, p. 78.
 - 3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Methodist Education Committee Memorandum, p. 209.
 - 4 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. D, Catholic Education Council Oral Evidence, p. 1356.



Both the Council of the Church Training Colleges and the Methodist Education Committee were critical of the way in which the Ministry had issued directives on the recent changes in the balance of training.¹ The Council considered that there was an urgent need for more effective co-ordination in the provision of all types of teacher training.² The Methodist Education Committee saw the solution to the problem in better long-term planning by the Ministry. It was accepted that there must be some form of central control and that there were difficulties in forecasting the age at which young women teachers tended to get married. But the Committee argued that the incidence of the birth rate was known and if this was used as a basis for long-term planning, whilst some changes might have to be made in the plans, there would be no need to make the dramatic changes in the balance of training which the colleges had recently experienced.³

The need to unify and co-ordinate the financing of the whole of teacher training was strongly advocated by the Council of the Church Training Colleges. The Council accepted that the system of the direct financing of voluntary colleges by the Ministry had

-
- 1 Both bodies were concerned at the recent changes in the "Balance of Training" whereby the colleges were asked to take 85% students for training for the primary sector and only 15% for training for the secondary sector. See J.D. Browne, Teachers of Teachers (1979), pp. 87-88, for a discussion on this matter.
 - 2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Council of the Church Training Colleges Evidence, section 8(a), p. 81.
 - 3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Methodist Education Committee Oral Evidence, Rev. Mr. Hughes, p. 214.

some advantages, especially since it facilitated an overall view to be taken of a substantial cross-section of the colleges and it enabled the official representatives of the Voluntary Bodies to discuss broad questions of policy with the Ministry. It was also acknowledged that careful consideration was given to their views and to those of individual colleges. The Council argued, however, that it was difficult to see how there could be any overall financial oversight in the case of L.E.A. colleges. This inevitably led to inequalities and variations in the financing of L.E.A. colleges. Thus the Council considered that there was a strong case for a common oversight of the whole field of financial provision.¹

Harvey confirmed that the Council would like to see some form of grants committee for the whole of teacher education to overcome the anomalies of the existing system. He felt that at present there was too much detailed control by the Ministry in the financing of the voluntary colleges which did not make for good administration, and this was a possible danger of the direct financing by the Ministry of all colleges. Whether the grants committee should be a separate body or a sub-committee of the U.G.C. would depend on the overall structure of control for the colleges. Nevertheless, Harvey preferred a separate body that would function independently of whatever body made grants to the universities proper. He conceded, however, that

¹ H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Council of the Church Training Colleges Evidence, section 8(b), pp. 81 and 82.

the Council had not given thought to whether Parliament would accept such a body and he accepted that in the long run it might be undesirable to have an ad hoc body for teacher training separate from the university system.¹

The Catholic Education Council also favoured a change in the source of finance for training colleges either to the university or some special committee along the lines of the U.G.C.²

It was clear, however, that the Voluntary Bodies were anxious to maintain control of their colleges. Dr. Stopford pointed out that the Church of England colleges provided them with an opportunity to do the things they wanted to do in their own particular way for those who wanted it done in that way. He was doubtful, however, if the Church of England would wish to maintain control over its colleges if they became quasi-universities.³ The Methodist Education Committee, too, was concerned to maintain a Methodist presence in both the Primary and Secondary sphere of teacher training.⁴ The Rt. Rev. Beck was adamant that the Roman Catholic Authorities wanted to keep control of their colleges. Furthermore, he conceded that if this principle was accorded to the Catholic colleges, it would have to be accorded to the L.E.As.⁵

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Church of England Board of Education Oral Evidence, p. 91.

2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. D, Catholic Education Council Memorandum, Part D, section 2(h), p. 1351.

3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Church of England Board of Education Oral Evidence, p. 91.

4 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. A, Methodist Education Committee Memorandum, section 6, p. 210.

5 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. D, Catholic Education Council Oral Evidence, p. 1356.

The A.E.C. Executive Committee saw the solution to the problem of the administration of the colleges within the context of a radical reshaping of the provision of higher education outside the universities. The Committee considered that, whilst all L.E.As should play an important part within this context, there were difficulties in each of the 146 L.E.As providing and administering higher education institutions. Consequently, it was proposed that Regional Councils for higher education, exercising statutory powers and administering higher education institutions, should be established. The Regional Councils would be constituted of representatives of all the L.E.As in the region together with representatives of appropriate industrial, commercial and educational interests. They would be financed partly by direct grant from the Ministry of Education, with appropriate safeguards as to their independence in matters of educational content and curricula, and partly by precepting on L.E.As in the region or, by raising a direct levy on the people in the region in the form of a higher education tax. Each Regional Council would establish academic boards for the appropriate fields of higher education representative of the teaching staff in the appropriate field which would be concerned with the standards and the provision of courses. The academic board for teacher training would be responsible to the Regional Council and not to the institute of education, thus severing the existing link between the colleges and the universities. The university departments of education would be represented on the academic board for teacher training but would not directly undertake initial teacher training.¹

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. C, A.E.C. Memorandum, pp. 759-761.

Whilst the A.E.C. Executive Committee policy favoured changes in the pattern of administration away from individual L.E.As, a large measure of "grouped" L.E.A. control would remain. In effect, the proposal for Regional Councils was antithetical to the A.T.C.D.E.'s proposal for Area Bodies, and by suggesting a severing of the links between the colleges and the universities could expect no support from the A.T.C.D.E. Even so, the A.E.C. proposal did offer an alternative coherent structure for the planning and administration of teacher training at the local level. The main weakness of the proposal, however, was that it did not have the support of the majority of the members of the A.E.C.

The A.E.C. Memorandum was dated 29th September, 1961, and the oral evidence of the A.E.C. to the Robbins Committee on 1st December, 1961, was based on the assumption that the Memorandum had the broad agreement of the A.E.C. as a whole, although it was accepted that a variety of opinions were held within the Association. At the A.E.C. Annual Meeting at Torquay in June, 1962, the members had before them a Notice of Motion approving and endorsing the evidence submitted by the Executive Committee to the Robbins Committee. This created concern within the A.E.C. and considerable opposition was expressed to the concept of a regional pattern of organisation. In the event, the Notice of Motion was defeated by 124 to 121 votes. Therefore the Executive Committee decided to submit a "Further Memorandum" informing the Robbins Committee of these events. The Memorandum stressed, however, that while the Notice of Motion was in general terms, the Executive Committee believed that its non-acceptance was due mainly to specific opposition to the proposal which implied

the surrender even in part of direct responsibility for the administration for higher education within the area of the individual L.E.A.¹

The C.C.A., the A.C.E.O. and the L.C.C. reacted strongly against the criticisms of L.E.A. administration and the suggestions that L.E.A. colleges should be taken away from the direct administration of individual L.E.As. Indeed, far from relinquishing control of their own colleges, the A.C.E.O. insisted that the local authorities should have a share in the government of voluntary colleges.²

In their Memoranda and oral evidence, the three organisations, with the aid of Shearman, set out to minimise the criticisms of L.E.A. administration and to reassure the Robbins Committee that they supported a liberal pattern and style of college administration within the L.E.A. sector. Both the C.C.A. and the A.C.E.O. conceded

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. C, Further Memorandum submitted by the A.E.C., 12th October, 1962, p. 778. For a report of the debate at the Annual Meeting see Education, Vol. 119, No. 3101, 29 June 1962, pp. 1317-18. The Notice of Motion read, "That this Association approves and endorses the evidence submitted by the Executive Committee, following the general discussions which took place at the Annual Meeting in 1961, to the Robbins Committee of Inquiry on Higher Education". The resolution was moved by Mrs. E.M. Wormald who reminded the meeting that the topic had been discussed at the previous annual meeting and that the Executive were satisfied that there were no objections to presenting the evidence to the Robbins Committee. Dr. Lincoln Ralphs, in seconding the motion, said that the function of the Executive was to reflect the view of the membership. The opposition to the motion was led by Alderman W. Hyman, Chairman of the West Riding County Council, who said the basis of the evidence was financial, and financial problems must be faced qua finance. Regionalisation would mean the loss of control of education by the L.E.As.

2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. D, A.C.E.O. Memorandum, p. 1287.

that a few L.E.As had been reactionary in the government of their colleges and that this situation should be remedied,¹ but it was maintained that in general most L.E.A. colleges had considerable academic and administrative freedom to manage their own affairs.² Broad argued that the only fierce financial control was on capital expenditure which was controlled by the Ministry.³ On the question of changes in the membership of governing bodies as a result of local elections, Ralphs said that it was increasingly becoming the recognised practice of L.E.As that direct political nominations should form a minority on governing bodies.⁴ Brown indicated that the C.C.A. would welcome a recommendation from the Robbins Committee for more freedom for college staff within their own institutions to settle academic matters through the strengthening of academic boards.⁵

Presswood stated that the A.C.E.O. wished to see the governing bodies of the colleges having complete freedom to spend within the "heads of estimates" without reference to the local council. Furthermore, the A.C.E.O. considered that the governing bodies should have a broader base including staff members, as was in fact already being achieved in many cases.⁶ Mrs. Cole of the L.C.C.,

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. C, C.C.A. Oral Evidence, Ralphs, p. 737; also Vol. D, A.C.E.O. Oral Evidence, Presswood and Clegg, p. 1293.

2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. C, C.C.A. Memorandum, para. 13, p. 728; also Vol. D, A.C.E.O. Memorandum, p. 1288.

3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. C, C.C.A. Oral Evidence, p. 737.

4 Ibid., p. 739.

5 Ibid., p. 737.

6 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. D, A.C.E.O. Oral Evidence, p. 1293. Also see A.C.E.O. Memorandum, pp. 1288 and 1290. The C.C.A. also favoured the broadening of the governing body membership but made no mention of staff representation: see Vol. C, C.C.A. Memorandum, p. 729.

which the Robbins Committee members acknowledged had an enlightened attitude towards college government, felt that a good deal of history was being brought into the discussions on college government. She hoped that the problem would be seen in the context of an evolving situation. She pointed out that during the discussions that had led to principals becoming members of the governing bodies of L.C.C. colleges, some principals had opposed this measure on the grounds that they preferred to act as independent representatives of their colleges in standing up to the governing bodies.¹

All three organisations emphasised the achievements of the L.E.As in the provision of teacher training and argued that it was doubtful if any other form of control could have accomplished so much in so short a space of time in such an economical way.² Furthermore, they stressed that a major advantage of L.E.A. administration was that it facilitated a close contact between the colleges and the schools.³ It was clear, however, that the three organisations were not only anxious that individual L.E.As should retain control over their colleges on the grounds of a vested L.E.A. interest in the quality and supply of teachers. They were also concerned that the L.E.As should have a substantial share in the provision of higher education,⁴ and no doubt saw the loss of control

-
- 1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. E, L.C.C. Oral Evidence, p. 1565. Also see the views of Ambrose, Vol. E, p. 1731.
 - 2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. C, C.C.A. Memorandum, para. 16, p. 728; Vol. D, A.C.E.O. Memorandum, p. 1283; and, Vol. E, L.C.C. Memorandum, para. 7, p. 1544.
 - 3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. C, C.C.A. Oral Evidence, p. 738; Vol. D, A.C.E.O. Memorandum, p. 1287; and Vol. E, L.C.C. Memorandum, para. 38, p. 1551.
 - 4 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. C, C.C.A. Memorandum, para. 19(i), p. 729; Vol. D, A.C.E.O. Memorandum, p. 1283; and, Vol. E, L.C.C. Memorandum, para. 7, p. 1544.

over training colleges as a further erosion in their role in higher education following the impending loss of control over the C.A.T.s.¹

The A.C.E.O. members were also sharply critical of the proposals for financing the colleges through a Grants Committee and of the A.E.C. policy of regional authorities for the administration of higher education outside the universities. Martin Wilson felt that the Grants Committee principle could be effective in dealing with a small number of institutions, but in the case of the large number of training colleges, he felt that it might lead to "more rule of thumb administration". Under L.E.A. administration, he suggested that there was likely to be more flexibility and more responsiveness to the needs of the colleges because it was the local authorities who in a sense challenged the Government when development was needed.² On the A.E.C. proposal, Martin Wilson stated that "we are not enamoured".³ Clegg pointed out that there were sections of local authorities, including those in Yorkshire, which had repudiated the A.E.C. recommendations.⁴ Lord saw the thinking behind the A.E.C. policy

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. D, A.C.E.O. Memorandum, p. 1285 and Oral Evidence, Lord, Martin Wilson, Sylvester and Presswood, p. 1292; and, Vol. E, L.C.C. Oral Evidence, Houghton, p. 1564.

2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. D, A.C.E.O. Oral Evidence, p. 1294.

3 Ibid., p. 1295.

4 Ibid. Clegg stated that one of the concerns of the Yorkshire authorities was the adverse effect which Regional Councils might have on the development of extended courses in modern schools. There can, however, be no doubt that the dominant reason for the opposition was that L.E.As did not want to lose control over their colleges.

as being to ensure that all L.E.As participated in the government of training colleges. But he thought that it was unnecessary to set up statutory boards, which would lead to an "administrative hierarchy and administrative empire", to achieve the principle. He believed that all L.E.As could participate in the government of colleges by being represented on existing governing bodies, and that it was sensible and practical to leave the "home authority" to continue with the administration.¹ Sylvester, however, considered that the basis of the A.E.C. proposal was to find an easier way of raising money than at present. He accepted that local authority finance was not in a satisfactory state, but this was a different kind of problem.²

The W.J.E.C. Memorandum supported changes in the government of colleges arguing that there should be a separate governing body for every college; that the membership should reflect the functions of the college and its place in the community; and that the governing body should have a large measure of freedom in the government and control of the college.³ But if the members of the Robbins Committee were reassured by the apparently liberal approach of the Memorandum, the W.J.E.C. oral evidence must have raised doubts about the possibility of securing a more liberal style of government under the administration of some L.E.As.⁴

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. D, A.C.E.O. Oral Evidence, p. 1295.

2 Ibid.

3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, W.J.E.C. Memorandum, section on Control and government of institutions of higher education, p. 1744.

4 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, W.J.E.C. Oral Evidence, particularly in relation to appointments, pp. 1754-1757.

The Ministry of Education approached the problem of the administration of the colleges from the viewpoint of their possible future role and the administrative arrangements for institutions of higher education at the national level. The Ministry's policy also seemed to steer a via media between A.T.C.D.E. and L.E.A. policies. Furthermore, the Ministry introduced a new element into the debate by suggesting that the problem of the administration of the training colleges had to be seen in relation to the problem of the administration of Area Technical Colleges.

The Ministry argued that whatever arrangements were made for the administration of institutions of higher education, it was necessary to satisfy two criteria. Firstly, the institutions, especially those with academic autonomy appropriate to independent degree-giving institutions, should have as much freedom as possible both in matters which affected academic policy and in day-to-day administration. Furthermore, the people actively engaged in higher education should be substantially concerned with the formulation of any national policy affecting it. Secondly, the Government, representing the public interest as a whole, must be in a position to ensure that the development of higher education was fully adequate to meet the national needs. Thus the Government should have ultimate responsibility on such matters as the total expenditure on higher education from public funds; the extent of the total provision for higher education; its broad distribution between types of institution; and for securing that, in so far as the national need for different types of highly qualified manpower is

identifiable, the plans for higher education were such as to enable the institutions to play their part in meeting it.¹

The Ministry considered that the most appropriate mechanism to meet these criteria was the Grants Committee system.² Whether there was one Government Department or several Departments with responsibilities for education, and the Ministry preferred the former,³ it was argued that there were two alternative approaches to the future development of the Grants Committee system.

The first alternative was to set up a group of Grants Committees, on the same model as the U.G.C., which would assume responsibility at the national level for all the institutions preponderantly engaged in full-time higher education. These would include: the universities, the College of Aeronautics, the Royal College of Art, the Colleges of Advanced Technology, the Scottish Central Institutions, most, or all of the regional technical colleges, and all the training colleges.⁴ The main advantage of this proposal would be that a group of Grants Committees with a wide coverage of full-time higher education would be able to look at the provision of this type of higher education as a whole and to plan the development of its constituent parts in a comprehensive way.⁵

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, Ministry of Education Memorandum, para. 158, p. 1907.

2 Ibid., para. 166, p. 1908.

3 Ibid., paras. 220 and 223. Also see Ministry of Education Oral Evidence, pp. 1943-4.

4 Ibid., para. 168, p. 1908.

5 Ibid., para. 171, p. 1909.

The main implication for L.E.A. training colleges would be that they would become direct grant institutions. Whilst the Ministry recognised that this change would be welcomed by the training colleges, the Ministry also pointed out that it would be strongly opposed by the L.E.As who felt that they had much to contribute to the development of the colleges. Moreover, it would also be resented by many of the area technical colleges which were doing more work at university level than most of the training colleges.¹

The second alternative would be to use the Grants Committee principle on a more limited basis in the first instance and to build up the number of institutions covered by it. Under this proposal, the Grants Committee or Committees would be restricted initially in their field of operations to the universities or university colleges, viz:- the universities, the College of Aeronautics, the Colleges of Advanced Technology, and the leading Scottish Central Institutions.² As the need for degree places outside this group became apparent, the Grants Committee, in consultation with the Government Department(s) and institutions concerned would designate institutions among training colleges and technical colleges for development into institutions of university standing which would then come under the orbit of the Grants Committees.³

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, Ministry of Education Memorandum, para. 169, p. 1908.

2 Ibid., para. 173, p. 1909.

3 Ibid., para. 174, p. 1909.

Whilst the second alternative lacked the attraction of the nearly complete coverage of higher education, the Ministry argued that it had four advantages. Firstly, it did not involve a major revolution in organisation. Secondly, it restricted the operation of the Grants Committee in principle to those types of institution with which the U.G.C. was established originally to deal, and avoided the administrative and other difficulties of extending the responsibility of the Committees to a substantial volume of work below degree level. Thirdly, it would enable the Grants Committees to grow gradually in scope. Finally, the L.E.As would continue to assist the further development of technical and teacher training colleges up to the point where they were ready to become a university college or part of a university.¹

It was felt that this solution might be more, though not completely, acceptable to the technical colleges than to the training colleges since the former had been used to some differentiation of status since 1956.² The training colleges, however, were not differentiated at all, and one of the attractions of the first proposal was that it would not only put all the training colleges on the same administrative footing but would make them undoubted members of the family of institutions of full-time higher education. This would make it easier for the training colleges to accept the differentiations that would arise when some of their number became university colleges or parts of universities.³ The

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, Ministry of Education Memorandum, para. 177, p. 1909.

2 Ibid., para. 178, p. 1909.

3 Ibid., para. 179, p. 1910.

second alternative, however, would involve not only drawing a line across the training colleges for the first time but also drawing a very sharp line between those "promoted" within the Grants Committees' ambit and those who would regard themselves as "left behind", especially if they were to remain under the control of L.E.As.¹

It was recognised, however, that it was not essential under the second alternative that L.E.A. colleges should continue to remain under L.E.A. control, and that other administrative arrangements might obtain. The Ministry Memorandum noted that one such possibility might be for the colleges to receive a direct grant from the Ministry. A second was to encourage groups of colleges to form federations to reduce the number of units in receipt of direct grants. A third was that the institutes of education should act as an intermediary between the colleges in their area and the Ministry. A fourth proposal was that groups of L.E.As should set up joint committees to administer groups of colleges, but it was recognised that this would not meet the colleges' demands for what they regarded as higher status. The Ministry concluded that none of these proposals was without difficulty.²

On balance, the Ministry preferred the second alternative because it could evolve more naturally and because the first alternative would cause difficulties if a large number of area technical colleges were left out. The Ministry anticipated that a

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, Ministry of Education Memorandum, para. 180, p. 1910.

2 Ibid., footnote, p. 1910.

few training colleges would immediately come under the Grants Committee arrangements, but it would not involve any large numbers at first.¹ It is also likely, however, that the Ministry was anxious to avoid a controversy that would occur if a large number of L.E.A. technical and training colleges were removed en bloc from the control of the L.E.As.

Of the other interested parties closely involved, the C.H.U.D.E. favoured a closer administrative affiliation of the colleges with the universities.² The C.I.D. supported the A.T.C.D.E.'s alternative proposal for financing the colleges through the institutes of education,³ although Professor Ben Morris added that they did so with some diffidence because they recognised that it was tied up with other questions and other colleges.⁴ The A.U.T., the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals, and the U.G.C. made no contribution to the administrative debate.

The Treasury felt that there was a case for more than one Government Department in dealing with education, but in determining with which Department institutions should be associated account had to be taken of such factors as their homogeneity, common problems and their relationship with other sectors of the system, particularly the L.E.As. On these criteria, the Treasury argued that at

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, Ministry of Education Oral Evidence, Smieton and Part, p. 1936.

2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. E, C.H.U.D.E. Oral Evidence, Tibble, p. 1527.

3 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. E, C.I.D. Memorandum, p. 1590.

4 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. E, C.I.D. Oral Evidence, Professor Morris, p. 1610.

the present time, whilst strengthening their academic links with the universities, the colleges should continue to be close to the L.E.A. system which took their output, although it was conceded that this situation might be different in say, ten years time. More importantly, the Treasury contended that in determining the best system of administration for the colleges, account had to be taken of the driving force needed to expand and transform the colleges. The Treasury felt that this was unlikely to be achieved without the initiative and active participation of the local authorities, and the Treasury doubted the realism of any plan of organisation which separated the bulk of the colleges from the local authorities.¹ The Treasury officials accepted, however, that the place of the colleges in the system might be determined by the Robbins Committee on educational rather than administrative grounds and the Treasury would carry out the necessary financial operations whatever was decided.² Even so, it was quite clear that the Treasury did not favour any changes in the existing means of financing the colleges in the immediate future.

Schools of Education: the Robbins Committee divided

Faced with this conflicting evidence of an acutely sensitive political nature, it is hardly surprising that the Robbins Committee should have found the framing of recommendations on the control and

1 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, Treasury Memorandum B, paras. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10, pp. 1981-2.

2 H.E.E. Pt. 1, Vol. F, Treasury Oral Evidence, Padmore and Clarke, p. 2010.

administration of the colleges one of their most difficult tasks.¹

The problem was probably further aggravated by the Robbins Committee's own philosophy of higher education.²

After acknowledging that the health of the whole public system of education depended on the efficiency of the colleges,³ the Robbins Committee expressed concern at the low morale of the colleges. They argued that this stemmed from the fact that the colleges felt themselves to be "only doubtfully recognised as part of the system of higher education and yet to have attained standards of work and a characteristic ethos that justify their claim to an appropriate place in it."⁴ Whilst the colleges had long been recognised as giving good training in the narrower sense of the word, the colleges considered that their efforts to improve the general education of their students, especially with the introduction of the three year course and the steady rise in entry standards, had lacked public recognition.⁵ As a result of the changes in the level of their work and their long-standing association with the universities through the institutes of education, the colleges felt themselves to be closer to the universities and wanted to move more clearly into the university sphere.⁶

1 See F.T. Willey and R.E. Maddison, An Enquiry into Teacher Training (London, University of London Press Ltd., 1971), p. 24.

2 H.E.R. See Chapter II.

3 Ibid., para. 308, p. 107.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., para. 311, p. 108.

6 Ibid., para. 312, p. 108.

Whilst the Robbins Committee envisaged that some of the colleges might wish to extend their range of operations and might become constituent parts of a university, or combine with a technical college to form a new university or become part of one, the Committee felt that for the next ten years or so, the majority of the colleges through their own volition or force of circumstances would continue to be engaged primarily in initial teacher training. The predominant course in these colleges would remain the concurrent one, and many of the students would enter the colleges without having achieved the minimum entry requirement for entry to present university courses.¹ Thus the Committee saw the essential problem as being to determine the appropriate academic, administrative and financial arrangements that would raise the status of these colleges giving them a more clearly recognisable place in higher education and facilitating the colleges continuing their dual role of providing higher education and a high level of professional training to meet the needs of the schools.²

The Robbins Committee made two important proposals on the size and academic programme of the colleges which had significant implications for their control and administration. Firstly, it was argued that if the status of the colleges was to be raised, it was necessary to keep their total number at a reasonable level, but to increase the size of individual colleges. It was accepted that the wide dispersal of the existing smaller colleges had an advantage in

1 H.E.R., paras. 313 and 314, pp. 108 and 109.

2 Ibid., para. 308, p. 107.

respect of the provision of teaching practice,¹ but it was felt that it had disadvantages in terms of educational efficiency.² The Robbins Committee conceded that where colleges were close together it was possible to make arrangements for co-operation in the teaching of some subjects, but it was felt that there was no substitute for colleges of a satisfactory size. In the view of the Robbins Committee, the colleges should be large enough to provide specialist teaching in a wide range of subjects and a diversity of laboratory and library facilities in specialised branches.³ Thus the Robbins Committee advocated that the expansion of teacher training should be largely confined to existing colleges and that the normal size of colleges should not be less than 750 students.⁴

Secondly, the Robbins Committee proposed that since 39% of the students entering the colleges had two or more 'A' level passes,⁵ and the standards reached by some students in their main subject courses in the colleges were broadly comparable with that of a pass degree,⁶ opportunities should be provided for suitably qualified students to take a four year course leading to a university degree and professional qualification. The Robbins Committee was anxious, however, that the colleges should make a

1 H.E.R., para. 317, p. 109.

2 Ibid., para. 318, p. 110.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid., para. 319, p. 111.

5 Ibid., para. 320, p. 111.

6 Ibid., para. 322, p. 111.

significant contribution to the planning of the degree courses and that this should not be entirely under the control of the universities. It was insisted that whilst the academic standard of the degree must be equivalent to what was customary in universities, the nature and approach to the various subjects should be suited to the needs of future teachers. "No one would wish to see the present university syllabuses arbitrarily imposed on the Training Colleges as a condition of making degrees available to their students."¹ To emphasise this point, it was proposed that the degree should be called a B.Ed., "gained in a distinctive way, and characteristically based on the study of education."² It was anticipated that by the mid 1970s about 25% of students in the colleges would be taking the degree.³ The Robbins Committee considered, however, that not all colleges would have the staff or facilities to offer degree courses and arrangements would have to be made for the transfer of students to other colleges if they were qualified and wished to take the degree course.⁴

As to the future administrative and financial arrangements to secure these developments, the Committee were divided. Three possible lines of advance were considered.

Firstly, there was the possibility of retaining the existing system, but making arrangements that would ensure that the present most progressive practices became universal. This entailed the

1 H.E.R., para. 327, p. 113.

2 Ibid., para. 341, p. 116.

3 Ibid., para. 339, p. 116.

4 Ibid., para. 334, p. 115.

institutes of education extending their academic function to enable university degrees to be awarded to appropriate students in the colleges; colleges having properly constituted governing bodies including staff representation and an outside membership selected on the basis of an interest in and suitability for the task; finance being allocated to governing bodies under the broadest categories of expenditure; defined procedures and responsibilities for the appointment of staff at various levels; and the admission of students being controlled by the principal and senior academic staff.¹ The Robbins Committee considered that this solution had many merits especially in the light of the remarkable progress that had been made in teacher training under the existing system. Indeed, it was conceded that some of the success "could probably not have been achieved under any other arrangements".² Nevertheless, the majority of the members rejected this line of approach on the grounds that it did not sufficiently reflect the national characteristics of the colleges and that it did not significantly strengthen the link between the colleges and the universities. The majority of the members attached great importance to this objective because "it would greatly help and encourage the colleges and would at the same time give the universities a major responsibility for direct leadership in a vital sector of higher education that has so far been only marginal to their main activities".³

1 H.E.R., paras. 679-682, pp. 222 and 223.

2 Ibid., para. 346, p. 117.

3 Ibid., para. 347, p. 117.

The second possibility lay in reshaping the system on a structure separate from the universities and on a similar basis to the technical education structure. The colleges would continue to be financed and governed as under the existing system with the appropriate modifications in the government of colleges, but the academic awards, including degrees, would be made by a central body on the model of the National Council for Technological Awards. The leading colleges would become autonomous either on their own or as constituent parts of universities.¹ This proposal stemmed from a view expressed to the Robbins Committee that the link with the universities had not been as beneficial as might have been expected and had inhibited the leading colleges in their development.² Freed from the association with the universities, the colleges would be able to maintain their own characteristic approach to their work and rise to greater stature than they could under the evolution of the existing system.³ Whilst the Committee wanted the colleges to maintain their distinctive ethos, they rejected this solution since they felt that the colleges themselves wished to become closer to the universities and it did not provide a satisfactory way forward for the leading colleges.⁴

The third possibility, and the solution supported by the majority of the members, was the establishment of Schools of Education.

1 H.E.R., para. 349, p. 118.

2 Ibid., para. 348, p. 118.

3 Ibid., para. 349, p. 118.

4 Ibid., para. 350, p. 118.

Basically, this scheme was an adaptation of the McNair proposal, and the majority of the members considered this as the next logical step from the institutes of education. The scheme not only involved the universities, through the Schools of Education, in responsibilities for the academic work of the colleges, but it also gave them a role in respect of the government and financing of the colleges. The majority of the members did not believe that the colleges could develop in the ways advocated and achieve their full-standing in higher education unless they were "accorded collectively within the university orbit a sufficient degree of autonomy".¹ Consequently, it was argued that it was highly desirable that academic and administrative responsibility should go hand in hand with the colleges moving into closer association with the universities administratively as well as academically.²

At the local level, the colleges, renamed Colleges of Education, in each university area would be formed into a School of Education which would take over the functions of the institutes of education. Each School, through its Academic Board, would be responsible to the university senate for the award of degrees and certificates to the students in the colleges. Under the Academic Board would be appropriate boards of study for different subjects which would be separate from the university's boards of study, although the introduction of degree work would necessitate explicit cross-representation beyond the existing involvement in the institute structure.³ The colleges would have independent governing bodies

1 H.E.R., para. 353, p. 119.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., para. 352, p. 119.

related federally to the School of Education and through it to the university.¹ Although L.E.As would lose direct control over their colleges, at least one-third of the governing bodies of their former colleges would consist of L.E.A. representatives and a substantial part of the membership of the governing bodies of Schools of Education would be nominated by the appropriate L.E.As. The Minister of Education would also be invited to appoint two assessors to the governing body of each School of Education.² The former L.E.A. colleges would be financed through a system of earmarked grants made by a Grants Commission through the universities to the Schools of Education.³ It was recognised, however, that special consideration would have to be given to the financing of voluntary colleges, but it was envisaged that there would be no difficulty in maintaining the existing kind of arrangements for these colleges.⁴ The university departments of education would either merge with or become a part of the School of Education of their university and their work would be supported by Exchequer funds as part of the earmarked grants given to the university in respect of the School of Education.⁵

1 H.E.R., para. 353, p. 119.

2 Ibid., para. 354, pp. 119/120.

3 Ibid., para. 355, p. 120.

4 Ibid., para. 356, p. 120.

5 Ibid., para. 357, p. 120.

At the national level, the colleges would be fully merged into the autonomous sector of higher education. Their finances would be negotiated through a Grants Commission with a Minister of Arts and Science who would be responsible for the autonomous sector of higher education. The new Ministry would be separate from the Ministry of Education which would continue to be responsible for the schools and the locally-administered institutions of further education, although consultation would take place between the Ministries on appropriate policy matters. The Grants Commission would establish an education committee to be responsible to the Commission for the Schools of Education. It was urged that the Commission should give consideration to the inclusion in the membership of this committee of some people with experience of the schools. In addition, the Ministry of Education would be represented on the committee. The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers would have a continuing role to play in advising both Ministries.¹

The Robbins Committee recognised that time would be needed for extensive discussions between the interested parties and the timing of the change in status of the colleges would require careful consideration in relation to their expansion in the next few years. It was also recognised that parts of their proposals, e.g. the introduction of the B.Ed. degree, might be implemented more speedily than others. But it was emphasised that the proposals formed a whole and the current discontent in the colleges was not just a matter of wanting degrees. It went much deeper and involved

1 H.E.R., Chapter XVII.

the whole standing of the colleges in the system of higher education in the country.¹

In a note of reservation,² Mr. H.C. Shearman dissented from these administrative proposals of the Main Report and strongly defended the retention of the L.E.A. system of college administration. In respect of the general arrangements at the Central Government level, he argued that the education service was a coherent whole and that close links between higher education and the rest of the system were essential. He was not convinced that the suggested Ministerial arrangements with an interlocking consultative structure would result in effective co-ordination. He submitted that a better system would be to have a single Minister of Education with one or two Ministers of State to assist him with the Ministry adopting administrative styles appropriate to the different sectors of education.

Shearman maintained that the principle of continuity was vitally important in the sphere of teacher training, yet the effects of the main Report's proposals would be that the Colleges of Education would have no immediate administrative contact with the authorities who had a major responsibility at both the central and local level for the schools. He was prepared to accept that some local authorities might not have shown a sufficiently liberal attitude to their colleges and that this should be changed. He pointed out, however,

1 H.E.R., para. 360, p. 121.

2 Ibid. Note of Reservation on Administrative Arrangements by Mr. H.C. Shearman, pp. 293-296.

that in many respects the Ministry of Education and the L.E.As had a good record, and it was hardly the fault of the L.E.As that training college students had rarely been recognised for degree courses. He argued that the task facing the colleges was not only to consolidate and extend the academic gains of the three-year course but also to carry through the expansion of teacher training. He believed that the L.E.As realised this need better than most, that they had a vital interest in both the quality and quantity of the teacher supply, and that they had the staff and technical resources to contribute to this development. He saw the best way forward as for the universities to create Schools of Education to provide degrees without disrupting the administrative partnership which already existed.

The Lines of the Impending Debate

In proposing the formation of Schools of Education and a contingent new pattern of administration and finance for the colleges, the majority of the Robbins Committee were, in effect, closely following the proposals of the A.T.C.D.E.'s Further Memorandum of 21st February, 1962. Reading the minutes of the oral evidence in sequential order, this is hardly surprising as it is possible to detect a growing sympathy for the A.T.C.D.E.'s case among the majority of the Committee members. In spite of the evidence of the liberal practices of some L.E.As, the reassurances of the Local Authority Associations that they supported a liberal approach to college administration and the Ministry's own policy on the government of colleges, the Committee

received sufficient evidence from sources apart from the A.T.C.D.E. to cast doubts on whether some L.E.As would be prepared to provide a pattern and style of administration appropriate to institutions of higher education as the Committee conceived them. More significantly, the majority of the members of the Robbins Committee had cut through to the essence of the A.T.C.D.E.'s policies, i.e. the question of the standing of the colleges in the system of higher education.

Writing in *Education for Teaching* in November, 1963,¹ Elvin argued that the issue went beyond liberal practices and centred on the autonomy of the colleges. The majority of the Committee were convinced that the perceptible malaise in the training college world was not simply a matter of the colleges wanting degrees. In their view, the colleges needed to be taken out of the administrative tutelage of the L.E.As.² They did not believe that the colleges could achieve their full standing in higher education unless the colleges were accorded a sufficient degree of autonomy which they believed could only be obtained in the university orbit. Elvin maintained that it was cardinal to the experience of universities that academic autonomy could not be real unless it was accompanied by administrative and financial autonomy subject to overriding national considerations.

1 H.L. Elvin, "The Robbins Report and the Education and Training of Teachers", Education for Teaching, No. 62, November, 1963, pp. 11 and 12.

2 This view was repeated by Lord Robbins in a letter to the Times after the announcement of the Government's decision on the future of the colleges. See CHAPTER 4.

Later in a debate in the House of Lords, Lord Robbins argued that there was a further consideration in the minds of the Committee in proposing the establishment of Schools of Education. It was felt that some colleges might become liberal arts colleges and it was only through an association with the universities that such colleges could be given the necessary status to prosper.¹

The School of Education solution also fitted in very well with the "ladder-tradition" development of institutions of higher education. As Elvin pointed out, there were many institutions from technical colleges which had become C.A.Ts to local colleges which had become universities that the L.E.As had been prepared to foster and then to see emerge out of their "control" but still to be associated with them through membership of their governing bodies.²

The proposal for Schools of Education certainly had attractions. It brought together the elements of academic planning, finance and administration; it recognised the national characteristics of the colleges; it was in line with the traditional evolutionary development of many institutions of higher education; it attempted to preserve features of the long-standing existing partnership of interests in the provision of teacher training; and it gave the colleges a measure of collective autonomy and a more recognisable place in the existing family of institutions of higher education. Whether it was the best solution for the provision of teacher training is a more debateable matter.

1 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXX, Nov. 9 to Dec. 2, 1st December, 1965, col. 1255.

2 H.L. Elvin, "The Robbins Report and the Education and Training of Teachers", Education for Teaching, No. 62, November 1963, p. 12.

Nevertheless, the proposal had anomalies and weaknesses. Whilst the L.E.As would lose control of their colleges, the Voluntary Bodies would appear to retain control of their colleges. Although most of the universities had taken only a peripheral interest in the colleges in the past, they were now requested to take a greater responsibility for teacher training. Furthermore, some of the colleges even after the introduction of B.Ed. degrees, and not all colleges would be involved in this provision, hardly fulfilled the Robbins Committee's criteria for institutions of higher education but would be admitted to the university sector, whereas some Regional and Area Technical Colleges with a greater proportion of higher level work would remain in the public sector.

The proposal for Schools of Education would be clearly acceptable to the A.T.C.D.E., although some of the colleges were bound to express reservations. But the seeds of main impending opposition to the proposal for Schools of Education had been sown in the evidence to the Committee. Leaving aside the issue of "one or two Ministers", whilst the colleges remained mainly concerned with teacher training the L.E.As were bound to press for the retention of the control of their colleges on the grounds of self-interested expediency, economy and successful past provision. Moreover, if the majority of the Robbins Committee had grasped the essence of the A.T.C.D.E. case, they had not fully grasped the essence and strength of feeling of the L.E.A. case, i.e. the L.E.As were determined to maintain a substantial share in the provision of higher education and the loss of the

colleges would be seen as a serious erosion in that provision. Whilst the Committee might claim that the proposal for Schools of Education was evolutionary in concept, given the number of L.E.A. colleges, it was bound to appear to the L.E.As revolutionary in scale. Furthermore, it was hardly likely that the Ministry would readily embrace the proposal given the inevitable opposition of the L.E.As, the Ministry's existing controls over the colleges and the probable reactions of the Area Technical Colleges.

As subsequent events were to prove, the Shearman Note of Reservation was to prove politically more realistic no matter how desirable or not the proposal for Schools of Education was on other grounds. Even so, the Robbins Report was certain to provide a significant impetus to the liberalising of college administration and government.

CHAPTER 4

SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION REJECTED

Initial Reactions to the Report

Within twenty-four hours of the official publication of the Robbins Report, a Government statement was issued from Downing Street accepting the proposals for expansion but expressing a cautious note on organisational changes:-

"On questions of organisation, which are the subject of important and far reaching recommendations, legislation and time will be needed. The Government accept that organisational changes will be necessary. They also agree with the Committee that considerations of academic freedom require that autonomous institutions of higher education should draw the Government's financial support through an independent body on similar lines to the present University Grants Committee. This will be a central feature in the changes which the Government will in due course propose."¹

In their immediate acceptance of the widely supported and less controversial proposals for expansion², the Government no doubt had an eye on the newness of a General Election.³ But, in fairness, it must be stated that the Government were concerned with the imminence of the bulge, and had a genuine belief in the importance of higher

-
- 1 Reported in Education, Vol. 122, No. 3171, 1st November, 1963, pp. 785-6.
 - 2 For discussion on this issue see R. Layard, J. King and C. Moser, The impact of Robbins (1969), pp. 26-30.
 - 3 The Leader in Education, Vol. 122, No. 3171, 1st November, 1963, pp. 775-6 comments: "Determined not to let the Labour Party step in first, the Government only waited a token of 24 hours before accepting the 10 year target put up by Robbins. Cynics who welcome the alacrity with which other news was released and noting the large programmes for roads, hospitals and old people's homes must be excused if they relate this, like the happily reflatated economy, to the imminence of a General Election".

education on both social and economic grounds.¹ Given the Ministry of Education's, the Treasury's and the Local Authority Associations' evidence to the Robbins Committee, it is hardly surprising, however, that the Government should be less inclined to express a firm view on the more controversial administrative proposals.

In turn, the Government's statement brought an equally immediate response from the A.E.C. On 25th October, 1963, the A.E.C. Executive Committee sent a letter to the Prime Minister, Sir Alec Douglas Home, supporting the scale of expansion in higher education proposed in the Robbins Report and welcoming the Government's declared intention to proceed as rapidly as possible with the development. The Executive Committee also accepted the Robbins Report's recommendations in respect of the establishment of a grants commission, and endorsed the Report's views on the importance of maintaining academic freedom in institutions of higher education. The Executive Committee was gravely concerned, however, over the proposal for two Ministers. They believed that it was essential that there should be only one Minister if the proper and balanced development of the education service as a whole was to be safeguarded. It was felt that the establishment of two Ministers would create particularly serious difficulties in matters relating to the supply and training of teachers which the Executive Committee believed was the most important problem facing the service during the next 10 to 20 years. The Executive Committee stressed, however, that whilst pressing the case

1 See R. Layard, J. King and C. Moser, The impact of Robbins (1969), p. 22.

for one Minister, they accepted the relationship between the Minister and autonomous institutions of higher education should be that recommended by the Report.¹

It would seem then that the A.E.C. Executive Committee's main initial objection to the Robbins Report was over the proposal for two Ministers, especially in its perceived adverse effects on the training and supply of teachers. This was re-emphasised by Alexander in his "Week by Week" column. He argued that two Ministers would create competition between higher education and the remainder of the service. Moreover, it would lead to a chaotic structure in which one Minister was responsible for securing an adequate supply of teachers appropriately trained to meet the needs of the schools and another was responsible to a rather limited extent for institutions which were concerned with teacher training.² Certainly, the issue of "one or two Ministers" was to dominate the general discussions on the organisational changes proposed in the Robbins Report for the next six months.

Did this mean then that the A.E.C. Executive Committee and Alexander were prepared to accept that training colleges should be financed and administered through Schools of Education? The letter to the Prime Minister did not make this clear. It merely stated that the relationship between autonomous institutions with the Minister should be that proposed in the Robbins Report: no specific reference was made to the colleges becoming autonomous institutions.

1 Education, Vol. 122, No. 3171, 1st November, 1963, p. 786.

2 Ibid., pp. 777-8.

In the light of the views expressed by Alexander on the role of universities in the initial training of teachers to the Robbins Committee, and the action taken at the A.E.C. Conference in 1962, it would have been a dramatic reversal in policy if the A.E.C. had now been prepared to concede the loss of control by L.E.As of their colleges.

A clearer indication of how the local authorities would react to the Robbins proposals on the financing and administration of the colleges was given in the Leader of Education on 25th October, 1963.¹ This warned that under the Robbins' proposals L.E.As stood to lose control of their training colleges, and whilst there was reference in the Report to L.E.A. representation on controlling bodies, the proposals meant the end of the direct connection of the local authorities and the Ministry of Education in the training of teachers. The emotional reactions within L.E.A. circles were reflected in a letter signed "H.W." published in Education on 8th November, 1963, which argued:-

"On every point at issue so far as the administration of education is concerned the Committee has adopted a pro-university solution. Considering the membership of the Robbins Committee, this result might be viewed as scarcely surprising, but this fact would seem to be all the more reason to resist the Report's recommendations in this matter ... and to stress very strongly the good sense contained in Mr. Harold Shearman's note of dissent."²

1 Education, Vol. 122, No. 3170, 25th October, 1963, p. 724. The phrase "meant the end of the direct connection of the local authorities and the Ministry of Education in the training of teachers" was not a strictly accurate interpretation of the Robbins' proposals.

2 Education, Vol. 122, No. 3172, 8th November, 1963, p. 839.

During the course of November and December 1963 several local authority education committees, including some of the most influential such as the L.C.C.¹, Middlesex, Lancashire and the West Riding², began to voice their opposition to the transfer of the colleges from the local authorities to Schools of Education. Their main argument was that if the rapid expansion in teacher training proposed by the Robbins Report was to be achieved, then the resources, expertise and building programmes that could be provided by the local authorities would be urgently needed and so no action should be taken which would prejudice this situation.

In an extensively critical letter of the Robbins Report to the Minister of Education dated 19th November, 1963, the West Riding Education Committee doubted whether the complicated set of interlocking committees proposed in the Report would be anything like as responsive to the emergencies which could arise in teaching supply as were the existing arrangements. It was pointed out that at present the colleges' estimates were built up each year according to annual need, and the Committee viewed with alarm the possibility of colleges having to operate on a triennial or quinquennial grant in times of rising costs. Whilst it was accepted that the Grants Commission would be required to earmark grants to the Schools of Education, the Committee interpreted this as meaning that the universities could not be relied upon to make an adequate grant to the teacher training service. Furthermore, they felt that

1 Times Educational Supplement, No. 2531, 22nd November, 1963, p. 756.

2 Times Educational Supplement, No. 2534, 13th December, 1963, p. 878.

there was no assurance that the Grants Commission would make an adequate grant to teacher training which might find difficulty in competing with the demands of the nation's research projects or with the massive expansion of the universities. The Committee emphasised the impressive contribution that L.E.As had made to the development of teacher training and they saw no reason why the Churches and not the L.E.As should continue to administer their colleges. The Committee deplored, and believed to be dangerous to the service, the implied belief that if an institution left L.E.A. administration its status would thereby be increased. It was also a further puzzling fact of the Report that although it was recommended that there should be more contacts between the schools and L.E.As on the one hand and higher education on the other, where this was most complete, as it was between the training colleges and the L.E.As, the proposal was that it should be severed. The Committee accepted that some L.E.As were open to criticism in the way they managed their colleges but this could be remedied by properly drawn up articles of government.¹

As might be expected, in contrast, the A.T.C.D.E. were generally satisfied with the Report's proposals for the colleges to come wholly into the university orbit and they stressed that it was impossible to separate the academic from the administrative and

1 See Education, Vol. 122, No. 3176, 6th December, 1963, p. 1037; and the Times Educational Supplement, No. 2534, 13th December, 1963, p. 878.

financial aspects of the colleges. Whilst the A.T.C.D.E.'s ultimate objective was to secure the complete recognition of colleges as national institutions in their own right, the Association welcomed the policy of the Report as a first step in this direction.¹ It was recognised, however, that much hard work would have to be done if the recommendations of the Report were to be fully implemented.²

At the C.I.D./C.H.U.D.E./A.T.C.D.E. Liaison Committee meeting in December 1963 there was an atmosphere of guarded optimism. Sir Charles Morris suggested that the first consideration was to gain the acceptance of Schools of Education by the universities. He said that the Vice Chancellors appeared to be sympathetic and it seemed likely that the universities would accept the general principles of the Report provided that the whole of the responsibility for the colleges came within the Schools of Education. He felt that the attitudes of the local authorities, however, were not yet clear as to whether they were formally opposed to the recommendations or just anxious to ensure that they had a stake in the Schools of Education.³ Professor Niblett, however, reported that the L.C.C. was very much against losing control of its colleges. He suggested that there might have

1 See Times Educational Supplement, No. 2532, 29th November, 1963, p. 806; A.T.C.D.E. News Sheet, No. 43, December, 1963, p. 1; A.T.C.D.E. Annual Report, 1963-64; and Education for Teaching, No. 62, November, 1963, Editorial, p. 3.

2 Education for Teaching, No. 62, November, 1963, p. 3.

3 C.I.D./C.H.U.D.E./A.T.C.D.E. Liaison Committee Meeting, 10 December 1963, Minute 52.

to be an interim period during which colleges remained administratively under the local authorities. He felt that the local authorities' strongest arguments were concerned with the maintenance of the supply of teachers, and he said that there had been some talk of setting up teacher training departments of their own in technical colleges.¹

Response and Counter-Response

The A.T.C.D.E. did not have to wait long for the views of the Local Authority Associations to become clear. At their meeting on 28th November, 1963, the A.E.C. Executive had considered their response to a letter from Sir Herbert Andrew, the Permanent Secretary at the Ministry of Education, dated 22nd November, 1963, inviting the various interest groups to submit their views to the Ministry on the Robbins' proposals for the arrangements for teacher training and other matters. The A.E.C. had also received an invitation from the A.M.C. to attend a joint meeting of the Local Authority Associations to consider how they should reply to Andrew's letter. Consequently, it had been decided to accept the A.M.C. invitation and to seek the support of the Associations for the following views:-

1. They support the view that the relationship academically between the teacher training colleges and the universities should be strengthened, and they would hope that this might be achieved.
2. They consider that the proposals for the administrative and financial change are not

1 C.I.D./C.H.U.D.E./A.T.C.D.E. Liaison Committee Meeting, 10 December 1963, Minute 53.

in the best interests either of the teacher training colleges or of the Education Service as a whole, and would be inimical to the rapid expansion and development in teacher training provision which is already planned and which is agreed by all concerned to be vitally necessary.

3. They consider that the present arrangements for the administration and financing of the teacher training programme are both satisfactory and sufficient and can ensure the planned development and expansion continues without interruption of any sort.
4. They express no view as to the ultimate future pattern but are of the opinion that the known needs and problems demand that the present arrangements should continue for a period of at least 15-20 years so that all concerned may devote their full energies to the practical problems of expanding and developing the necessary provision in this field.¹

A joint meeting of representatives of the C.C.A., the A.M.C., the A.E.C., the W.J.E.C. and the L.C.C. was held on 12th December, 1963. The outcome of the meeting was a joint letter from the Associations to the Prime Minister, copies of which were sent to the Ministry of Education for circulation to other interested parties.²

The letter indicated that the Associations accepted the Robbins' target for the expansion of the colleges but pointed out that this had to be achieved at a time of unprecedented expansion in the universities and within the Government's plans for the whole of public sector capital investment. Thus speed and value for money was needed in the training college programme. The Associations also agreed with the Report on the importance of more training college

1 A.E.C. Executive Committee Minutes, 28 November 1963, Minute 9(2).

2 For a full copy of the letter, see APPENDIX SIX.

students having the opportunity to take degrees, but argued that at the same time the colleges would be facing new demands from the changing needs of the schools and further education, and the universities and the technical colleges would be under comparable pressures. Given this situation, it was imperative that the Ministry of Education, the L.E.As, the colleges and the schools should co-operate and should not have their energies directed to tasks which others could do better.

Against this background, the Associations stressed three points. Firstly, many of the Robbins' recommendations had to be worked out in detail before their effects could be assessed. In view of the local authorities' statutory obligations, the Associations wanted assurances that the supply of teachers would respond quickly to the changing needs of the schools and further education. Consequently, they required further investigation into the proposed arrangements for earmarked grants, the consultative machinery, the position of smaller colleges, especially those where no degree work would be undertaken, the colleges for housecraft, for physical education, for mature students and for technical teachers.

Secondly, the transfer of about 100 L.E.A. colleges to independent governing bodies would involve making separate trust deeds, conveyances, constitutions and articles of government, transfer of staff at many levels, new salary and superannuation arrangements, etc. In some cases contractual and architectural responsibilities would also have to be transferred. Simultaneously, the U.G.C., the universities and the training colleges would have to create and staff new administrative machinery. The transfer of a

small number of C.A.T.s had shown how time consuming the process could be. Such changes, then, were likely to hinder the expansion of the colleges and internal educational developments.

Thirdly, the four-fold increase in the number of training college students since the war had been achieved with the backing of the initiative and resources of the L.E.As and the close partnership between the authorities and the Ministry of Education with its well-known success in educational building. Thus, the Associations were concerned that at a critical moment in the development of higher education and the supply of teachers, these advantages might cease. Furthermore, if this happened, it was unlikely that the present rate of growth could be sustained or the same value for money obtained.

Consequently, the Associations argued that without prejudice to long term decisions on the Robbins' recommendations, it should be agreed that during the period of rapid expansion administrative and financial responsibility for the colleges should remain as at present. Even so, action should be taken to increase the independence and the academic status of the colleges. On the academic side, the Associations hoped that there would be early discussions with the Minister, the universities and the colleges. On the administrative side, the Associations were proposing to examine on a national basis the existing arrangements for L.E.A. colleges with particular reference to the freedom and responsibility of governing bodies. As a first step, they were inviting representatives of the A.T.C.D.E. to meet them at the earliest opportunity.

The Local Authority Associations' case was particularly persuasive in three respects which in the event were to prove influential contributing factors to the rejection of Robbins' financial and administrative proposals. Firstly, the cost of transferring the colleges to the Schools of Education would have been an expensive operation. Whether it would have led a comparative increase in the future running costs of the colleges is a matter for speculation.¹ Secondly, the immediate administrative problems which would have been involved would have indeed been extremely time consuming as had been illustrated by the transformation of nine technical colleges into C.A.T.s and the setting up of seven new universities.² If the colleges' energies were not to have been seriously diverted from meeting the supply problem, then at best, a fairly lengthy transitional stage would have been needed. Thirdly, whilst it was true, as had been shown by the expansion undertaken by Voluntary colleges, that independent colleges could be just as responsive to change as the L.E.A. colleges, the local authorities would justifiably claim that the existing system had a proven record in rising to meet the emergency demands in supply. At a time of crisis, on the

-
- 1 This would have depended on such factors as staff/student ratios; the level of salaries at which college staff were transferred to the universities and the pattern of posts within the colleges on the university salary scales; and the cost of providing administrative posts within the colleges and Schools of Education. No doubt the Schools of Education would have made some use of the special administrative services of the universities.
 - 2 See the Treasury's Memorandum to the Robbins Committee: Higher Education, Evidence - Part One, Volume F, p. 1982. It is likely that the Treasury was also influential in the decision not to adopt Robbins' administrative and financial proposals, but at present no documentation is available to prove this.

grounds of expediency alone, there was a strong case for retaining the existing system rather than adopting an untried one closely tied to the university sector which had not generally shown a particular interest and concern in teacher training in the recent past. The most serious question-mark, however, over the Associations' case was whether the local authority system could, or had the will to, provide a suitable and acceptable style of administration and government for institutions of higher education which was legitimately demanded by the training colleges.

The A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee considered the Local Authority Associations' letter at their meeting on 3rd January, 1964, and subsequently replied declining the Local Authority Associations' offer of immediate discussions. The A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee pointed out that they were in the process of considering their own reply to Sir Herbert Andrew's letter and this was of primary importance in the present situation. Whilst they appreciated the contribution that the Voluntary Bodies and L.E.As had made to the development of the colleges, this did not invalidate their own view that the time had come for the colleges to move wholly into the university pattern. Thus they wished to await a Government decision on the future of the colleges and they felt that discussions at that stage would be premature. The Executive Committee accepted, however, that whatever the Government decided there would need to be a period of transition and they felt that this would be the time for planning and co-operation.¹

1 Letter from Miss H. Simpson, to be found in the A.E.C. Executive Committee Minutes, 31 January 1964.

The A.T.C.D.E. also sent a letter to the Prime Minister refuting some of the arguments of the Local Authority Associations' letter and confirming their full support for the Robbins' recommendations. The A.T.C.D.E. argued that the contention that the colleges were not fitted to undertake the plans for expansion and needed the expertise of the architects' departments of L.E.As ignored two facts. Firstly, not every authority which administered a college had such resources and in many cases the colleges themselves had the major responsibility for planning. Secondly, for many years the Voluntary colleges had carried out plans for expansion and had dealt with large sums of money and with extensive building operations. Consequently, given adequate machinery, administrative and financial responsibility could well be undertaken by the colleges within Schools of Education.

Furthermore, the A.T.C.D.E. contested the implicit assumption in the Local Authority Associations' letter that conditions had generally been satisfactory for L.E.A. colleges. Whilst the A.T.C.D.E. appreciated the happy relations existing between some authorities and their colleges, in a considerable number of cases the colleges had been hampered in administration by standing orders of the local council and by regulations applying to all educational institutions within the authority. There were also a number of authorities which were illiberal in outlook and administration.

The A.T.C.D.E. believed that the machinery proposed by the Robbins Committee provided an opportunity for all concerned to co-operate in meeting the national need. They were also confident that the colleges would approach the supply problem with determination and good heart. It was accepted that in practice a transition stage

would be needed, but as a first step, it was necessary to establish the principle of administrative control through the Schools of Education. The A.T.C.D.E. were convinced that the Report's recommendations provided a coherent and unified scheme for the colleges, and that by representation on the appropriate bodies, the contribution of the local authorities through their particular expertise and experience would be no less important and significant.¹

Similarly, in their reply to Sir Herbert Andrew, the A.T.C.D.E. re-iterated their full support for the Report's proposals and re-emphasised their belief that if the colleges were integrated into the university pattern, the interests of the L.E.As would be fully recognised by ample representation on governing bodies, Schools of Education, the National Advisory Council and other committees which might be established.²

The next six months witnessed a lively, and at times acrimonious, debate in the national press and the Associations' Journals, and at the Associations' Conferences. Whilst much of the debate was of a repetitive or speculative nature, it did reveal some interesting viewpoints and divisions within both the membership of the Local Authority Associations and the A.T.C.D.E.

1 For the full text of the A.T.C.D.E.'s letter to the Prime Minister, see APPENDIX SEVEN.

2 Reported in Education, Vol. 123, No. 3184, 31st January, 1964, p. 193; also in Education for Teaching, No. 63, February, 1964, Editorial, pp. 2 and 3.

Firstly, in opposing the Robbins' proposals for changes in the financing and administration of the colleges, the Local Authority Associations had the strong support of the majority of the local authorities¹ led by the influential L.C.C. and West Riding authorities. Nevertheless, some L.E.As which actually administered colleges, including Nottingham², Coventry³, Bath⁴ and Gloucester⁵, openly declared their support for the transfer of the colleges to the proposed Schools of Education. At the A.E.C. Conference in June, 1964, Mrs. G. Maw, Chairman of the Bath Education Committee said that there was an urgent need for unity within the teaching profession and for an increase in professional stature. She believed that the Robbins' proposals would help in achieving these objectives. Thus, Bath would be proud to see its colleges integrated into a School of Education and proud to hand them over. She felt that the valuable contribution of the L.E.As would be retained in the new pattern of administration. In support of Mrs. Maw, Mr. R. Turner, Chief Education Officer of Gloucester, argued that it had to be realised that training colleges had now come of age: they were no longer local institutions recruiting their people from local schools.⁶

1 See Times Educational Supplement, No. 2540, 24th January, 1964, p. 160; and the debate at the A.E.C. Conference of 1964 reported in Education, Vol. 124, No. 3206, 3rd July, 1964, pp. 66 and 69.

2 See Times Educational Supplement, No. 2540, 24th January, 1964, p. 160.

3 Ibid.

4 Education, Vol. 124, No. 3206, 3rd July 1964, p. 69.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid.

Secondly, whilst the Local Authority Associations favoured a closer academic association between the colleges and the universities, there were strong criticisms of the universities and institutes of education in some local authority circles. For example, Mr. Jack Longland, the Director of Education for Derbyshire, argued that the institutes were not in close touch with the schools, nor had the people in the institutes got their feet on the ground as far as the schools were concerned. Furthermore, the institutes lacked the status of the traditional university departments.¹ Sir Lionel Russell seized on the criticisms of the Robbins' Report itself, of the universities' failure to keep a balance between research and teaching, and the Report's stress on the importance of teaching, the need to expand more broadly based courses and the importance of close contacts between the schools and higher education. Thus he found it difficult to imagine that the time was ripe to transfer training colleges and their governing bodies from the local authorities to the aegis of the universities.² Mr. G.A. Taylor, the Chief Education Officer of Leeds, went even further, suggesting that the system of teacher training should be re-shaped and re-organised apart from the universities on a structure analogous to technical education which the Robbins' Report had dismissed. The colleges would continue to be administered by governing bodies under the aegis of the local authorities and the Voluntary Bodies with a Central Body like the National Council for Technological Awards granting academic awards. He believed that such

1 Education, Vol. 124, No. 3206, 3rd July, 1964, p. 69.

2 Ibid., p. 66.

a dynamic approach would enable the colleges to strike out on their own.¹ Whilst criticisms of the universities and the institutes were not new in L.E.A. circles², it is clear that the renewed criticisms indicated a fear among some authorities that a closer association between the universities and the colleges might distract the colleges from their primary purpose of teacher training.³ Furthermore, to some extent they can be seen as a response to a feeling within L.E.A. circles that the Robbins Report was an attack on the L.E.As by a Committee which was dominated by university opinion. This feeling was heightened by the fact that the Robbins Committee had proposed that the Voluntary Bodies should continue to administer their colleges, and by Elvin's article on the rationale behind the Robbins Committee's proposals.⁴ Whilst the basis of some of these criticisms and views were questionable, nevertheless, they had the effect of strengthening opposition among some of the local authorities to the Report's proposals for changes in the administration and financing of the colleges.

Thirdly, throughout the debate, the local authorities continued to stress that their main opposition to the Robbins' proposals was on the grounds of a self-interested concern in the teacher supply,

1 Times Educational Supplement, No. 2541, 31st January, 1964, p. 231.

2 See, for example, the A.E.C. evidence to the Robbins Committee, Higher Education, Evidence - Part One, Volume C, p. 777.

3 See Education, Vol. 124, No. 3230, 18th December, 1964, p. 1079.

4 See Elvin's article in Education for Teaching, No. 62, November, 1963, pp. 6-13, and W.H. Petty's response in Education, Vol. 123, No. 3184, 31st January, 1964, pp. 201-202. See also Clegg's views in Times Educational Supplement, No. 2539, 17th January, 1964, p. 106.

and whilst there should be no changes in the system in the immediate future, this should not prejudice long-term decisions.¹ Even so, from the intensity of the opposition from some local authorities and their obvious pride in their colleges, it would seem that the Times Educational Supplement's view that some local authorities were "appalled by the imminent loss of empire"² had some justification, although this was subsequently strenuously denied.³

Fourthly, not all the members of the A.T.C.D.E. supported the Association's policy in entirety although the opinion in the colleges was overwhelmingly in favour of the establishment of autonomous governing bodies within Schools of Education. For example, Miss G.E. Allen, the Principal of Matlock Training College, welcomed the strengthening of academic links with the universities, but disagreed with the A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee and Council on the integration of the colleges into the universities and the policy on Voluntary colleges. She did not accept that it was impossible to separate the academic and financial and administrative aspects of the colleges and she argued that the existing system had worked well in the past. In spite of earmarked grants, she felt that the smaller colleges might still suffer in the hard bargaining for funds. Furthermore, the universities were already involved in their own plans for expansion and had not the administrative or financial staff to cope with the teacher training expansion. She considered

1 See, for example, the A.E.C. Conference debate in Education, Vol. 124, No. 3206, 3rd July, 1964, p. 66.

2 Times Educational Supplement, No. 2540, 24th January, 1964, p. 160.

3 See, for example, T.H. Tunn, "The Significance of 1970", in Education, Vol. 127, No. 3289, 4th February, 1966, p. 262.

that it would be folly to scrap a well-tried and well-established system for an unknown and untried one. L.E.As had the experience and staff to deal with finance and administration and with architects' plans and building contracts on a large scale. In addition, she felt that it was false to imply that L.E.A. colleges lacked freedom as compared with voluntary colleges. She accepted that there was room for improvement in both types of college government, but there were enlightened local authorities and their colleges enjoyed academic freedom and a great deal of other freedom as well. Their governing bodies were not restricted to members of the borough and county councils and they had responsibility for preparing estimates and the supervision of expenditure. She believed that a system could be introduced to ensure that all L.E.As and Voluntary Bodies adopted an enlightened attitude in their administration of their colleges.¹ Dr. Cyril Bibby, the Principal of Hull Training College, was also unhappy about the position of voluntary colleges vis-a-vis L.E.A. colleges in the Robbins Report and sympathised with the L.E.A. feelings on the matter.² He

1 Times Educational Supplement, No. 2542, 7th February, 1964, p. 297.

2 Education, Vol. 123, No. 3189, 6th March, 1964, p. 447. Bibby stated that he could not understand the inconsistency in the Robbins Report about the position of Church Colleges. "There is no logic in it, and by tactfully or timorously failing to grasp the nettle of church control, the Robbins Committee has presented local authorities with the powerful weapon of an appeal to fair play" ... "Thus those in colleges of education who favour autonomy, but also have some regard for justice and logic, find themselves in a very difficult position". It was clear that Bibby not only regarded the position of voluntary colleges as a political weapon which could be used by the local authorities, but also felt it presented the A.T.C.D.E. with an embarrassing situation. The A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee, however, did not seem to be openly embarrassed by the situation.

acknowledged that some L.E.As had been unimaginative and oppressive, but he questioned whether all the voluntary colleges' governing bodies had been enlightened in their administration. Whilst he supported the establishment of Schools of Education, he also warned that these, too, could have drawbacks:-

"I know of nothing in the nature of things to guarantee that on a college governing body Professor A, B and C will necessarily be more enlightened than Councillors X, Y and Z. I know that city and county councils can produce frustrating delays, but for sheer bumbling and procrastination give me an assemblage of academics any day. I know that all university animals are equal, but we may well find that some are much more equal than others."¹

Towards a Government decision

During the debate on the Consolidated Fund Bill on 27th January, 1964, Sir Edward Boyle, the then Minister of Education, told the House of Commons that the Government had not yet reached a conclusion on the recommendations of the Robbins Committee concerning the colleges. He said that this had been one of the most difficult problems facing the Robbins Committee and had resulted in a difference of opinion. The Government was still in the process of seeking views from the interested parties and in particular was awaiting the views of the universities. He reported that whilst there seemed to be agreement on the award of degrees, the L.E.As had pointed out disadvantages in any rapid fundamental changes in the administrative and financial structure at a time of rapid change.²

1 Education, Vol. 123, No. 3189, 6th March, 1964, p. 447.

2 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 688, 1963-64, Jan. 27 to Feb. 7, 27 January, 1964, col. 72.

The issue of "one or two Ministers", which had a bearing on the problem of the control of the colleges, was settled in February 1964.¹ At about the same time, the Vice Chancellors Committee and the A.U.T. Council declared their support for Schools of Education.² Further support for the A.T.C.D.E. case came from the Council of the Church Training Colleges and the Church of England Board of Education.³ Nevertheless, the Government showed no signs of reaching a decision on the question of the administration and financing of the colleges. No doubt having taken one controversial decision on the Robbins' proposals, the Government had considered it advisable to leave a decision on this difficult matter, together with the related problem of the future of the technical colleges, until after the formation of the new Department of Education and Science.

It was becoming increasingly clear, however, that opinion within the Ministry of Education and Government circles was hardening against the transfer of the colleges to Schools of Education, at

-
- 1 See the Prime Ministerial statement given to the Lords by Viscount Blackenham: Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLV, 1963-64, Feb. 4 to Feb. 27, 6th February, 1964, col. 263.
 - 2 See A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 6 March 1964, Minute 199(i). It was reported that Sir William Mansfield Cooper, the Chairman of the Vice Chancellors Committee had given unstinting support. He had stressed that the colleges would not enter the universities as second class citizens. He had also pointed out that the universities would only accept the colleges if the universities had full administrative as well as academic responsibility. This viewpoint does not accord fully with the evidence of the U.G.C. (see below).
 - 3 See Harvey's letter in the Times Educational Supplement, No. 2541, 31st January, 1964, p. 228; and the Report of the meeting of the Church Assembly in the Times Educational Supplement, No. 2542, 7th February, 1964, p. 307.

least in the immediate future. Mr. Hogg, the designate Secretary of State for Education and Science, informed the Times Educational Supplement during an interview in February 1964 that he was less inclined than the Vice Chancellors to hurry in establishing teacher training colleges as parts of universities. He believed that they were "different institutions" and he regarded them as much more like liberal arts colleges. But he did want to hurry up the introduction of the four-year degree courses awarded by an external body.¹ It was also reported within the A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee that Sir Edward Boyle had spoken on more than one occasion indicating that he had some sympathy with the local authorities' point of view and that he felt that there was a "different staircase" for the colleges.²

The A.T.C.D.E. interpreted these views as implying that the Ministry might be considering the severing of the links between the colleges and the universities. It was urged within the Committee that both Boyle and Hogg should be invited to meet the Officers of the Association and that they should be made fully aware of the illiberal attitudes of many authorities to the government of colleges. Furthermore, they should be told of the serious damage that would be done if the close connections with the universities which had been growing over the past 20 years were suddenly cut off.³

1 Times Educational Supplement, No. 2543, 14th February, 1964, p. 380.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 6 March 1964, Minute 200.

3 Ibid. There is no evidence to suggest that either the Government or Ministry of Education had any intentions of severing the links between the colleges and the universities.

During the months immediately following the establishment of the D.E.S. in April 1964, there was still no indication that the Government was nearer a decision on the issue. With the calling of a General Election for October, the A.T.C.D.E. abandoned any hope of a Government decision until towards the end of the year. Whilst the issue was not mentioned by any of the parties in their election manifestos, from the Conservative Party's reactions to the Labour Government's subsequent decision on the future of the colleges, it seems that even if the Conservative Government had been returned to power, their decision would have been similar to the one taken by the Labour Government.¹

The newly elected Labour Government lost no time in consulting widely with the various interest groups and received deputations from the A.T.C.D.E. and the C.I.D.² In particular, the Government seemed to be most concerned to have the advice of the U.G.C.

The U.G.C. proceeded to consult both the Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals and the individual universities. It was found that while a few universities had reservations, most of them were willing to accept the Robbins' proposals in principle and to co-operate in their implementation. In particular, they accepted the recommendation that the four-year courses leading to both a B.Ed. degree and a professional qualification should be provided in

-
- 1 For an interesting discussion on the views held within the Labour Party at this time, see Eric Robinson, The New Polytechnics (Harmondsworth, Penguin Education Special, 1968), pp. 32-34. For the Conservative Party's reaction to the Labour Government, see below.
 - 2 See Stewart's reply to Hogg in Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 703, 1964-65, Nov. 30 to Dec. 11, 11th December, 1964, col. 1975.

the colleges for suitable students. Most universities were also prepared to consider establishing Schools of Education. But whilst some felt that the proposals on the academic side could be accepted only if the financial and administrative arrangements were also accepted in toto, many universities did not share this view or did not feel so strongly about it.

After considering these views, the U.G.C. informed the Government that for their part, they were not convinced that the academic, administrative and financial problems were inseparable. They saw no reason why the process of forging academic links between the universities and the colleges should not be extended and accelerated as a separate operation. It was felt that in most areas it should be possible for universities to participate in the academic arrangements necessary to ensure the proper institution of degree courses for a proportion of students within the colleges without having to alter fundamentally the constitutional relationship between the bodies or the channels by which the colleges were financed. They believed:-

"The administrative and financial proposals were far more controversial and raised far greater problems. It seemed to us that, at a time when the Colleges were urgently engaged in planning for expansion, it would be unwise to introduce comprehensive changes which were bound to result in prolonged local argument and upheaval, and which would alter, with effects that could not easily be foreseen, the existing distribution of responsibility for the supply of teachers. It might be that closer academic relationships would eventually produce a situation in which more radical constitutional and financial changes become necessary. But these changes could

be introduced then as the natural outcome of the academic developments and by agreement between all the various bodies concerned."¹

The long awaited Government statement on the future of the colleges was eventually made in the House of Commons on 11th December, 1964, by Mr. Michael Stewart, the Secretary of State for Education and Science. He said that the Government shared the widely accepted view that there should be closer links between the training colleges and the universities and that wider opportunities should be provided for suitable training college students to obtain a degree together with a professional teaching qualification by means of a four-year course. They considered that this could be achieved through the extension of the functions of the institutes of education, and they hoped that the universities would now proceed to work out with the colleges the form which such courses should take and the nature of the degrees to be awarded. The Government also agreed that the training colleges could be appropriately renamed "Colleges of Education".

Mr. Stewart stated, however, that:

"There has been far less agreement over the Robbins Committee's proposals for the administration and finance of the training colleges. The Government, after considering the advice given them by the University Grants Committee, have concluded that the academic and the administrative and financial aspects are separable, and that fundamental changes should not be made in the administrative and financial

1 Taken from an extract from the Report of the University Grants Committee to the Secretary of State for Education and Science "University Development 1962-67", Cmnd. 3820, 1968, published in R. Bell, G. Fowler and K. Little, Education in Great Britain and Ireland (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1973), p. 212.

structure of the teacher training system, particularly at a time when the colleges are engaged in a very large and rapid expansion, and when the problems of teacher supply are especially difficult. They have, therefore, decided that for the present the colleges should continue to be administered by the existing maintaining bodies under the present system of overall supervision. They intend, however, to secure that the present arrangements for the internal government of colleges are reviewed forthwith by all those concerned in the light of the Robbins Committee's recommendations on this subject."¹

Stewart agreed with Hogg that the statement was controversial, but rightly pointed out that whatever the conclusion the Government had reached it would have been controversial. In fact, the content of the statement raised little controversy in the House. It seems that most of the MPs present were more concerned that the statement had been given on a Friday and that it was not the usual Parliamentary practice to give notices on Fridays.² Hogg stressed that the statement would disappoint the colleges which would challenge the principle of separability, but he seemed to be more interested in the nature of the consultative procedures adopted by the Government before reaching a decision. More importantly, however, Hogg said that he thought that he would have come to the same conclusion as Stewart. The only major challenge to the statement from the opposition benches, and a half-hearted one at that, came from Mr. Christopher Chataway when he asked if it was not slightly disingenuous to pretend that the academic freedom that the Robbins Committee had suggested for the colleges

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 703, 1964-65, Nov. 30 to Dec. 11, 11th December, 1964, cols. 1972-73. For the full statement see APPENDIX EIGHT.

2 It is possible that in making the statement on a Friday the Labour Government were anticipating, and hoped to avoid, controversy in the House of Commons.

could be given while rejecting the administrative arrangements proposed by the Committee. But Stewart was able to brush this point aside without further question by stating that whilst the colleges would remain under the present arrangements, this did not preclude them developing academic standards and opportunities for students to take degrees.¹

The Conservative Party support for the Labour Government policy was re-affirmed in the debate on Higher Education in the Commons on 25th March, 1965, by Sir Edward Boyle² and Mr. Chataway.³ Boyle stated that he was sure that Stewart's decision not to detach the training colleges from the L.E.As was right although it was bound to disappoint the teaching profession and the colleges.

The main reasons given for the rejection of the Robbins Committee's administrative and financial proposals in Stewart's statement were their controversial nature and the Government's concern not to disrupt the expansion of teacher training. Clearly, not all the universities were anxious to accept the colleges into the university system, nor was the U.G.C. very anxious to take over the administrative responsibility for the colleges at a time of university expansion and an increasing government and parliamentary interest in university affairs. To take the colleges

1 For the full debate on the statement see, Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 703, 1964-65, Nov. 30 to Dec. 11, 11th December, 1964, cols. 1972-1977.

2 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 709, 1964-65, March 22 to April 2, 25th March, 1965, col. 763.

3 Ibid., col. 824.

away from L.E.A. control would also have caused a first class political row, and whilst the A.T.C.D.E. might protest at the decision, they had hardly the political influence of the Local Authority Associations. Furthermore, the existing system was proving that it could cope with the expansion of teacher training, at least in terms of numbers. But it is likely that other factors had been influential in the Government's decision. The country was facing, once again, financial difficulties and it is probable that the Government saw the transfer of the colleges to the university sector as an expensive operation and as likely to raise the per capita cost of training teachers. More importantly, the existing system gave the Department potential substantial controls, and the L.E.As considerable influence, over the provision of places in, and the productivity of, the colleges.¹ Consequently, it was unlikely that the Government was ready to dismantle the existing system at a time when the Department was attempting to raise the productivity of the colleges in a situation of financial and teacher supply crisis.

Some of these factors were confirmed later by Mr. Prentice, Minister of State at the D.E.S., in the Commons. In the debate on Higher Education he stated that:

"The Government took the view that local education authorities had a vital role in teacher supply and in discharging that role over the years had founded and administered colleges, on the whole successfully. I take the view that sometimes some unhappy examples of clumsy administration by local authorities causes people to generalise and to attack local authority

1 See also W. Taylor, Society and the Education of Teachers (1969), pp. 76 and 77; E. Robinson, The New Polytechnics (1968), pp. 32-33, and M.V.C. Jeffreys, 'Institutes of Education from McNair to Robbins' in Aspects of Education (Journal of Institute of Education, University of Hull, December 1965), p. 65.

control in general. I would have thought that this was a respect in which, as in so many others, local democracy usually worked well and where bad examples were matters which could be tackled within the context that the general record was successful. We also had to take account of the fact that university opinion on the subject was divided and that not all universities wanted to have these colleges under their umbrella. We also had to take account of the fact that programmes of teacher supply and teacher training must be accountable to a degree not easy to reconcile with the traditional academic freedom of the universities."¹

It is also interesting to speculate whether at this stage the D.E.S. was in the process of formulating a policy for the introduction of the Binary System of higher education, and the Government was not prepared to allow training colleges to move into the autonomous sector when they were preparing to stop technical colleges from taking the same path. Certainly, Alexander felt that Stewart's statement implied two systems of higher education: one under the control of the universities and one under the general administrative control of the L.E.As.²

Reactions to the Government Statement outside Parliament

If the Government statement raised little controversy in the Commons, it certainly received more comment in the wider educational world. In a letter to the Times on 15th December, 1964, entitled "A Matter For Regret", Lord Robbins wrote:

"The members of the teacher training colleges in this country will doubtless be gratified to learn that in some way or other they are to have the opportunity of taking degrees other than the external degree which,

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 709, 1964-65, March 22 to April 2, 25th March, 1965, cols. 836 and 837.

2 Education, Vol. 124, No. 3230, 18th December, 1964, p. 1081.

hitherto, has furnished their only outlet in this respect.

But they are less likely to be gratified to learn that, contrary to the recommendation of the Committee on Higher Education, they are to be denied inclusion in the university system and are to remain in the tutelage of the local authorities - a relationship which, whatever its value in the past, seems likely now to be an obstacle to further progress.

I suspect that others will share this disappointment, for the proposed transfer to the university orbit formed an essential part of the desirable structure of higher education in this country as the Committee on Higher Education conceived it. It offered at once the emancipation of the members of the training colleges from the status of second-class academic citizenship which at present they undeservedly suffer, the full involvement of the universities in the future development of this important branch of higher education and the opportunity for all sorts of experiments within the university system which outside it would lack coherence and standing.

It must, therefore, be a matter of profound regret that a Government which claims to be progressive, aided and abetted apparently by a University Grants Committee which has certainly not yet risen to the level of the new opportunities with which it is confronted, should have chosen this poor-spirited solution to this very important educational problem."¹

Similarly, Mr. H.L. Elvin also deplored the Government's decision.² He regarded the view of the U.G.C. on the separation of the academic and the financial and administrative aspects as odd, and he rightly pointed out that the U.G.C. existed precisely because the two were not separable. He argued that a degree of financial and administrative independence responsibly exercised was essential for higher education as it was understood. The Robbins Report had not asked for autonomy for each college but for

1 The Times, 15th December, 1964.

2 Education, Vol. 124, No. 3230, 18th December, 1964, pp.1083-84.

collective responsibility through the universities and through the U.G.C. to allow the colleges to achieve the status of higher education which the Robbins Committee believed the colleges warranted. Furthermore, he questioned why the Secretary of State should consult the U.G.C. on the matter and he suggested that the Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals would have been a more appropriate body. On the arguments of the needs of supply, he stated that the colleges had always and would always respond. Indeed, the Department had received many letters from the colleges asking to be allowed to expand. He believed that the surest way to discourage recruitment was not to raise the status of colleges when the case had been made out and he felt that the supply of staff and students would now suffer.¹ He argued that there was no sign in the Secretary of State's statement that the decision had been taken on educational grounds, and he believed that it had been taken because the L.E.As did not want to lose control of their colleges. The Government had left a loophole, however, in the phrase "for the present" and he urged the Secretary of State to say what was meant by this and to give a date for the establishment of Schools of Education.

1 This fear was never realised. For comments on the expansion of the colleges, see: R. Layard, J. King and C. Moser, The impact of Robbins (Harmondsworth, Penguin Education Special, 1969), Chapter Eight. The authors state, "If there were a prize to be awarded for expansion, it would have to go to the colleges of education" (p. 65).

The A.T.C.D.E. was inevitably deeply disappointed by the decision on finance and administration and regarded it as a setback greater than the gain of the four-year degree course.¹ Nevertheless, the Association accepted the decision with good grace. In a press statement, the Association expressed disappointment that the full Robbins' proposals had not been adopted, but welcomed the Government's decision to further the association between the colleges and the universities and to press for the introduction of a four-year degree course. The A.T.C.D.E. also welcomed the Government's intention to review the arrangements for the internal government of the colleges. It was emphasised, however, that the Association regarded the decision on the establishment of Schools of Education as an interim measure and that the Association's ruling of full support for the Robbins' proposals remained unchanged. Consequently, the Association considered that within a period of three to five years, the situation should be reviewed with the object of ensuring the complete implementation of the Robbins' recommendations at the earliest possible date.²

It was clear, however, that the A.T.C.D.E. would press the review body on the government of colleges for significant changes in the style of the administration of L.E.A. colleges. In response to a letter from the Chief Education Officer of Manchester published in the Guardian on 17th December, 1964, Mr. K.G. Collier, the

1 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education (London, A.T.C.D.E., undated), p. 5.

2 Appendices to the A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee 1964-65, Appendix 25.

Chairman of the A.T.C.D.E., wrote that he would like to see conditions obtaining for colleges of education comparable to those obtaining in the universities. He argued that the chairman of the governing body should be a person of distinction not dependent upon the results of local elections; that principals should be fully involved in the planning of any change in the college life, from making the college co-educational to altering the establishment of laboratory assistants; that the selection of new lecturers for a staff should be made by predominantly academic persons; that lecturers should be entitled to engage in reasonable outside lecturing and examining work without forfeiting the fees; and the disbursement of revenue granted by the maintaining authority for the running of the college should be firmly in the hands of the college.¹

Conversely, the L.E.As welcomed the Government decision and clearly regarded it as a victory for their policies. The Editorial in Education felt that Stewart's statement represented a blunt rejection of the doctrine enshrined, as in Holy Writ, in the Robbins Report and hitherto believed to be the orthodox U.G.C. belief also, that without more or less complete autonomy there could be no academic freedom worthy of the name. This was of incalculable significance for the future development of higher education and corresponded to the line taken by the L.E.As that academic freedom was not denied to schools and colleges simply by dint of L.E.A. administration.² Alexander suggested that now the C.N.A.A. would

1 Correspondence reported in the A.T.C.D.E. News Sheet, No. 47, February 1965, pp. 23 and 24.

2 Education, Vol. 124, No. 3230, 18th December, 1964, p. 1080.

be able to play a useful role in validating degree courses in subjects with which the universities might not be prepared to cope. He hoped that the colleges would develop relationships with the C.N.A.A. as well as the universities in order that graduate status would be available for all teachers.¹ It was evident that Alexander was now directing his energies to the development of the public sector of higher education.

On Robbins' letter to the Times, Alexander felt that it was understandable that Robbins should feel strongly about the rejection of the administrative and financial recommendations for the colleges, but that it was regrettable that highly emotive terminology had been used. He argued that to suggest that the Report's recommendations offered emancipation to the members of the training colleges from the status of second-class academic citizenship was an astonishing proposition considering the Report had only envisaged a minority of colleges being admitted to internal degrees of universities. He stressed that Robbins seemed to have forgotten the recommendation for the C.N.A.A. and the need therefore for recognising an alternative system of higher education to that offered by the universities which would command the confidence of the nation.² "All of us, on occasions, no doubt write letters which we may subsequently

1 Education, Vol. 124, No. 3230, 18th December, 1964, p. 1081.

2 In fact, the Robbins Report envisaged a much more limited role than that suggested by Alexander. See Higher Education, Chapter Ten.

regret. I fear Robbins may regret his letter of 15 December."¹
Lord Robbins' letter also brought a rebuke from Sir Edward Boyle
in the Commons.²

Both Alexander and the Leader in Education, however, agreed
that the most important and urgent issue was now to secure the
liberalisation of college government. It remained to be seen,
then, how this was to be achieved.

-
- 1 Education, Vol. 124, No. 3231, 25th December, 1964, "Week by Week",
p. 1111. Robbins showed little sign of regret and returned to the
issue on a debate on Higher Education in the Lords: see, Hansard
(Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXX, 1965-66, Nov. 9 to Dec. 2,
1st December, 1965, cols. 1253-1254.
 - 2 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 709, 1964-65, March 22
to April 2, 25th March, 1965, col. 764.

CHAPTER 5

TOWARDS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WEAVER STUDY GROUP¹

Initial Proposals

Shortly after the Secretary of State's announcement on the future of the colleges, the Local Authority Associations once again invited the A.T.C.D.E. to meet their own study group for discussions. At first, the A.T.C.D.E. declined on the grounds that they were pressing the Secretary of State to take immediate steps to establish an official working party representative of all concerned.² At this stage the A.T.C.D.E. were anxious to secure an official review under the auspices of the D.E.S., a policy for which Mr. T.R. Weaver, the deputy secretary of the D.E.S., had already shown his support.³ The A.T.C.D.E. feared that to enter into informal discussions with the Local Authority Associations might pre-empt the setting up of an official working party.

The Secretary of State was clearly concerned to get the discussions under way and on 12th January, 1965, the D.E.S. informed the Associations that the Secretary of State was prepared to convene a small Study Group representative of the L.E.As, the Voluntary Bodies and the colleges if this was acceptable to them. It was

-
- 1 D.E.S., Report of the Study Group on the Government of Colleges (London, H.M.S.O., 1966). Commonly known and referred to as the Weaver Report and the Weaver Study Group after the name of the Chairman, Mr. T.R. (later Sir Toby) Weaver.
 - 2 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 1 January 1965, Minute 221.
 - 3 J. Browne, Teachers of Teachers (1979), p. 118.

suggested that the Study Group should consist of two representatives of each of the Local Authority Associations including the L.C.C. (viz. the A.E.C., the A.M.C., the C.C.A., the W.J.E.C. and the I.L.E.A.), one representative of each of the Voluntary Bodies (i.e. the British and Foreign Schools Society, the Catholic Education Council, the Church of England Council of the Church Colleges of Education and the Methodist Education Committee) and four representatives of the A.T.C.D.E. It would be for the Study Group to decide whether, and if so how, they could best bring university or other experience to throw light on the subject of the discussions. A chairman and secretariat was to be provided by the Department. The letter significantly noted that the Secretary of State was well aware that some preliminary examination of the problems was already taking place and he proposed to allow time for this to be carried out before assembling the Study Group.¹

The proposed membership of the Study Group seems to have been readily accepted by the Local Authority Associations. Indeed, it would appear that the Secretary of State and the Local Authority Associations had reached agreement on the nature of the composition of the Study Group before the Secretary of State's letter was sent to the Associations.² Whilst the Department and the more progressive local authorities were willing to put a certain amount of pressure on their colleagues to reform the government of colleges, they

1 A.T.C.D.E. Finance and General Purpose Committee File, Appendix 14: letter from the D.E.S.

2 See below, especially Prentice's statement in the Commons on 25th March, 1965.

regarded the issue as a matter mainly between the providing bodies and the colleges.¹ The Local Authority Associations in fact were more concerned to ensure that the proposed Study Group should examine the problems of non-academic staff in the colleges. Consequently, they successfully sought an agreement with the D.E.S. that matters relating to the numbers and grading of administrative staff in L.E.A. colleges should come under the purview of the Study Group.²

Whilst welcoming the proposal for the formation of the Study Group, the A.T.C.D.E. informed the Secretary of State that they regarded the membership as unacceptable. Firstly, they considered that their own membership was inadequate in view of the fact that the whole future life and work of the colleges would be under discussion. They argued that the Study Group would need to draw on a wide variety of experience from people who had worked in Voluntary and in different types of L.E.A. colleges. It was assumed that their Chief Officers (i.e. the Chairman, the Vice Chairman and the Honorary Secretary) must be among their representatives, but these included two principals of Voluntary colleges. Thus the A.T.C.D.E. felt that in addition to these representatives, their representation should include principals from different types of L.E.A. colleges including those in large urban authorities, the smaller boroughs and the rural districts. Secondly, the A.T.C.D.E. objected to the omission of university

1 J.D. Browne, Teachers of Teachers (1979), p. 119.

2 A.E.C. Executive Committee Minutes, 29 January 1965, Minute 14.

representatives. It was pointed out that in his original statement to the House of Commons, the Secretary of State had indicated that the review would be undertaken by "all those concerned", and it was argued that surely the universities were to be counted in that category. Thirdly, the A.T.C.D.E. suggested that the institutes of education were in a special category since they were immediately and directly concerned with the colleges in all aspects of their work and organisation. It was the A.T.C.D.E.'s opinion that the institutes would be most appropriately represented either in their own right or as members of a university representation. The A.T.C.D.E. acknowledged that members of the C.I.D. were members of the A.T.C.D.E., but it was felt that if the C.I.D. representatives were to be included in the A.T.C.D.E. representation, then this should be taken into account in determining the number of representatives allowed to the A.T.C.D.E. In view of all of these considerations, the A.T.C.D.E. suggested that they should have a minimum of six members on the Study Group. If a member of the C.I.D. was included in the A.T.C.D.E. representation then this should be raised to seven.¹

The exclusion of a university and institute representation on the Study Group was regarded with deep concern by the A.T.C.D.E. The Association was not only looking to the universities for support in securing a liberal pattern of government for the colleges but they genuinely feared that the omission of university

1 A.T.C.D.E. Finance and General Purpose Committee File, Appendix 15: letter from the A.T.C.D.E. to D.E.S. dated 20.1.65. For an account of the reactions of the C.I.D. to the membership of the Study Group, see W.R. Niblett, D.W. Humphreys and J.R. Fairhurst, The University Connection (1975), p. 234.

representatives might have repercussions for the establishment of B.Ed. courses. In Leeds, for example, the Director of the Institute of Education had informed the Institute's academic board that the university was delaying action on the B.Ed. degree until it was known whether or not the universities would be invited to join the discussions on the government of colleges.

Preliminary Discussions

On the more positive side, the effect of the Secretary of State's decision to form a Study Group was to encourage the A.T.C.D.E. to meet with the Local Authority Associations. A single meeting¹ was held on 9th February, 1965, at which the Local Authority Associations gave a sympathetic reception to the A.T.C.D.E.'s criticisms of some of the examples of the difficulties experienced in the administration of some L.E.A. colleges.² In the discussions, which centred on the appointment of staff, finance and the constitution and composition of governing bodies, there appeared to be a considerable area of preliminary agreement, in principle if not always in detail, between the two sides. On some of the issues, however, the L.E.A. representatives were divided.

In respect of staffing, both sides were in agreement that the governing body of a college should be formally responsible for the appointment of the academic staff with substantial power and responsibility delegated to the principal to act on

1 The report of this meeting is based on the notes of one of the A.T.C.D.E. members attending the meeting.

2 For details of these examples, see APPENDIX NINE.

their behalf. It was also felt that the academic board might possibly play a role in appointments. Furthermore, it was agreed that the advice of the university should be taken in the appointment of academic staff although it was recognised that this could lead to difficulties. The appointment of non-academic staff was a more controversial issue due to possible difficulties arising from grading, promotion and conditions of service; relationships with the establishment committee; and relationships with the unions. The A.T.C.D.E. representatives felt that the appointment of non-academic staff should be in the hands of the governing body and the appropriate college officers. Some of the L.E.A. representatives, however, saw advantages of non-academic staff being appointed to the L.E.A. pool. In spite of the disagreement, it was accepted that the problem might need to be looked at by a small working party set up by the Study Group.

Both sides were in agreement that governing bodies should have greater powers and freedom of expenditure once the estimates had been approved. The L.E.A. representative, however, felt that it would not be possible to permit complete freedom of virement. It was pointed out that one of the implications of greater freedom in expenditure would be that colleges would have to appoint well-qualified bursars and the colleges would need to have proper procedures for accounting.

There were areas of disagreement between the A.T.C.D.E. and L.E.A. representatives, and amongst the L.E.A. representatives themselves, on the constitution and composition of governing bodies. Some of the L.E.A. representatives, and in particular

Sir William Alexander, supported the A.T.C.D.E.'s case that legislation would be necessary to ensure the setting up of governing bodies, although they recognised that local authorities would be reluctant to have yet another Act. Alexander argued that at present there was no obligation on L.E.As to establish separate governing bodies for their colleges, and that they could only delegate powers to sub-committees. Furthermore, Education Committees had only the authority to delegate powers to sub-committees that had been delegated to them from the Council and they were subject to the Council's standing orders. Other L.E.A. representatives, notably Briault, disagreed, and felt that legislation was unnecessary.¹ On the composition of governing bodies, Sir Lionel Russell considered that the L.E.As might be prepared to accept the A.T.C.D.E. policy that only one-third of the members should be L.E.A. representatives. Both the A.T.C.D.E. and L.E.A. representatives were in agreement that the governing body should include representatives of the university and teachers.² Some of the L.E.A. representatives, however, saw difficulties over the A.T.C.D.E. policy of staff representation with full voting rights. They pointed out that local government had been "brought up" on the idea that interested parties should not be voting members and the members who declare an interest

1 This was to become a protracted issue in the Study Group.

2 It appears that the N.U.T. was not only pressing for representation on college governing bodies but felt that they should also be represented on the Study Group.

should not take part. It was felt that the problem might be solved by legislation or in stages. Alexander and Russell favoured the "stages approach" with staff acting as "assessors". Alexander felt that this could place staff in a more powerful position to give members of a governing body advice. The A.T.C.D.E., supported by Briault, insisted that members of staff should be full members of the governing body and that they could easily withdraw on matters which concerned them directly.

The meeting does not appear to have discussed university representation on the Study Group. Nor was the question of the senior administrative officer, rather than the C.E.O., acting as clerk to the governors raised, although in fact this was to become one of the key points of A.T.C.D.E. policy. Whilst perhaps the areas of agreement were in some respects more apparent than real, the A.T.C.D.E. representatives found the meeting valuable.¹ Moreover, they were impressed and encouraged by the atmosphere of the meeting and the accommodating attitudes taken up by the L.E.A. representatives.²

1 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 5 March 1965, Minute 317.

2 A.T.C.D.E. representative's notes on an A.T.C.D.E. "follow-up" meeting on 12th February, 1965, to the meeting with the Local Authority Association. The A.T.C.D.E. representatives had approached the meeting with the Local Authority Associations with some trepidation. Sir William Alexander had been regarded as a possible "bête-noire". The meeting in fact dispelled these fears.

University Representation on the Study Group

At a "follow-up" meeting of the A.T.C.D.E. representatives on 12th February, 1965, it was apparent that some of the A.T.C.D.E. representatives felt inclined to join the Study Group even if university representatives were not involved. They were now more concerned with the size of their own representation. They suggested that the A.T.C.D.E. should refuse to join the Study Group if their representation was less than six even if the universities were successful in securing representation, but that they should consider joining the Study Group if the A.T.C.D.E. representation was seven or more even if the universities were not represented. Nevertheless, it was agreed to continue to support the principle of university representation although it was felt that it should be the prime responsibility of the universities to press their own case.¹

At a Joint Standing Committee meeting of the A.T.C.D.E. and A.U.T. it was agreed to get the matter of university representation on the Study Group raised in the Lords and Commons.² In the Lords, Lord Chorley asked whether the Government would ensure that the universities were effectively represented on the Study Group. In reply, Lord Bowden, the Minister of State for Education and Science, explained that the Secretary of State had offered the Local Authority Associations, the A.T.C.D.E. and the Voluntary

1 A.T.C.D.E. representative's notes on an A.T.C.D.E. "follow-up" meeting on 12th February, 1965.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 5 March 1965, Minute 313. See also A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 6.

Bodies the help of the D.E.S. in convening a small group to review college government. In the first instance, the Secretary of State had decided to offer membership only to those who were not directly concerned with the government of the colleges, namely the local authorities and all other bodies which controlled and operated the colleges on the one hand and the staff association on the other. The Secretary of State did not consider that it was for him to impose any additional members on the Group in the first instance, but he expected that the Study Group would wish to make certain that the universities were involved in the discussions from the very beginning. Furthermore, the Secretary of State would use his good offices with the Study Group to see that this happened. Lord Chorley found this a less than satisfactory answer and pressed the matter stating that it was clear that the Robbins' proposals could not be carried out effectively unless the universities were brought in very closely and intimately from the beginning. Lord Bowden, however, refused to be drawn any further on the matter. He emphasised that there were many problems at issue in the government of colleges, some of which concerned the universities and some of which they had nothing to do with. He reassured the House that whilst the Government wished to further the association between the colleges and the universities, it seemed that given the legal position the best way to start the negotiations was by offering the Government's help to the parties most concerned. Then, as soon as the Study Group had been convened to suggest, then, that other parties should be brought in urgently and quickly.¹

1 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXIII, 1964-65, Feb. 9 to March 4, 2nd March, 1965, cols. 1024-1026.

When the A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee met on 5th March, Miss Simpson, the Association's honorary secretary, reported that the exclusion of the universities from the Study Group membership had aroused widespread protest, and the Association's Officers had reached the conclusion that on these terms the A.T.C.D.E. would not be able to take part in the Study Group discussions. She had also received a copy of a letter from Harvey of the Council of the Church Colleges of Education informing the Secretary of State that the Council would not take part in the Study Group if university representatives were not included. It was also apparent that the universities would object most strongly.¹ On consideration of Lord Bowden's comments in the House of Lords, the Executive Committee, however, resolved:-

- "(1) That if it appeared to be acceptable to university and institute members the A.T.C.D.E. should accept the invitation to attend the first meeting of the Study Group on the understanding that the inclusion of university representation should be the first item on the agenda.
- (2) That the membership of the A.T.C.D.E. delegation to the Study Group be decided by the Officers when the number of members had been announced but that the Association's delegation should not include a representative of the C.I.D."²

In effect, the resolutions of the Executive Committee reflected the growing division in their ranks in support of

1 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 5 March 1965, Minute 312.

2 Ibid., Minute 314.

university representation, an anxiety to get the discussions under way and an increasing pre-occupation with the size of their own representation. Lord Bowden's statement to the House of Lords was seen as an opportunity for the A.T.C.D.E. to extricate themselves from the dilemma that they found themselves in by originally over-committing themselves to press for university representation on the Study Group.

This compromise solution was subsequently threatened by an incident in the Commons. On 25th March, 1965, during the debate on Higher Education in the Commons, the matter of university representation was raised by Sir Edward Boyle and Mr. Christopher Chataway. Both wanted to know what progress had been made in setting up the Study Group. Mr. Chataway stated that he understood that the first proposals for the Study Group contained no members from the university world and that this was unacceptable to the A.T.C.D.E. He felt that it was unreasonable to exclude the universities from the review as they were among the most qualified to speak knowledgeably about the proper internal government of institutions of higher education. Therefore, he suggested that it was very reasonable that those concerned with the colleges of education should want the advice of the universities in working out the new arrangements.¹

In a reply which seemed to confirm that the D.E.S. had consulted the Local Authority Associations on the composition of

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 709, 1964-65, March 22 to April 2, 25th March, 1965: see Boyle, cols. 763 and 764; and Chataway, cols. 824 and 825.

the Study Group prior to the letter of 12th January to the Associations, Mr. Prentice, the Minister of State at the D.E.S., stated:

"The universities' views will be welcome and they will be asked to come in and talk with the Study Group, but it was felt on balance that the universities should not actually be members of the Study Group itself. That was the view of both the local authorities and the Government."¹

Prentice went on to say that this was essentially a matter in which the internal administration of the colleges was to be improved and was therefore primarily a matter between the authorities who run the colleges and the people who work in them. Nevertheless, the Study Group would welcome the view of the universities and others who might have a view to express. When asked by Boyle if the universities would be prepared to take part on this basis, Prentice said that he hoped and expected that in general the solution would be acceptable to the universities and that they would be prepared to give evidence. He conceded, however, that there would be some resentment that the universities had not been included.²

Prentice's statement appeared to the A.T.C.D.E. to be a reversal of the position previously stated by Lord Bowden. Once again the A.T.C.D.E. vacillated on whether or not to take part in the Study Group. At the C.I.D./C.H.U.D.E./A.T.C.D.E. Liaison

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 709, 1964-65, March 22 to April 2, 25th March, 1965: Prentice, col. 837.

2 Ibid., Prentice and Boyle, cols. 837 and 838.

Committee meeting on 29th March, it was agreed that the A.T.C.D.E. should write to Crosland, the Secretary of State, asking for clarification on the apparent contradiction between the statements of Lord Bowden and Mr. Prentice and stressing that the A.T.C.D.E. would be unwilling to take part in the deliberations if the universities and institutes did not take a full part as had appeared to be Lord Bowden's intention.¹ Professor Stewart, who had previously written to Crosland making it clear that the C.I.D. and the universities had a direct interest in the government of the colleges, also agreed to write again to Crosland. He intended to propose that an attempt might be made to resolve the difficulty by an informal and unofficial meeting of Crosland and his colleagues with five or six people from the various interests concerned including the C.I.D., the A.T.C.D.E., the L.E.As and the Voluntary Bodies. He suggested that if this proposal was acceptable, the A.T.C.D.E. might still consider attending an informal first meeting of the Study Group to try to find a solution to the difficulties.²

In the event, at the urgent request of the Secretary of State, who had already agreed to increase the A.T.C.D.E. representation to six, the Association agreed to join the Study Group.³ At the first meeting of the Study Group, the Secretary of State pre-empted the issue of university representation by stating that one of the

1 C.I.D./C.H.U.D.E./A.T.C.D.E. Liaison Committee Minutes, 29 March 1965, Minutes 2 and 4.

2 Ibid., Minutes 3 and 5.

3 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 6.

first tasks of the Study Group was to decide the manner in which they should seek outside advice, particularly from the universities. He pointed out that the question of university representation had been the subject of a misunderstanding which had now been settled. He had spoken to Sir John Wolfenden, the Chairman of the U.G.C., who had talked to the Chairman of the Committee of Vice Chancellors, and he had been assured that the Committee would be pleased to co-operate with the Study Group and to find, when approached, suitable university people to advise them.¹ Even so, there was a good deal of opposition from the L.E.A. members to the immediate inclusion of university representatives in the discussions of the Study Group.² It was eventually agreed that there should be at least one plenary session for the discussion of basic principles before outside advice was taken. In fact, the university representatives were not invited to attend until the fourth meeting of the Study Group.³ Then they were invited to attend on an ad hoc basis according to their interests, and not as official members of the Study Group.⁴

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 1, 17 May 1965, Minute 2.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 11 June 1965, Minute 446.

3 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 2, 9 June 1965, Minute 14(b).

4 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/6: Copy of a letter from Mr. T.R. Weaver to Sir Charles Wilson, the Chairman of the Committee of Vice Chancellors, dated 29th June, 1965. The following university representatives attended two or more meetings: Sir Robert Aitken, Vice Chancellor of the University of Birmingham; Professor W.H.G. Armytage, Head of the Department of Education, University of Sheffield; Dr. D.G. Christopherson, Vice Chancellor of the University of Durham; Mr. H.L. Elvin, Director of the Institute of Education, University of London; Mr. T.A.F. Noble, Vice Chancellor of the University of Leicester; Professor W.A.C. Stewart, Director of the Institute of Education, University of Keele, and Chairman of the C.I.D.; Dr. H.M. Taylor, Vice Chancellor of the University of Keele; Mr. A.A. Bath, Secretary to the Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals; and Mrs. B. Langston, Senior Assistant to the Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals.

CHAPTER 6

THE WEAVER STUDY GROUP¹ AND REPORT

Section A: Preliminary Considerations

Membership and Purpose

The membership of the Study Group consisted of Mr. T.R. Weaver, Chairman (D.E.S.); Sir William Alexander (A.E.C.); Alderman A. Ballard (A.M.C.); Dr. E.W.H. Briault (I.L.E.A.); Mr. L.W.K. Brown (C.C.A.); Mr. K.G. Collier (A.T.C.D.E.); Mr. R.F. Cunningham (Catholic Education Council); Mr. L. Drew (W.J.E.C.); Mr. R.J. Harvey (Council of the Church Colleges of Education); Alderman Ll. Heycock (W.J.E.C.); Mr. P. Lord (C.C.A.); Reverend G.R. Osborn (Methodist Education Committee); Mr. J.P. Parry (A.T.C.D.E.); Miss B. Paston Brown (A.T.C.D.E.); Mr. E.G. Peirson (A.T.C.D.E.); Miss E.S.M. Phillips (A.T.C.D.E.); Mr. G.G.G. Robb (British and Foreign Schools Society); Sir Lionel Russell (A.M.C.); Sir Harold Shearman (I.L.E.A.); Miss H.M. Simpson (A.T.C.D.E.); and Councillor Mrs. E.M. Wormald (A.E.C.). Mr. P.R. Odger acted as the Assessor for the D.E.S. Mr. M.A. Walker of the D.E.S. served as secretary.²

The Study Group had no official stated terms of reference. At the beginning of their first meeting, however, the Secretary of State put it to the Study Group in an apparently neutral way that:-

1 The official collection of the Study Group papers are as yet not available for consultation. The present chapter is based on a collection of Study Group papers and personal notes of an A.T.C.D.E. member of the Study Group.

2 Weaver Report, p. ii.

"The problem was to strike the correct balance between the freedom which institutions of higher education should enjoy and the social control which democratically-elected representative bodies are required to exercise. Study was called for to get the balance right and to see what consequential changes should be made."¹

A clearer idea of the thinking and intentions of the D.E.S., however, was revealed in an address by Weaver to a joint meeting of the A.C.E.O. and the A.E.O. at Cambridge in August, 1965, when he stated:-

"In expressing their intention to secure a review of the existing arrangements the Government have implied that the scales of this balance are at present tilted against the colleges. It will not only be the task of the Study Group to suggest not only how the laggard authorities - for such there undoubtedly are - can be brought to behave as liberally as the best, but how the best can be pointed to still better practices."²

It seems likely that the D.E.S. was also looking for guidance, implicitly if not explicitly, from the deliberations of the Study Group in deciding the mode and style of government of other institutions of higher education which would emerge in the public sector with the introduction of the newly announced plan for the "Binary System" of higher education.³ Certainly some of the L.E.A.

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 1, 17 May 1965, Minute 2. Also see Weaver Report, para. 10, p. 3.

2 Education, Vol. 126, No. 3265, 20th August, 1965, p. 344.

3 The first public statement on the "Binary" policy was made in a speech by Crosland at Woolwich Polytechnic on 27th April, 1965. The acceptance of the "Binary" policy clearly made it more urgent to find an acceptable solution to the problem of the government of institutions of higher education in the public sector. The suggestions of the Weaver Report were subsequently adopted as the basis for the pattern of the government of polytechnics in the D.E.S. Administrative Memorandum No. 8/67, Polytechnics, 5th April, 1967.

members¹, including Alexander, Brown and Heycock, saw implications in, and applications of, some of the Study Group's recommendations for the development of technical colleges. The general view of the Study Group, however, was that it was not for the Study Group to take cognisance of technical colleges.²

Atmosphere, attitudes and standpoints

Although the full collection of the official papers of the Study Group is not yet available for consultation, some idea of the atmosphere of the discussions and the attitudes and standpoints of the participants can be gleaned from the Report itself and from other sources. Both Weaver, in his letter to the Secretary of State in presenting the Report³, and Evans, in his booklet "The Government of Colleges of Education"⁴, write of the spirit of co-operation between the members of the Study Group. Even so, Evans points out that the "discussions were frequently difficult and strained, and on several occasions the Study Group was in danger of a real impasse"⁵. He adds, "some of the more crucial points in the final Report were agreed only after arduous discussions, and even then the L.E.A. members were doubtful if they would be

1 The term "L.E.A. members" has been used throughout this chapter to refer to the local authority representatives.

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 5.

3 Weaver Report, p. iv.

4 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, pp. 6 and 7.

5 Ibid., p. 6.

acceptable to the organisations they represented"¹. The A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee minutes also refer to "very hard fought negotiations"².

The skilful and tactful role of Weaver as chairman is acknowledged by Evans and Alexander. Evans records that great credit is due to Weaver "in obtaining agreement when it sometimes seemed that no agreement could be reached"³. Alexander writes, "it is a tribute to the chairman of the Working Party that the Report is unanimous"⁴.

All of these views are confirmed in the private papers of one of the A.T.C.D.E. members on the Study Group⁵ and by the style and tone of the Report.

In spite of the tensions and difficulties, the meetings had their lighter moments. For example, in one of the Study Group's working papers the somewhat bizarre phrase "an educational organ of the denomination"⁶ was used by the Secretary. When Harvey said that he preferred "church" to "denomination" in the phrase, the

-
- 1 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 7.
 - 2 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 10 June 1966, Minute 419(ii).
 - 3 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 7.
 - 4 Education, Vol. 127, No. 3297, 1st April, 1966, "Week by Week", p. 691. In fact, the Report was not unanimous. Alderman Ll. Heycock did not sign the Report.
 - 5 Private papers of an A.T.C.D.E. member of the Study Group.
 - 6 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 3, 24 June 1965, Annex A, Section B1(i)(a).

Secretary explained that he had thought it best to avoid the association of "church" and "organ". The Study Group inevitably agreed to find a more suitable wording.¹

Evans, writing from an A.T.C.D.E. point of view, dramatises the nature of the discussions as being fundamentally about how much freedom the A.T.C.D.E. could gain for the colleges and how much power and control the L.E.As were prepared, or would consent, to yield. He argues that since the local authorities had been successful in securing the retention of the administration of the colleges, they were, no doubt, prepared to agree to give greater freedom and responsibility to the colleges in academic matters and in staff appointments, and were probably prepared to agree to the establishing of governing bodies as distinct from Education Sub-Committees. But he maintains that it was hardly to be expected that they would be prepared to yield their control over such a large and important section of higher education. Furthermore, he contends that the A.T.C.D.E. members had three considerable advantages in the negotiations. Firstly, they were a unified group with agreed principles and they were able to meet regularly before each session of the Study Group in order to formulate their policy on the issues to be discussed. On the other hand, the L.E.A. representatives came from five organisations, and the Voluntary Bodies were generally in sympathy with the A.T.C.D.E. Secondly, the A.T.C.D.E. representatives had an extensive and intimate knowledge of the colleges. Thirdly, the university representatives were able

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 4, 5 July 1965, Minute 1.

to contribute to the discussions from a position of authority and experience of autonomous academic institutions.¹

Whilst it was never an issue, nor ever assumed, within the Study Group that the providing bodies should relinquish all of their control over their colleges as Evans would seem to imply, his other points are supported by the available evidence, although some aspects of his analysis are somewhat superficial. On some of the issues facing the Study Group, it was not just a question of how much power and control the L.E.As were "prepared", or would "consent" to yield. It was also a question of how much they could actually, or felt able, to delegate to the colleges given the statutory framework in which the L.E.As had to operate and given their legal obligations whilst they remained, in the last resort, responsible for maintaining the colleges. Furthermore, the L.E.A. members were sensitive to the fact that some of the changes proposed in the administration of the colleges had to be seen in the wider context of other institutions they administered. Moreover, the disadvantage of the L.E.A. members' negotiating position was not merely that they came from five organisations but rather that on many issues they were genuinely divided. Thus, as Evans rightly points out, once certain responsibilities were conceded, the A.T.C.D.E. were able to use these to lead to others², and since the style of working of the Study Group was based on reaching consensus

1 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, pp. 6 and 7.

2 Ibid., p. 7.

rather than by formal voting on issues, the L.E.A. members were carried along on certain decisions although they had strong reservations.

Conversely, whilst the fact that the university representatives had a particular kind of experience of autonomous institutions generally worked in favour of A.T.C.D.E. policies, on the important question of the size and composition of academic boards this experience actually supported the views of some of the L.E.A. members against the A.T.C.D.E. views. Nor were some of the representatives of the Voluntary Bodies always sympathetic to the proposals of the A.T.C.D.E., particularly in respect of the membership of providing bodies on governing bodies.

Perhaps, however, the greatest advantage the A.T.C.D.E. had working in their favour, which is not mentioned by Evans, was that Weaver and the D.E.S. were committed to the liberalising of college government.

Procedures

The members of the Study Group were well aware of the sensitive nature of their task both from the point of view of the colleges and the providing bodies. Consequently, it was tentatively agreed at their first meeting that their general aim should be to produce a Report in the form of a body of guidance for issue to the providing bodies and the colleges rather than in the form of recommendations to the Secretary of State. It was recognised, however, that they might also wish to recommend that the Secretary of State should take certain steps.¹

1 Weaver Study Group, SGC Minutes 1, 17 May 1965, Minute 3(i).

At their second meeting, it became clear that some members, and in particular Alexander, were dissatisfied with the "body of guidance" approach and considered that the Study Group should be more specific on such matters as the allocation of responsibilities to definite partners in the provision and work of a college.¹ As a compromise, Weaver suggested that the objective of the Study Group should be to produce a document which would show as clearly as possible where the responsibility lay for each function of the college's work and administration and at the same time convey the spirit in which the Study Group hoped that the functions would be exercised.² Significantly, Weaver himself undertook the preparation of a paper setting out some of the ideas of the spirit in which their recommendations should be interpreted.³ Much of the content of this paper was later used in Chapter VI of the Report.⁴

The Study Group also agreed that it was desirable that their Report should be produced as soon as possible and the target date was set as the Autumn of 1965.⁵ In the event this timetable proved to be too optimistic and the Report was not published until March, 1966. It was decided that this tight schedule ruled out the taking

1 For the dispute that led to the Weaver compromise, see below, Section B, "Educational character and general running of the college: the Governing Body".

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 2, 9 June 1965, Minute 4.

3 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/5, Note by Chairman.

4 See Weaver Report, Chapter VI, "The Quality and Spirit of College Government", pp. 24-26.

5 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 1, 17 May 1965, Minute 3(ii).

of formal evidence, which some members felt unnecessary and were anxious to avoid, and it was accepted that the best alternative technique was to invite outside people to discuss certain topics with the Study Group in order to help them reach conclusions.¹

The Study Group, however, showed little inclination to make much use of this device. Apart from inviting university representatives to contribute to the discussions and consulting two local authority clerks and an assistant clerk, two local authority treasurers, the Legal Adviser of the D.E.S., and two members of the Solicitors' Department of I.L.E.A., no other outside advice was officially sought.²

Thus the Study Group's discussions were based mainly on internal working papers prepared by members. Most of the discussions took place in plenary sessions, although a small working party consisting of the Chairman of the Study Group, five L.E.A. members, four A.T.C.D.E. members and one representative of the Voluntary Bodies was set up to examine in detail specific legal and financial points with the local authority clerks and treasurers.³

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 1, 17 May 1965, Minute 3(iii).

2 The two local authority clerks were Mr. A.R. Davis, Clerk of the Nottinghamshire County Council, and Mr. G.C. Ogden, Town Clerk of Leicester (with Mr. J.S. Phipps, Assistant Town Clerk of Leicester, attending one meeting by proxy). The two local authority treasurers were Mr. N. Doodson, Treasurer of Lancashire, and Mr. J.B. Woodham, Treasurer of Middlesbrough. The Legal Adviser of the D.E.S. was Mr. G.E. Dudman. The two members of the Solicitors' Department of the I.L.E.A. were Mr. H.P. Christen and Mr. E.D.M. Farmer.

3 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 2, 9 June 1965, Minute 14(d).

Section B: Issues, Debates and Recommendations

The purpose of this Section is to trace the debates in the Study Group on some of the major issues and the contingent recommendations. As far as possible, the sequential order of the Weaver Report has been followed.

Educational character and general running of the college:

Governing Bodies

One of the first considerations of the Study Group was to establish the context within which the governing body of a college had to operate. The A.T.C.D.E. in their discussion document had felt that this might be covered by a general statement to the effect that "the general character of education and training will be the joint responsibility of the Governing Body, the Providing Body, the Institute of Education and the Department of Education and Science".¹ The term "general character" covered the size of the college; whether single or mixed, and if the latter the proportion of sexes; the balance of training and ranges of age for which training was provided; the proportion of resident, non-resident and day students; the types of course to be offered; and in the case of Voluntary colleges, the religious character where appropriate.²

Alexander, however, felt that such a general statement was inadequate, and he did not like the concept of "joint responsibility".

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/3, para. B1(i).

2 Ibid.

He argued that there were four levels of responsibility in the provision of colleges: at the national level the Secretary of State was responsible for meeting the country's needs; the L.E.A. or Voluntary Body were equally responsible with the Secretary of State on agreeing which needs a college should meet; the governing body was responsible for the administration of a college in general terms; and the principal was responsible for the day to day running of a college. He accepted that certain functions were the "joint concern" of several partners and initiatives should come from all points in the chain, but he argued that "responsibility" must not be spread over too many partners and at each level, as far as possible, there should be one final voice.¹

Some members of the Study Group dissented from this view and felt that it would not be easy to place responsibility exclusively in the hands of one party; for example, decisions about individual colleges would have to be taken at the local level once the national pattern had been determined, and decisions would often have to be reached in consultation with, or subject to the approval of, other parties.² Indeed, Harvey felt that it would be impossible to have a clear definition of responsibility.³ The A.T.C.D.E. members stressed that it was more important to emphasise the spirit of the working relationships between the various parties. Alexander,

1 A.T.C.D.E. Study Group member's personal notes.

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 2, 9 June 1965, Minute 5.

3 A.T.C.D.E. Study Group member's personal notes.

however, was adamant in insisting that there must be a clear location of definitive responsibility.¹

As has been observed, the disagreement was resolved by Weaver proposing that the Report should be as objective as possible in showing where the responsibility lay for each function but it should also be an essay on community.

It was readily established that the Secretary of State's statutory obligations required that he must be ultimately responsible for the control of the number of colleges and their individual size and character (which included the number and sex of students, the range of ages for which training was provided and the proportion of residents); but over the plans for individual colleges he and his Department must work in close consultation with the L.E.A. or Voluntary Body which provided the college, and with the institute of education. It was also accepted that in his concern with standards and the supply of teachers, he must also lay down by statutory regulations certain requirements about such matters as premises, admission of students, teaching staff and courses.²

Within this agreed framework, the main area of debate in the Study Group centred on whether the onus of responsibility for determining the size and character of a college, and changes in these aspects, should rest with the providing or governing body.

1 A.T.C.D.E. Study Group member's personal notes.

2 Weaver Report, para. 19, p. 15.

The A.T.C.D.E. felt that it should rest with the latter. The L.E.A. members, however, maintained that a providing body must have sufficient power to be answerable to the Secretary of State for the task he had given them to perform in relation to the teacher supply.¹ The problem was further complicated by the fact that once a college had been established, the legal relationship between the providing and the governing body of a Voluntary college, which was established by a Trust Deed, was somewhat different from that between a local authority and the governing body of its college. A compromise was eventually reached by distinguishing between the position of new and existing colleges, and between L.E.A. and Voluntary colleges.

In forming a new college, it was accepted that the providing body should be responsible for determining, in consultation with the institute of education, the size and character of the college². (The A.T.C.D.E. had originally wanted the providing body to set up a governing body and to appoint a principal as soon as a decision, in principle, had been made to establish a college. The governing body and the principal would then have assumed responsibility from the beginning in negotiations with the institute and the D.E.S.).

In respect of an existing maintained college, it was agreed that the providing body should, in consultation with the governing body and the institute, be responsible for determining any changes

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 4, 5 July 1965, Minute 7(i).

2 Weaver Report, para. 20, p. 5.

to be made in the size or character of the college. The governing body, however, would be free to take the initiative in proposing such changes.¹ Thus in respect of both new and existing colleges, the ultimate responsibility at the local level for the character and size of a L.E.A. college rested with the providing body, although it was the clear intention of the Study Group that the governing body should play a significant part in determining changes in existing colleges.

The responsibility for determining the size and character of an existing Voluntary college, however, would be the responsibility of the governing body in consultation with the institute, and where appropriate in association with the providing body or the central educational body of the denomination concerned.² The providing body of a Voluntary college would be responsible for deciding, where appropriate, the religious character of the college and the nature of religious education to be provided.³ This, in fact, merely confirmed the existing situation that obtained for Voluntary colleges.

Thus, the Study Group concluded "that the governing body should be responsible for the general running of the college and, within the framework of the size and character evolved for it between the Department, the providing body and the institute, should be responsible for the broad pattern of courses."⁴

1 Weaver Report, para. 21, p. 5.

2 Ibid., para. 22, p. 5.

3 Ibid., para. 23, p. 5.

4 Ibid., para. 24, p. 5.

This was a far more restricted role than the A.T.C.D.E. would have liked for governing bodies, particularly in respect of L.E.A. colleges, and it represented a major concession in A.T.C.D.E. policy.

Establishment and appointment of teaching staff

The Study Group quickly endorsed the A.T.C.D.E. proposal that within the approved estimates the governing body should be responsible for determining the total number of academic staff and, within the proportions of lecturers of different grades authorised by the Pelham Committee, the number in each grade.¹ The only serious voice of dissent to this proposition in respect of L.E.A. colleges came from Briault who argued that since an increase in the establishment involved a commitment for future years, the approval of the establishment as well as the estimates should rest with the providing body.² He suggested that if a governing body was responsible for deciding the establishment of teaching staff within the approved estimates, a governing body would be able to use money provided for full-time appointments which could not be filled for a staffing purpose not approved by the providing body. This could result in considerable differences in staffing patterns of individual colleges. Whilst he did not wish to press his objection, he wanted it recorded in the minutes.³ Russell accepted that a

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/3, B4(i)(a). Also see Weaver Report, para. 32, p. 7.

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 3, 24 June 1965, Annexe B, para. 1.

3 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 5, 23 July 1965, Minute 5(v).

situation described by Briault could arise, but he was not prepared to support Briault's reservation because he believed that an effective sanction remained in the hands of the L.E.A. in the ability to change the powers delegated to a governing body.¹ The general view of the Study Group on the matter was that they were entitled to assume "reasonable" if not "angelic" behaviour on the part of governing bodies.²

In their discussion document, the A.T.C.D.E. had also suggested that a permanent advisory committee of representatives of the D.E.S., the providing bodies and the staff of colleges should be established to formulate notional standards for the academic establishments of colleges.³ On the advice of Weaver, who considered that this was very dangerous as it could lead to power accruing to the D.E.S., the idea was abandoned. It is interesting to reflect on this proposal in the light of the subsequent establishment of a Pooling Committee.

The Study Group also accepted, with apparently little discussion, the A.T.C.D.E. proposal that the governing body should be responsible for the appointment of all members of the academic staff, and the main substance of the Association's proposals for the procedures for the appointment of senior and

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 5, 23 July 1965, Minute 5(vi).

2 Ibid., Minute 5(vii).

3 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/3, B4(i)(a).

other members of the academic staff which gave staff as well as the principal a role in appointments.¹

The procedure for the appointment of the principal and deputy principal, however, was the subject of more extensive discussions. The A.T.C.D.E. had originally proposed in a Study Group Paper that the appointment of the principal should be the responsibility of the governing body who would set up a sub-committee with strong academic representation to consider applications and make recommendations. It was suggested that the sub-committee should include, inter alia, the chairman of the governing body, the Vice-Chancellor of the University or his representative, and the Director of the Institute of Education.² It had been assumed, but not specifically stated, that the committee would include representation of the providing body through their members on the governing body. The L.E.A. members, however, objected to the fact that no specific reference had been made to the providing body which they felt should be closely associated with the appointment of both the principal and deputy principal. They were also concerned that if the providing body only had a small representation on a governing body its interests might be neglected in the appointment procedures.³ Furthermore, they pointed out that failure to associate the providing body with the selection process might give the providing body a reason for refusing to confirm an appointment.⁴ Thus it was

1 See Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/3, B4(ii)(b) and (c); and Weaver Report, paras. 36 and 37, p. 7.

2 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/3, B4(ii)(a).

3 A.T.C.D.E. Study Group member's notes.

4 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 5, 23 July 1965, Minute 6(ii).

eventually agreed that the Report should specifically recommend that the appointment of the principal and the deputy principal in a L.E.A. college should rest with the governing body, subject to confirmation by the providing body¹, and that the governing body should associate the providing body in some way with the selection process. It was also agreed to commend two procedures for this purpose: either to refer a short list of candidates for the approval of the providing body; or to include in the appointment committee set up by the governing body one or more representatives of the providing body.² Similarly, in the case of voluntary colleges, it was agreed to suggest that the governing body should consider consulting the providing body, or such other body as the providing body may wish to act on their behalf, in the appointment of the principal and deputy principal.³

On the question of whether members of the academic staff in maintained colleges should be appointed to the service of the local authority or a particular college, the A.T.C.D.E. members had to accept, somewhat reluctantly, the legal advice of the Clerks of the local authorities that appointments must be made to the service of the authority. It was agreed, however, that the Report should emphasise that members of the academic staff of a maintained college should be appointed by a minute of the authority to a defined

1 All appointments in maintained colleges are de jure subject to the confirmation of the providing body.

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 5, 23 July 1965, Minute 6(iii). Also see, Weaver Report, para. 34, p. 7.

3 See Weaver Report, para. 35, p. 7.

post in a particular college and not to the authority's service generally, and could not be moved at the authority's discretion to another of its educational institutions.¹ Although it could not be foreseen by the A.T.C.D.E. at the time, this situation in fact was to eventually prove advantageous to some members of staff in maintained colleges vis-a-vis members of staff in voluntary colleges when the contraction in teacher training in the 1970s was to lead to college closures and redundancies.

Non-academic staff

The situation regarding the appointment of non-academic staff in maintained colleges proved to be a far more sensitive issue with the local authority members less willing to accord to the colleges the same degree of freedom as in matters relating to the appointment of academic staff. Their concern was partly based on the possibility of wide differences developing in the non-academic staffs of colleges of comparable size; partly on the establishment decided for colleges having repercussions for the staffing of their other institutions; and partly on the grounds that they felt that the "pool" system for non-academic staff had economic and other advantages. Furthermore, the local authority members pointed out that there were contractual obligations which had to be fulfilled in the case of some members of the non-academic

1 Weaver Report, para. 38, p. 7. The phrase "could not be moved at the authority's discretion to another of its educational institutions" does not appear in the final Report but appears in the Study Group Working Party Minutes; viz. SGG/WP Minutes 4, 4 October 1965, Minute 14.

staff which had been negotiated with the unions. The issue of non-academic staff was one of the few matters referred to the Study Group Working Party.

In a "Note" prepared by the Secretary of the Study Group for the Working Party it was suggested that if wide differences between comparable colleges in the size and nature of their establishment of non-academic staff were to be avoided, some guidance in the form of model staffing structures for colleges of different sizes would be needed similar to that provided by the D.E.S. for Voluntary colleges. It was felt that such guidance could be best provided by a working party on which the L.E.As, the Voluntary Bodies, the staffs of colleges and the D.E.S. were represented. The Local Authority Associations would then approve the guidance for L.E.A. colleges and the Department for Voluntary colleges.¹ Within the approved estimates of the college, the governing body would then determine the number and grading of administrative, professional, clerical, and other staff in the light of such agreed guidance and, in the case of maintained colleges, of any representations made by the providing body about the grading of posts in other establishments for which it was responsible.²

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, Paper SGG/WP/2. "Establishment, appointment, promotion, suspension and dismissal of non-academic staff", Note by the Secretary, para. 4. It was also suggested in the Paper that the Study Group, in order to save time, might set up its own working party, with power to co-opt, to draw up the original staffing structure. The structure would then be reviewed at intervals of, say, three years by a working party on the lines suggested in the Note. This idea was not adopted.

2 Ibid., para. 5.

The Secretary's proposals were largely in line with A.T.C.D.E. policy. The main difference was that the A.T.C.D.E. felt that the needs of colleges should be considered in respect of their special functions as residential institutions of higher education and not in relation to other establishments administered by local government authorities or to the office staffing of the authorities themselves.¹

At the first meeting of the Study Group Working Party attended by the two local government Clerks, Mr. Davis and Mr. Ogden, it was agreed that a body of fairly precise guidance on the number and grading of posts for non-academic staff would be useful and a working party should be established to draw up the guidance.² It was accepted, however, that the circumstances of colleges varied so widely that local decisions would be necessary on whether some modifications in the recommended staffing structures would be required for individual colleges.³

The L.E.A. members, however, did not like the proposal that the governing body should have the responsibility for determining the number and grading of administrative staff within the approved estimates even though this would be exercised in the light of agreed guidance and representations made by the providing body. Instead, they suggested that, in the interests of equality of treatment and of making the best use of expensive staff as facilities for higher education expanded, expert control of the colleges' establishments of non-academic staff was necessary and this should rest with the

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/3, B4, section (i), para. 4(c) Note.

2 Weaver Study Group, Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 1, 20 July 1965, Minute 2(i) and (ii).

3 Ibid., Minute 2(iii).

Establishment Committee of the authority.¹ The governing body would then submit annually proposals for an establishment of non-academic staff as part of the estimates of the college, in the expectation that the authority would approve them if they were in line with the guidance. The governing body would be expected to justify any departures from the guidance in an upward direction, just as the Establishment Committee would be expected to justify any departures in a downward direction.² The original minutes of the meeting recorded that these suggestions were generally agreed by the Working Party members. This led to a protest from the A.T.C.D.E. members who were clearly not in agreement with the proposals, and the minutes were subsequently amended to read that the suggestions were "apparently accepted".³

As a concession to the colleges, the L.E.A. members were prepared to accept that the corollary of the authority retaining control of a college's non-academic establishment would be that the appointment of staff would rest entirely with the governing body and the principal⁴, although the staff would be appointed to the service of the authority.⁵ At a subsequent meeting of the

1 Weaver Study Group, Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 1, 20 July 1965, Minute 2(iv).

2 Ibid., Minute 2(v).

3 Weaver Study Group, Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 4, 4 October 1965, Minute 1.

4 Weaver Study Group, Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 1, 20 July 1965, Minute 3(i). This had been proposed by the A.T.C.D.E. in Paper SGG/3, B.4, (ii) (b) and (c) and by the Secretary in Paper SGG/WP/2, paras. 6-9.

5 Ibid., Minute 3(iii).

Working Party, the L.E.A. members under pressure from the A.T.C.D.E. members further conceded that the non-academic staff should in general be appointed to specific posts in colleges and could not be moved from the colleges at the authority's discretion. They stressed, however, that it might not be possible to apply this condition to certain categories of non-academic staff.¹

The Study Group endorsed the Working Party's proposal that a working party should be set up to draw up, and keep under review, a body of guidance on the number and grading of posts for non-academic staff in maintained colleges of education of differing sizes. It was also decided that an interim recommendation should be made to the Secretary of State to this effect, with the proviso that the working party should not commence their task until the Study Group Report was available since this might have implications for their work.²

The A.T.C.D.E. members of the Study Group, however, queried the stance of the L.E.A. members on the Working Party that certain categories of non-academic staff might be subject to moves at the discretion of the authority. Briault explained that certain groups of non-teaching staff had conditions of service agreements with authorities which provided for selection by institutions and appointment to the authority's service but also included a right to move or to be moved. He accepted, however, that where this right applied, a member of staff should

1 Weaver Study Group, Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 4, 4 October 1965, Minute 14.

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 7, 7 October 1965, Minute 3. Also see Weaver Report, para. 46, pp. 8-9.

not be moved without consultation with a governing body. Nevertheless, they could not expect to keep indefinitely the person selected. Shearman stressed that such agreements had the advantages of enabling an authority to help a governing body to move personnel they did not like and to make fair arrangements for filling some of the most attractive posts in certain areas of the authority's service.¹ Whilst the A.T.C.D.E. members accepted these advantages, Peirson argued that where this situation obtained it would reduce a governing body's control over their staff and weaken the staff's loyalty to the college. It was eventually agreed that uniform arrangements would not suit the circumstances of all authorities and colleges. But whatever arrangements were adopted it was important that the wishes of the governing body about the selection and retention of staff should be respected.² The sense of these discussions is conveyed in the final Report which recommends that all appointments should be made to the service of the authority but to defined posts in particular colleges, and that nationally and locally negotiated agreements to which a maintaining authority is a party should be respected.³

No further mention is made in the Study Group Minutes available for consultation of the A.T.C.D.E. members' dissatisfaction with the L.E.A. members' proposals for the control and procedures for determining a maintained college's non-academic

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 7, 7 October 1965, Minute 15.

2 Ibid., Minute 16.

3 Weaver Report, para. 49, p. 9.

establishment at the local level. It would appear from the final Report that the A.T.C.D.E. had to concede that the governing body of a maintained college should submit annually proposals for an establishment of non-academic staff as part of the estimates and justify to the authority scales of provision more generous than those indicated in the guidance. The Report, however, makes no specific reference to the role of the Establishment Committee in determining the non-academic establishment but instead stresses that a governing body should expect proposals that fell within the guidance to be approved.¹ Nevertheless, the procedure for the approval of the non-academic establishment within the estimates meant that, de facto, the Establishment Committee would be involved. Thus, in effect, the A.T.C.D.E. had to accept a situation in which the governing bodies of L.E.A. colleges would have less freedom than the governing bodies of voluntary colleges which, within the approved estimates for non-academic staffing based on notional structures prepared by the D.E.S., were free to depart from the notional structures if they wished to do so.²

Leave of absence

One of the major sources of irritation among principals and staffs of some L.E.A. colleges was the restrictive attitude of their L.E.As to granting leave of absence to staff, even for a day, without securing the approval of a committee of the authority.

1 Weaver Report, para. 47, p. 9.

2 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/7, Control of expenditure in voluntary colleges on non-teaching staff, Note prepared by the Secretary, para. 1. Also see Weaver Report, para. 45, p. 8.

In the case of longer periods of absence, for example study leave, decisions were often subject to long delay.¹ In comparison, the governing bodies of voluntary colleges had the power to grant leave of absence and were required to consult the D.E.S. only where additional expenditure was involved, for example because a replacement was necessary.²

The A.T.C.D.E. regarded this situation not only as a source of frustration, but also as detrimental to the proper freedom and flexibility of institutions of higher education to permit their staff to carry out such functions as outside lectures, examining and research. In their document to the Study Group, the Association proposed that the granting of leave of absence of more than a month should be the responsibility of the governing body acting on the recommendation of the principal. For less than a month, the responsibility should rest with the principal.³

During the discussions in the Study Group Working Party, the L.E.A. members were prepared to concede that it was reasonable to give principals and governing bodies a very large measure of discretion to decide whether they could spare staff who wanted leave of absence for purposes which could directly or indirectly benefit the college or for urgent private business, and to decide whether the leave of absence should be with or without pay. In turn, the A.T.C.D.E. accepted that the approval of the authority should be required for study leave. The main area of disagreement,

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 4, 4 October 1965, Minute 7.

2 Weaver Report, para. 51, p. 9.

3 Weaver Study Group Working Paper SGG/4, B4, (ii) Conditions of Service, (a) Leave of absence.

however, centred on where staff required leave of absence to do something which earned money. In such cases, the L.E.A. members insisted that it was reasonable for an authority to have rules applicable to all teaching staff in its service. Collier and Miss Phillips, however, felt that they could not accept this condition until they knew more about the implications of such rules.¹

When the matter was raised at the main Study Group meeting on 7th October, 1965, the A.T.C.D.E. members strongly defended the right of college of education staff to retain fees received for examining or lecturing, which was often for the benefit of the education service as a whole and for which the work in fact might have to be done in the staff's spare time. They maintained that the appropriate comparison was with the university tradition and practice rather than with other L.E.A. institutions. Furthermore, since staff had no fixed hours of duty and often had to be in college at the week-end, an absence of one or two days would not necessarily mean a shorter working week. The L.E.A. members, however, were concerned at the implications of concessions to the colleges for other maintained institutions. Alexander was prepared to agree that it would not be reasonable for fees always to be offset against teachers' salaries, although he argued that outside earnings could not be ignored where a teacher spent substantial periods of time on other work. Whilst it was desirable that a principal should have the power to make many of the decisions, he

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 4, 4 October 1965, Minute 8.

considered that it should be within a framework laid down by the authority and subject in certain cases to reference to the governing body. This framework might appropriately cover length of absence, fees and replacements for absent staff. He agreed that there was no need for it to be the same in every detail for colleges of education as for schools and establishments of further education. Even so, he insisted that an authority had to protect itself from a charge that it treated different categories of teachers in its service in markedly different ways.¹

The minutes of the meeting recorded:

"It was finally agreed that the Study Group could not define the framework and should not go beyond a recommendation that principals should have freedom to grant leave of absence within the limits of rules laid down by the authority and subject in certain types of case to approval by the governing body."²

The A.T.C.D.E. members, however, regarded this wording as too restrictive, and at the subsequent meeting of the Study Group Miss Paston Brown complained that the minute sounded firmer than she had recalled the spirit of the discussions. She disliked the implication of the wording that the framework would be laid down in such a way that the principal could not go beyond the rules of the authority. At Alexander's suggestion, it was agreed to substitute "within arrangements approved by the authority" for "within the limits of rules laid down by the authority".³

The final Report adopts this "softer" line of approach. Whilst accepting that an authority may find it necessary to make rules, the

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 7, 7 October 1965, Minute 9.

2 Ibid., Minute 10.

3 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 3.

Report hopes that they will be both liberal and not too embracing in scope. Furthermore, it indicates that the Study Group believed it to be important that the principal should be left with a large measure of discretion, subject in certain types of case to approval by the governing body.¹

Finance

The main aim of the A.T.C.D.E.'s policy on finance was to secure as much freedom and responsibility as possible for the colleges to manage their own financial affairs. In particular, the A.T.C.D.E. wanted the colleges to be free from the detailed scrutiny of estimates exercised by the D.E.S. or L.E.As; to be permitted to spend freely within approved estimates; to be able to exercise as much virement as possible; to carry forward unspent money from one year to the next; and to have the freedom to order supplies and services from any source which they judged that they could get best value for money.

The discussions in the Study Group concentrated mainly on the problems of the L.E.A. sector where restrictions had tended to be most severe. Whilst it is true that the Department's approach to the financial management of voluntary colleges had been generally more liberal than the L.E.As' approach to their colleges and most of the A.T.C.D.E.'s criticisms were directed towards the L.E.A. sector, the financing of voluntary colleges was

1 Weaver Report, para. 53, p. 10.

not without problems. Nevertheless, when difficulties relating to the Department's role in the financing of voluntary, or even L.E.A. colleges, was raised, the Chairman carefully steered the discussions away from such matters. The D.E.S. seemed to regard their own approach to the financial management of voluntary colleges as a model for L.E.A. colleges and were not prepared to relinquish any existing controls. Indeed, D.E.S. policy seemed to be in the direction of a closer financial control of voluntary colleges in particular and all colleges in general.

In a paper prepared for the Study Group by the A.T.C.D.E., which covered the financing of both L.E.A. and voluntary colleges, it was proposed that the detailed estimates for a college should be prepared within the college for scrutiny by the governing body who would then submit them to the L.E.A. or D.E.S. for approval under broad heads of expenditure.¹ In order to provide flexibility it was argued that the maximum amount of virement should be permitted. It was further suggested that the estimates should make provision for a general reserve fund which would be carried forward from year to year to cover unforeseen expenditure and which would provide an added incentive to careful housekeeping. Expenditure from the reserve fund would only require the approval of the governing body.² Whilst small unexpected needs would be met from the reserve fund, larger ones would be met through a supplementary estimate submitted by the same procedure as the main estimates.³

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/3, B2 (i).

2 Ibid., B2 (ii).

3 Ibid., B2 (iv).

After the estimates had been approved, the responsibility for expenditure within the approved total estimates would rest with the governing body. The A.T.C.D.E. felt that a distinction should be made between academic and non-academic expenditure. The universities would be consulted on such aspects of the former as library and laboratory provision through the academic members of the governing body. Similarly, the governing body would have the opportunity of consulting the L.E.A. on non-academic expenditure.¹ The L.E.A. colleges would not be required to use the central purchasing arrangements but would have the freedom to order equipment and supplies direct from suppliers who would send their accounts to the college. Use would be made, however, of central purchasing arrangements where this was appropriate and economic.²

Each college would have a qualified bursar capable of running the college's finances and collaborating with the L.E.A. or D.E.S.³ The bursar would be responsible for the accounts of the college through the governing body to the L.E.A. or D.E.S. with a system of accounting appropriate to the college.⁴

In respect of the premises and grounds, it was suggested that substantial projects for new buildings should be the joint responsibility of the governing body, the institute, the providing

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/3, B2 (iii).

2 Ibid., B2 (v).

3 Ibid., B2 (i).

4 Ibid., B2 (vii).

body and the D.E.S. Minor extensions and alterations would be authorised by the governing body provided that they had been allowed for in the estimates.¹ Each college would have on its establishment a small maintenance staff who would undertake the day-to-day repairs of buildings and grounds under the direction of the bursar. The bursar of an L.E.A. college would also be empowered to call on either outside contractors or the L.E.A. according to circumstances.² The governing body through the principal would be responsible for letting the premises and any profits would be placed in the reserve fund.³

During the preliminary discussions on the A.T.C.D.E. proposals in the main Study Group, reservations and doubts were expressed by the L.E.A. members. Whilst it was generally accepted in the Study Group that a governing body should have as much freedom as possible to incur expenditure once the estimates had been approved, Brown pointed out that the more freedom given initially, the more difficult it usually proved to justify a supplementary estimate later on. Alexander did not like the idea of a reserve fund and he felt that the object of the fund could be secured in other ways. In contrast, Harvey argued that a reserve fund would be useful for voluntary colleges since under the existing system of finance, even if a college had a surplus for several years running, there was no

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/3, B2, 2(i).

2 Ibid., B2, 2(ii).

3 Ibid., B2, 2(iii).

means of carrying over money to meet a deficit in the following year.¹

The L.E.A. members also questioned the validity of the distinction between academic and other expenditure. Collier defended the distinction on the grounds that before a B.Ed. course, for example in science, could be approved, a university would need to be satisfied about the level of laboratory equipment and provision. The L.E.A. members, however, were clearly opposed to the universities being involved in the finances of the colleges. Not surprisingly, Alexander questioned whether Collier's point was a real problem. He thought that a university would specify its requirements for approving a B.Ed. course and if these were not met colleges would not obtain approval. Russell emphasised that many L.E.As had already gained experience in these matters in the need to improve facilities in technical colleges before courses could be recognised for the Diploma in Technology.²

In the face of L.E.A. opposition, the A.T.C.D.E. seem to have abandoned pressing the distinction for it was not raised again in subsequent discussions.

Furthermore, some of the L.E.A. members were wary over the possible financial consequences of colleges having freedom to order and purchase equipment from any source. Shearman argued

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 2, 9 June 1965, Minute 9.

2 Ibid., Minute 10.

that sometimes the use of central purchasing arrangements led to substantial economies. Weaver, however, suggested that the U.G.C. practice of fixing norms based on the most economical sources of supply, but giving universities discretion to buy where they wished might prove to be more appropriate for colleges of education.¹

The A.T.C.D.E. proposals and the points raised in discussion were taken up at the second meeting of the Study Group Working Party attended by Mr. Doodson, the Treasurer of Lancashire, and Mr. Woodham, the Treasurer of Middlesbrough. Weaver pointed out that the objective of the Study Group was to discover what financial restrictions bore most heavily on colleges of education and to reconcile a proper measure of freedom for the colleges with the exercise of the necessary degree of control by local authorities and the D.E.S.² The discussions, which were of an exploratory nature, centred on four topics: the preparation, submission and approval of estimates; virement; carrying over money from one year to another; and powers of incurring expenditure.

On the preparation, submission and approval of estimates, Weaver said that the general view of the Study Group was that the initiative should rest with the governing body of a L.E.A. college to submit at the appropriate time estimates in an agreed form to the authority, which would then decide the amount of money that could be given to the college.³ Doodson and Woodham pointed out that the

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 2, 9 June 1965, Minute 11.

2 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 2, 23 July 1965, Minute 1.

3 Ibid., Minute 2.

detail in which estimates should be submitted and the number of heads appropriate at different stages depended on the object to be served. They suggested that the internal estimates of a college should be looked on as a management document and would need to be prepared in considerable detail for the governing body. In addition to normal needs, a college might on occasions want more heads in order to carry out a finer analysis of expenditure in a limited field. The Treasurers felt, however, that an authority might be content for a college's estimates to be submitted to it under fewer heads than it would require the college's expenditure to be set out for accounting purposes. They argued that the number of heads of expenditure between which virement would be allowed was a separate issue.¹ In response to a view that a college's estimates should not include any capital work, the Treasurers pointed out that the distinction between capital and revenue items depended not on the nature of the work but whether future generations would have to pay part of the cost. The upper limit for meeting capital expenditure out of revenue was a matter of decision by the individual authority.² The Working Party and the Treasurers, however, were in agreement that the submission of annual estimates was preferable to a three or five year system. It was felt that one of the disadvantages of triennial or quinquennial estimates was that the system could not operate without a number of escape clauses. Nevertheless, it was considered that annual estimates should not be thought of in isolation but as a part of a three year or five year programme.³

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 2, 23 July 1965, Minute 3.

2 Ibid., Minute 5. There was in fact a limit of £10,000 p.a. for any one college.

3 Ibid., Minute 6.

The Treasurers were of the opinion that many of the difficulties experienced by L.E.A. colleges in meeting unforeseen needs at the time that estimates were prepared, or changes in priorities, could be overcome by virement. They pointed out, as Brown had done in the main Study Group, that it had to be accepted that the greater the powers of virement which an authority granted, the more reluctant it would be to agree to supplementary estimates.¹ The D.E.S. officials indicated their support for the principle of virement, but in a structured and clearly defined way. They explained that voluntary colleges were free to exercise virement within five main groups of items: employees; premises; provisions; lodgings and school practice; and miscellaneous, including books, equipment, furniture, clothing, stationery, printing and excursions.² The last group was designed so that savings on administrative expenses could be diverted to more productive items such as books and equipment. They stressed, however, that voluntary colleges were not allowed to switch money between groups without the Department's approval and that experience had shown that complete freedom of virement resulted in considerably greater expenditure.³ The Working Party agreed that it would be desirable to draw up a list of heads of expenditure within which L.E.A. colleges would be free to exercise virement; that it was reasonable to expect virement between groups to be allowed only with the maintaining authority's

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 2, 23 July 1965, Minute 7.

2 See Weaver Report, APPENDIX A, pp. 27 and 28 for full details.

3 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 2, 23 July 1965, Minute 8.

approval; and that it would not be right to allow a college to switch money from an item of non-recurrent to recurrent expenditure which would commit the authority to expenditure in future years.¹

In respect of the carrying over of money from one year to another, A.T.C.D.E. members suggested that it would be valuable if it were possible to save money over a period of years in order to provide an item which a maintaining authority would find difficult to approve as a part of any year's estimates. The Treasurers expressed doubt about the propriety of such action and said that it was contrary to local government practice to allow money for current expenditure which had not been spent to be retained by the institution at the end of the year for which it had been provided.² It was accepted, however, that there were circumstances which might arise in which better value for money could be obtained if a college were allowed to purchase certain items in the following year with funds which had been provided in the previous year for that purpose.³

On the question of the power to incur expenditure, Weaver explained that the general view of the Study Group was that L.E.A. colleges should be given as much freedom as possible to incur

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 2, 23 July 1965, Minute 9.

2 Ibid., Minute 11.

3 Ibid., Minute 12.

expenditure once the estimates had been approved.¹ The A.T.C.D.E. members strongly queried any need for reference back to the authority and argued that it was psychologically most important to trust colleges to act sensibly and to consult the Chief Education Officer or other expert advisers in appropriate cases. One of the L.E.A. members, however, felt that a college could not be made responsible for selecting or buying items of all types and prices unless the bursar was an officer of the authority. The A.T.C.D.E. members rejected this proposition as an attempt to keep colleges in leading strings. Woodham suggested that the difficulty might be overcome by regarding the financial officer of a college both as responsible to the principal and as owing loyalty to the authority's Treasurer for financial practices and standards.²

In the light of the discussions, Woodham and Doodson agreed to explore the problems raised in greater detail. In particular, they undertook to work out the minimum number of heads under which it would be reasonable for a L.E.A. college to put forward its estimates to the maintaining authority; to produce a list of heads within which virement would be permitted; to consider the practicability of allowing a college to carry over into the following year unspent money; to devise a formula to average out expenditure under certain heads over a period of five years which could be adjusted in the light of changes in the value of money;

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 2, 23 July 1965, Minute 15.

2 Ibid., Minute 16.

and to prepare a note suggesting the essential financial regulations which colleges should be expected to observe in handling and spending money within the approved estimates.

On further consideration and more detailed analysis of the situation, the Treasurers clearly found their task more difficult than they had anticipated. In the Preamble to a subsequent paper prepared for the Working Party, Doodson and Woodham emphasised that local authorities had to operate within statutory limits which did not allow any fundamental concessions to L.E.A. colleges of education. The local authorities' estimating arrangements were all derived from the Rating and Valuation Act of 1925 which paid no heed to separate committees through which a local authority worked, and the estimates must be those of the authority as a whole.¹ Similarly, the funds of the local authorities were controlled by the Local Government Act of 1933, which required that there should be one general rate fund or county fund for the whole authority.² These provisions had been strictly interpreted by the courts and techniques to equalise rates from year to year had been held illegal. In recent years, however, it had become possible to equalise certain branches of expenditure from year to year by the use of capital funds and repair funds under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1953, as amended

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, Paper SGG/WP/4, "Financial control by local education authorities", para. 3. Also see, Rating and Valuation Act 1925, Section 12(1).

2 Ibid., para. 4. Also see, Local Government Act 1953, Sections 181(1) and 185.

by the Local Government (Financial Provisions) Act, 1963.¹ Doodson and Woodham pointed out that the consolidation of budgets and funds had obvious administrative advantages such as overspendings tended to be compensated by underspendings, working balances would be kept to a minimum and savings of interest could be achieved. They felt that it would be unrealistic to expect local government to take the initiative in the fragmentation of its budgets and funds to suit the purposes of any of its specialised branches.²

The Treasurers stressed that chief financial officers of authorities also had statutory responsibilities, especially under section 58 of the Local Government Act, 1958, and the Ministry of Housing and Local Government Circular 4/59 had made it clear that the words of the Statute must be widely construed. Nevertheless, they felt that chief financial officers were now probably more inclined than formerly to delegate some aspects of financial control, although they could not contract out of the responsibilities imposed on them by statute.³

On the question of the form of the submission of estimates, Doodson and Woodham argued that there were good reasons why a local

1 Ibid., para. 5. Under Section 1(1) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1953, a local authority could establish a capital fund and/or a renewal and repairs fund, but under Section 1(2) the funds could not be used for expenditure incurred for the purposes of any functions of the authority as a L.E.A. Under Section 9 of the Local Government (Financial Provisions) Act, 1963, these provisions were amended to allow such funds to be used for meeting expenses incurred as a L.E.A.

2 Ibid., para. 6.

3 Ibid., para. 7.

authority might require all its operating committees to conform to a uniform style of submission; for example, so that all similar classes of expenses could be aggregated in building up the total estimates picture, and the Treasurers considered that a college of education should be expected to conform to the general practice of an authority. They felt, however, that the only way in which the degree of detail in submitted estimates had any significance to the submitting authority was the matter of virement.¹

In respect of the minimum number of estimate headings for virement purposes, Doodson and Woodham stated that all L.E.As had to submit returns of both estimated and actual expenditure and income to the Department in a prescribed form based on that for education accounts recommended by the Institute of Municipal Treasurers and Accountants. Whilst it was theoretically possible to use one set of headings for estimates and another for accounts, in practice, this was troublesome and undesirable. Using the nine basic minimum account headings², the Treasurers drew up a list of eighteen headings (see Fig. 1) for college estimates within which, but not between, governors could reasonably exercise virement.³

1 Ibid., para. 9.

2 Ibid., para. 10. The nine basic minimum account headings were: Employees, Premises, Supplies and Services, Transport, Establishment Expenses, Agency Services, Miscellaneous Expenses, Debt Charges, and Revenue Contributions to Capital Outlay. As far as the Treasurers knew all local authorities prepared their estimates in more detail than this, although some published their final accounts in this basic form. Much more than the basic information, however, was required to complete the return of actual expenditure to the Department in Form 77(a) RTC.

3 Ibid., para. 11.

Fig. 1

List of headings for virement purposes suggested for
Maintained Colleges by Mr. N. Doodson and Mr. J.B. Woodham

Employees

1. Salaries and wages (including superannuation and national insurance) of teaching staff
2. Salaries and wages (including superannuation and national insurance) of non-teaching staff
3. All other employees' expenses

Premises

4. Repair, maintenance and alteration of buildings and grounds
5. Fuel, light, cleaning materials and water
6. Furniture and fittings
7. Rent and rates
8. Other

Supplies and Services

9. Books, educational equipment, stationery and consumable materials
10. Cleaning, domestic and administrative equipment
11. Provisions
12. All other

Transport

13. New vehicles
14. Other

15. Establishment Expenses

16. Miscellaneous Expenses

17. Debt charges

18. Revenue contributions to capital outlay

They pointed out, however, that many L.E.As followed the recommended practice in distinguishing, under each appropriate head, between recurring and non-recurring or extraordinary expenditure, and in such cases colleges would be expected to conform.¹ Furthermore, they expressed some reservations about virement within "revenue contributions to capital outlay". This normally comprised of a short list of quite major items, and whilst switching between items on the original list might well be permitted, the L.E.A. might reasonably have doubts about dropping an item from the list in favour of one not originally contemplated.²

On powers of incurring expenditure, the Treasurers noted that the approval, by the Council, of an operating Committee's revenue estimates normally carried with it authority to spend, and the Treasurers were happy to agree to regard a college of education as an operating committee for this purpose. Given, in addition, a satisfactory definition of virement levels, they felt governing bodies would then enjoy considerable freedom to spend. There were, however, certain qualifications to the general principle of powers of incurring expenditure.³

Firstly, many local authorities designated some items in the approved estimates as "reserved items", i.e. they may not be spent without further reference to, for example, the finance committee. This was especially the case with large non-recurring items and with items which, when spent, would give rise to continuing liabilities.

1 Ibid. Appendix D, note (3).

2 Ibid., para. 11.

3 Ibid., para. 12.

The Treasurers saw no reason to exempt colleges of education from this practice, though they expected the definition of a reserved item to be drawn up with special reference to the circumstances of the colleges. In particular, they saw no merit in reserving all items which individually exceeded a given cash limit.¹

Secondly, the real control over employees lay, or should lie, in an establishment or manpower budget, and not in the cash provision. Local authorities, however, often provided a notional amount of cash in the estimates on the understanding that recruitment could continue up to the approved establishment if this proved possible, although this technique was only possible if the authority carried balances, or provided a contingency sum, to cover all of its departments. The Treasurers saw no reason why a college of education should wish, or be allowed, to opt out of this form of control.²

Thirdly, although central purchasing/contracting arrangements were often cited as a restriction on financial freedom, local authorities derived substantial economies from these arrangements. The Treasurers accepted that this situation could give rise to a real conflict of interest but they saw no simple solution to the problem. They considered that a central contract for fuel might produce financial economies with no off-setting disadvantages, and even gas and electricity consumption could sometimes be aggregated with those of other departments to secure more favourable tariffs.

1 Ibid., para. 13.

2 Ibid., para. 14.

They also felt that contracts for repair and maintenance of buildings might be better arranged centrally without impinging upon any power of management. Consequently, they suggested that such arrangements should normally continue unaltered, though the L.E.A. should be prepared to make approved exceptions where the particular circumstances of a college established a good case for doing so.¹ In respect of the purchase of consumables such as cleaning materials, uniform clothing, printing and stationery, etc., the Treasurers felt it was reasonable for governing bodies to please themselves whether or not to use the central purchasing/contracting arrangements provided. This being the case, they suggested that the college administration should be fully involved in the selection of suppliers and the passing of recommendations to the central purchase/contract committee. Furthermore, they suggested that the budget provision for items of this sort should be placed on a per capita basis so that governing bodies would have an added incentive to find economical sources of supply.²

Fourthly, many authorities had works and/or transport units serving either the whole authority or the whole of the Education department. The Treasurers hoped that governing bodies would not feel unduly constrained by such arrangements. They recognised, however, that such services could become inflexible, and suggested that a college should be associated with a "user board", at officer level, to see that the college's needs were properly

1 Ibid., paras. 15 and 16.

2 Ibid., para. 17. The Treasurers argued that in an attempt to find the most economical source of supply, governing bodies might find this was in fact the central purchase/contract.

considered and that the costings of such organisations were satisfactory. They further suggested that similar arrangements should apply in respect of printing departments where these existed.¹

For statutory reasons the Treasurers did not consider there was any possibility of carrying forward all unspent funds, whether by the creation of a "reserve fund" or otherwise. They accepted, however, that there were a few specified classes of expenditure for which the budgetary period of twelve months had less than usual significance and in which something akin to a "carry forward" practice might be desirable.² They felt that premises, supplies and services, and revenue contributions to capital outlay might come within these categories.³

They re-emphasised the point that local authorities already had adequate powers to establish renewal and repair funds under S.1(b) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1953, as amended by S.9 of the Local Government (Financial Provisions) Act, 1963, and might be encouraged to use these for this purpose.⁴ Furthermore, they suggested that there might be some justification for using such funds for meeting expenditure on furniture and fittings, although they felt that it was more appropriate to treat these categories in an alternative way⁵ (see below).

1 Ibid., para. 18.

2 Ibid., para. 19.

3 Ibid., para. 20.

4 Ibid., para. 21.

5 Ibid., para. 22.

In regard to revenue contributions to capital outlay, the Treasurers noted that the maximum permitted revenue contribution in any year was £10,000 for any one college, but that this expense could be irregular in its incidence, and so inflate the estimates in occasional years. It was suggested that whilst aggregate budgeting by an authority helped to cancel out such irregularities, in a difficult year heavy charges for revenue contributions might reasonably be charged to a capital fund established under S.1(a) of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 1953, as amended.¹

The Treasurers stressed, however, that the Department would have to be approached to secure permission for using the repair and capital funds in these ways. Since all local authorities' expenditure on colleges of education was "pooled" by the D.E.S., it was possible that the Department might object to some L.E.As producing estimates and accounts on the basis of actual expenditures, and others on the basis of fund contributions.²

Doodson and Woodham could not find any conventional way of dealing with furniture, fittings, books, educational equipment, etc. on a basis longer than twelve months. They suggested that a way of overcoming the problem might lie in providing an amount in the estimates based on a three or five year average of estimated needs. The amount unspent in any one year would be added to the provision for the next year. In this way fluctuations from year to year,

1 Ibid., para. 23.

2 Ibid., para. 25.

whether deliberate or not, would not inflate or deflate the average annual rate of expenditure. Subject to sensible safeguards, such as large balances could not be permitted, the Treasurers felt that this technique might be appropriate for these classes of expenditure.¹

The Treasurers found difficulty in making recommendations on the observance of financial regulations. This was partly due to the fact that treasurers had a personal responsibility under the Statutes for safe and efficient arrangements and inevitably their opinions and attitudes varied, and partly that local authorities who varied enormously in the extent to which they codified their financial regulations. Rather than draw up a "model list" of regulations, they considered that it would be more sensible to suggest a "reasonable approach" to the problem² based on the notion that a college of education was a large enough department to employ its own finance officer, who would be responsible to the treasurer for carrying out financial regulations. They recognised that this involved an element of dual loyalty, but pointed out that many organisations had finance officers with loyalties both to operating heads and to the head of finance, and in practice no difficulty need arise.³ It was further accepted that the approach would only satisfy governing bodies if they felt that a substantial measure of financial control had been delegated to their finance officers.⁴

1 Ibid., para. 25.

2 Ibid., para. 26.

3 Ibid., para. 27.

4 Ibid., para. 28.

The approach suggested was that a treasurer, in collaboration and consultation with departmental finance officers, should publish an "accounting manual" prescribing departmental procedures. The departmental finance officer would then have the duty to see that the manual was complied with, and the treasurer would use his audit staff to confirm, by way of test checks, that this was so.¹

Despite the somewhat limited scope of the suggestions of their paper, Doodson and Woodham felt that these would remove the "leading strings" atmosphere wherever this was possible by establishing a "harmonious financial relationship" which they considered was more important than the exact pattern of forms and procedures.²

In many respects the limitations contained in the Treasurers' document were a disappointment to the A.T.C.D.E. members. When the document was discussed at the Study Group Working Party on 17th September, 1965, Parry enquired, that if it were true that the existing statutory limits were such that "no fundamental concessions" were possible to colleges of education operated by L.E.As, whether the legislation which the Study Group had agreed was needed to set up governing bodies could also secure for L.E.A. colleges at least the degree of financial freedom that was enjoyed by voluntary colleges.³ Neither Weaver nor the L.E.A. members, however, were sympathetic to this suggestion. Brown argued that opinions might

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid., para. 30.

3 By this date the Study Group had already reached a tentative agreement that legislation would be necessary to set up governing bodies for L.E.A. colleges. See below, section on

differ as to what concessions were "fundamental". Furthermore, he felt that there was little virtue in concessions which put treasurers on the defensive and inclined them to restrict colleges' freedom in other directions. He believed that it was of the utmost importance that authorities should be happy about the concessions granted to the colleges and that a spirit of mutual confidence should be built up. Neither Weaver nor the L.E.A. members were prepared to entertain any ideas of making fundamental changes in the financial structure. In an effort to find a compromise solution, Weaver suggested that the best way forward was to consider the Treasurers' paper and see whether the essential measure of freedom required by the L.E.A. colleges could be secured within the existing system and if not, what stood in the way.¹

Weaver argued that freedom in spending mattered more than freedom in estimating or accounting. In regard to the estimate heads for virement purposes, he suggested that if the 'debt charges' and the 'revenue contributions to capital outlay' were excluded, this would leave 16 groups for virement purposes for L.E.A. colleges compared with the five groups within which this was allowed in voluntary colleges. He was concerned about this imbalance and enquired whether it was important that all committees and sub-committees of an authority should use the same list of heads. Neither Doodson nor Woodham appeared to be very keen to make changes in the list. Doodson said that efforts had recently been made to standardise the heads for virement. Woodham accepted that it would be practicable to have a separate list for colleges so long

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP, Minutes 3, 17 September 1965, Minute 3.

as the authority's accounting needs could be met merely by rearranging the items under the main heads which served the Department's purposes, but the elements would have to be the same.¹

The A.T.C.D.E. members, with the exception of Peirson, and Briault were also dissatisfied with the limited scope of virement for L.E.A. colleges in comparison with voluntary colleges. Peirson, however, said that he would be satisfied with the amount of virement allowed in the Treasurers' paper on the grounds that where there was little or no virement, if a college could not manage to keep within its estimates under certain heads, the overspending would be treated as excess expenditure. He felt that this system might be better than a system of virement.²

The other A.T.C.D.E. members, supported by Briault, expressed the view that the large miscellaneous group within which voluntary colleges were allowed to exercise virement was extremely valuable. Briault stated that the principals of the I.L.E.A. colleges wanted, above all, to be able to switch money between furniture, fittings, books and equipment, so that if, for example, they took special care of the furniture they could save money and spend it on other items of educational value which possibly might not have been approved if they had been included in the estimates. The colleges also wanted freedom to choose in a subject such as geography whether to spend on equipment or on a field excursion.³

1 Ibid., Minute 4.

2 Ibid., Minute 5.

3 Ibid., Minute 6.

Woodham said that he would not object, for the purposes of virement but not of accounting, to the addition of "furniture and fittings" and "educational visits and excursions" to the group under Supplies and Services in their list which was entitled "books, educational equipment, stationery and consumable materials".¹ It was agreed to amend the Doodson and Woodham list in this way, thus reducing the number of headings for virement purposes suggested for maintained colleges to fifteen.² (See Fig. 2).

Briault pointed out that repairs, maintenance and alterations of buildings did not figure in the estimates of the I.L.E.A. colleges since all work was carried out centrally. He considered that this was a better system since it relieved colleges of a tiresome burden and made it possible to carry out more or less work at individual colleges from one year to the next in accordance with their needs instead of the amount to be spent on each college being predetermined. At the same time, colleges were allowed to put in hand minor jobs up to a fixed amount and arrange for bills to be sent to the authority. The A.T.C.D.E. members, however, believed that the circumstances of the I.L.E.A. were exceptional.³ Consequently, it was agreed to recommend the governing bodies should be given the opportunity to decide whether they wished to carry the responsibility for the repair, maintenance and alterations

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP, Minutes 3, 17 September 1965, Minute 7.

2 Ibid., Minute 8.

3 Ibid., Minute 9.

Fig. 2

Revised list of fifteen headings for virement purposes
suggested for Maintained Colleges which forms APPENDIX B to
the Weaver Report

Employees

1. Salaries and wages (including superannuation and national insurance) of teaching staff
2. Salaries and wages (including superannuation and national insurance) of non-teaching staff
3. All other employees' expenses

Premises

4. Repair, maintenance and alteration of buildings and grounds
5. Fuel, light, cleaning materials and water
6. Rent and rates
7. Other

Supplies and Services

8. Books, educational equipment, furniture, fittings, stationery, consumable materials, and educational visits and excursions
9. Cleaning, domestic and administrative equipment
10. Provisions
11. Other

Transport

12. New vehicles
13. Other

Establishment

14. All establishment expenses

Miscellaneous

15. All other expenses

of their buildings and grounds, or whether they preferred this to be undertaken by the authority.¹ This recommendation was subsequently modified in later discussion and in the Report.

On the problem of powers to incur expenditure, the A.T.C.D.E. members stressed that considerable friction was created by requirements that money could not be spent on certain items in approved estimates without reference back to the authority. Whilst Woodham said that he could not support the imposition by L.E.As of a financial limit on the cost of items which could be bought without further reference, he insisted that it was right that complicated and expensive equipment might have to be treated in this way because of the impracticability of examining the case for it in detail at estimates time.² Weaver suggested that the problem might be partially overcome if it were suggested in the Report that once money had been voted in the estimates, authorities should accord to governing bodies the greatest possible freedom to spend without reference back. But the Report should also acknowledge that the Study Group understood that on occasions authorities found it necessary to require reference back because there had not been time when the estimates were under scrutiny to reach a decision on certain items, e.g. complicated and expensive equipment. To obviate this, as far as possible, the Report should urge governing bodies to put forward a

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP, Minutes 3, 17 September 1965, Minute 10.

2 Ibid., Minute 11.

detailed case for such items well in advance of the date when estimates had to be submitted.¹

The Treasurers' suggestion that the college administration should be fully involved in the selection of suppliers for central purchasing and contracting was welcomed by the A.T.C.D.E. members, but they felt that this did not go far enough to meet their demands. In support of the A.T.C.D.E., Weaver argued that the essence of the colleges' approach was not that they did not want anything to do with central purchasing and contracting arrangements, but that they wanted to be trusted to decide for themselves whether the use of these represented the best value for money. Quality and suitability needed to be taken into account as well as cheapness. Doodson, however, adamantly maintained that it should not restrict colleges' freedom to expect them to obtain fuel through a central contract which might lead to economies.² It was agreed, after considerable discussion, that it would be sensible for colleges to obtain supplies of coal, oil, electricity and gas through a central contract. For other items, it was hoped that authorities would not insist on the use of central purchasing or contracting arrangements, though it was accepted that it would be reasonable for them to approve colleges' estimates on the assumption that supplies and services were obtained from the most economical sources. In particular, it was suggested that in some cases the attainment of high educational standards might depend on colleges

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP, Minutes 3, 17 September 1965, Minute 12.

2 Ibid., Minute 14.

being able to buy where they wished. Consequently, an element of freedom of choice was considered extremely important, and in any case, it was known that some authorities already ensured that central arrangements did not apply to a certain proportion of a college's expenditure.¹

Although the A.T.C.D.E. would have preferred a reserve fund, the A.T.C.D.E. members, and the Working Party in general, were appreciative of the two methods devised by the Treasurers for carrying over money from one year to another.² It was agreed that the Working Party should commend the two methods of easement suggested by the Treasurers to L.E.As, although it was recognised that it might be difficult to operate them in a period of inflation and expansion when forecasts five years ahead were bound to be unreliable.³

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP, Minutes 3, 17 September 1965, Minute 15.

2 Another form of easement which was suggested at the second meeting of the Working Party, and included in the Weaver Report (para. 69), was that an authority which maintained two colleges of education placed completely at each college's disposal a considerable sum of money (£45 per student in 1964/65) to be spent on a variety of minor items, on the understanding that any unspent balances at the end of the year could be carried forward. The items included books, stationery and materials; travelling expenses of staff, students and candidates; hospitality; furniture, apparatus and equipment (other than certain large items); and upkeep of buildings and grounds (other than large jobs carried out under the supervision of the County Architect). The authority counted all the funds handed over to a college in a particular year as having been spent in that year (SGG Minutes 2, 23 July 1965, Minute 13). It is not clear how the authority recorded the non-spending in the accounts.

3 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG Minutes 3, Minute 18.

The only major point on which the meeting failed to reach a satisfactory conclusion was on the use of central works units. Since it appeared that a legal element was involved in the matter, it was decided to refer the issue to a meeting with the Clerks.

At the subsequent meeting of the Working Party with the Clerks, Weaver explained that there was a strong feeling in the colleges that they should be allowed, at least, to get minor jobs done for themselves.¹ Briault pointed out that the governors of the I.L.E.A. colleges could authorise minor alterations and repairs (not including structural alterations), provided that the expenditure was within the amount provided for such work in the approved estimates, that no single item exceeded £500, and that all items costing over £200 were formally reported to the appropriate sub-committee of the Education Committee. Where an item exceeded £60 the work had to be carried out under the direction of the authority's chief engineer or architect. For smaller jobs of up to £60, the governing body could, if they wished, employ a local builder.²

The Working Party members were attracted by the principles of this approach. It was pointed out, however, that complete freedom could not be given to governing bodies to carry out all work since in the last resort, the authority was responsible for seeing that the premises of its institutions were suitable and in a good state of repair. In connection with building work two other

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 4, 4 October 1965, Minute 9.

2 Ibid., Minute 10.

points arose: what needed to be done and the preparation of a proper specification. The general view, although it was not fully supported by the A.T.C.D.E. members, was that a governing body should consult the authority's architect about what work needed to be done when they were framing their estimates, and the architect should decide when the estimates had been approved whether jobs costing more than a certain sum should be carried out by the authority. If he decided that the authority should do the job it was hoped that he would work in close association with the governing body.¹

The issue was discussed further in the main Study Group. Whilst Weaver considered the I.L.E.A. approach had much to commend itself, he thought that the limit of £60 on jobs for which a governing body could, if they wished, employ a local builder seemed too low.² In support of this view, Miss Simpson argued that speed was often one of the factors which caused governing bodies to want to give a job to a local builder. Some of the L.E.A. members, however, were reluctant to depart from the points generally agreed at the Working Party's meeting with the Clerks, especially in relation to the part to be played by the local authority architect. They again emphasised that governing bodies could not be given full responsibility for carrying out repairs and alterations on account of the legal

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP, Minutes 4, Minute 11.

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 7, 7 October 1965, Minute 11.

obligations of the authorities. Briault added that part of the reason for colleges of education being maintained by L.E.As was that authorities' resources should be available to them and it ought to be natural for a college to turn to the authority's architect for advice.¹

The Study Group eventually concluded that the appropriate limit for jobs which a governing body of a maintained college could, if they wished, employ a local builder would vary according to whether the authority's area was compact or extensive, and a range of £100 to £250 was suggested. In order to protect the authority against action for damages the authority's architect would have the right to inspect the work.² The Study Group also agreed that the conclusions reached in the Working Party's meetings with the Treasurers should be embodied in the Study Group Report, although it was recognised that their own conclusions, in effect, modified the principle enunciated in the Working Party that governing bodies should have the right to decide whether they wished to be responsible for their own repairs, maintenance and alterations.³

The A.T.C.D.E. members were reluctant to concede the principle and it would appear that they returned to the issue during the drafting stage. They felt strongly that, at least, governing bodies should have as much freedom as possible within the legal constraints, and that the initiative for decisions on repairs, maintenance and alterations should rest with governing

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 7, 7 October 1965, Minute 12.

2 Ibid., Minute 13.

3 Ibid., Minute 17.

bodies. The essence of these ideas is conveyed in the final Report. The Report concedes that there were difficulties in giving complete responsibility to maintained colleges to carry out all repairs, maintenance and minor alterations because in the last resort the authority was responsible for the state of the premises of its institutions. Furthermore, alterations which included improvements or additions to existing premises usually involved capital as distinct from maintenance expenditure, and required the approval of the Department.¹ Nevertheless, the Report states that these difficulties did not justify an authority insisting that the governing body should be dependent exclusively on their services.² After reassuring local authorities that expenditure would have to be within the approved estimates, it suggests that where there was a job of less than £500 the governing body should get it done by what they judge is the best and quickest means.³ For jobs larger than this, they should decide what projects they wanted to spend money on but should follow the advice of the authority's architect on how it could best be carried out. The Report insisted, however, that dictation by the authority or its architect should be avoided on matters which the members of the governing body as intelligent laymen might be expected to settle for themselves.⁴

1 Weaver Report, para. 76, p. 15.

2 Ibid., para. 77, p. 15.

3 Ibid., para. 78, p. 15.

4 Ibid., para. 79, p. 15.

The Composition of Governing Bodies

The main initial problems facing the Study Group on the composition of governing bodies were to determine which interests should be represented and to find an acceptable balance of representation between the interests. The Study Group seems to have accepted without question the A.T.C.D.E.'s policy that in addition to representatives from the providing body, the governing body should include representation from authorities other than the providing body, the university/institute of education, serving teachers and persons concerned with teacher training or, where appropriate, specialist subjects. The preliminary discussions at the first meeting of the Study Group, then, centred on two fundamental issues of principle: the proportion of representatives of the providing body in relation to other interest groups, and whether representatives of the academic staff should be members of the governing body.

On the former issue, the view of the A.T.C.D.E. members was that the providing body, itself, should be allocated about one-third of the places on a governing body. In respect of L.E.A. colleges, the initial reactions of the L.E.A. members varied. Some considered that it was undesirable for L.E.A. representatives in total to be in a large majority, whilst others felt that a progressive authority might be prepared to give a governing body a greater degree of freedom if a high proportion of governors were members of the providing authority itself. In contrast, Russell, who was anxious to secure an adequate representation for other interest groups, argued that there was no need for the L.E.A.

representatives to be in a majority at all. He recognised, however, that if they were too few in number the college's interests might suffer when it came to fighting for funds in the council.¹ It was also stressed that it was easy to over-estimate the representation of the authorities since there could be four categories of representatives: the chairman of the Education Committee and/or a sub-committee, who might be ex-officio members; members of the authority; people representing the authority but not members of it; and people appointed to the governing body by the authority on the nomination of an outside body.² The general consensus of opinion of the L.E.A. members, however, was that the total number of representatives strictly representing L.E.As, if not the providing body itself, should be capable of forming a majority.

As far as voluntary colleges were concerned, Mr. W.B. Godfrey, who was attending the meeting in place of Cunningham for the Catholic Education Council, emphasised that it was essential that the voluntary providing body concerned should have a majority of the governors of a voluntary college to ensure that the college's distinctive character was preserved.³ Apparently this was not a view shared by Harvey and this was later to lead to a dispute among the members from the Voluntary Bodies.

On the second point, whilst some of the L.E.A. members were either lukewarm or opposed to the idea of academic staff

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 1, 17 May 1965, Minute 8.

2 Ibid., Minute 9.

3 Ibid., Minute 8.

representation, the majority viewpoint within the Study Group, advocated by the A.T.C.D.E. and strongly supported by the Voluntary Bodies, Briault and Weaver, was that academic representation was necessary for effective communication between the academic board and the governing body. It was argued that it was an oversimplification to contend that the academic board should be solely concerned with academic matters and the governing body with administration and finance. On the one hand, the academic board was the organ of thought in the college and it must be in a position to submit recommendations to, and to act on recommendations from, the governing body. On the other hand, decisions on some academic matters, such as the creation of a new department or changes in staffing, could be taken only by the governing body. Consequently, it followed that a governing body must be constituted so that the views of the academic board were represented on it and there was no divorce between the people responsible for finance and the people responsible for academic affairs.¹ In fact, the A.T.C.D.E. and Briault viewed the problem from different ends of the spectrum. The A.T.C.D.E. wanted academic representation so that the principal and staff would be involved in the general and financial policy-making of the college. Briault was concerned that the providing body and the local education officers should have an influence on the academic affairs of the college.

During the course of the first meeting of the Study Group Working Party, two legal questions were raised in respect of the membership of governing bodies of L.E.A. colleges. The first, which

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 1, 17 May 1965, Minute 10.

reflected some residual opposition to academic membership on governing bodies, related to whether it was legally permissible for academic staff to be members of the governing body of a L.E.A. college. The second arose out of a dispute over whether the chief education officer should be the clerk to the governors, and if not, if it was possible for him to be a member of the governing body.¹ In both cases the Working Party was anxious to ascertain the situation in the case of a governing body being constituted as a sub-committee of the authority or by other means.²

The legal position was clarified by Ogden, whose analysis no doubt to some extent explained the traditional attitudes of some L.E.As in their opposition to academic representation on governing bodies. In a paper submitted to the Working Party³, Ogden pointed out that Section 94 of the Local Government Act, 1933, provided that a person who was disqualified under Part II of the Act for being elected or being a member of a local authority was disqualified for being a member of a committee or sub-committee of the authority or for being a representative of that authority on a joint committee appointed by agreement between the authority and other local authorities. Under Section 59 of the Act, a person was so disqualified if he held any paid office or other place of profit in the gift or disposal of the authority or any of its committee. Consequently, when a governing body of a college was a committee or sub-committee of a local authority, the substantive provisions

1 See below, section on the servicing of governing bodies of L.E.A. colleges.

2 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP, Minutes 1, 20 July 1965, Minute 4(v).

3 Weaver Study Group Working Party, Paper SGG/WP/5, prepared by Mr. G.C. Ogden, Clerk of Leicester.

of Section 94 prohibited a person in the employment of the local authority from being a member of the governing body.

In the case of the members of the staff of a college, however, Section 10 of the Education Act, 1946, contained a proviso to Section 94 of the 1933 Act by providing that a person shall not by reason of his being a teacher in, or being otherwise employed in, any school, college or other educational institution maintained or managed by a local education authority be disqualified for being a member of any committee or sub-committee appointed for the purposes of the enactments relating to education or of being a representative on a joint committee appointed for those purposes. Consequently, when a governing body was a committee or sub-committee of a local authority, it was possible for both a principal and any other member of the academic staff to be a member of the governing body. Ogden, however, did not consider that a chief education officer could be appointed as a member of a governing body so constituted as, although he might be employed *inter alia* for the purposes of the college, he was not employed in the college or any other institution.

Where the college's governing body was not a committee or sub-committee of the local authority, the eligibility or otherwise to membership was determined by the instrument setting out the constitution of the college. Ogden was not aware of anything in general law which would prevent a L.E.A. appointing a chief education officer, principal or other members of the academic staff to the governing body of such a college where it was allowed under the relevant Act, Trust Deed or other constitutive instrument.

As a lead to the appropriate proportion of the authorities' representatives on governing bodies, at the request of Russell, a survey of the governing bodies of C.A.T.s in the period before 1st April, 1962, when they were transferred to direct grant status was carried out by the Secretary. Of the nine C.A.T.s only four were maintained by a single authority and one was administered through a joint education committee.¹ In three of the C.A.T.s maintained by L.E.As, the number of Education Committee members were in a minority: in one case only seven out of twenty-four had to be members of the Education Committee.² In one college maintained by a single authority and in the college jointly maintained by two authorities, the chairman of the governing body was in practice not a member of the Education Committee.³

When the Study Group returned to consider the composition of governing bodies of L.E.A. colleges in detail at their sixth meeting, the Secretary of the Study Group had prepared a paper setting out suggestions for the composition of governing bodies. It was suggested that a governing body was unlikely to function effectively if it consisted of more than twenty members, although

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/8, Arrangements for the government of Colleges of Advanced Technology when they were maintained by local education authorities, Note by the Secretary, para. 2. Of the other four C.A.Ts, one was already receiving direct grant and three were grant-aided but not maintained by a local education authority.

2 Ibid., para. 4(a).

3 Ibid., para. 4(b).

if it was much less certain interests which ought to be represented might not be represented adequately, if at all.¹ It was further suggested that whilst it had been the normal practice in colleges to have a quorum of one-third of the total number of governors, if as many as three members of the academic staff were governors, in order to avoid the possibility of them forming a majority of governors present, it might be felt desirable that just over one-third of the governors should constitute a quorum.²

Three possible models were suggested based on a membership of nineteen (Fig. 3 below). The essential difference between the models was that in (a) the representatives of the maintaining L.E.A. were in the majority; in (b) the representatives of authorities, but not of the maintaining authority alone, were in a majority and; in (c) the representatives of the authorities were in a minority.

Fig. 3 Three Possible Models for the Composition of Governing Bodies suggested by the Secretary of the Study Group³

<u>Representatives of</u>	(a)	(b)	(c)
Maintaining authority	10	8	7
Other authorities	2	2	2
Institute of Education/University	2	3	4
Persons with teaching experience or other interests in schools or colleges of education, or in subjects in which the college specialises	2	3	3
Members of academic staff	3	3	3
Total	19	19	19

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/10, Constitution and composition of governing bodies and academic boards, Note by the Secretary, para. 21.

2 Ibid., para. 22.

3 Ibid., para. 24.

The discussions in the Study Group centred on four major issues: the distribution of membership between the various interests; the proportion of members appointed to represent the local authorities; methods of appointing members, especially the use of the principle of co-option; and the appointment of the chairman.

Alexander did not like the Secretary's approach and doubted whether any single model for the composition of governing bodies would suit every college. Therefore he suggested that it would be more sensible to work out for each interest group numerical limits within which it would be reasonable for representatives to be appointed.¹ After considerable discussion, general agreement was reached on the definition of interests and numerical limits for their representation given in Fig. 4 below.

Fig. 4 Interest Groups and their Numerical Representation
Agreed by the Study Group²

<u>Interest Grouping</u>	<u>No. of Places</u>
Principal and members of academic staff	2-4 (Principal ex-officio + 1-3 others)
Universities, including institutes of education	2-4
Teachers serving in grant-aided schools (2), and other persons interested in teacher training or in subjects in which the college specialises (2)	4-4
Maintaining authority and other authorities	6-10
	<hr/> 14-22

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 6, 15 September 1965, para. 13.

2 Ibid., Minute 13. Also see Weaver Report, para. 92, p. 18.

The balance of representation was designed to enable the representatives of authorities to be either in a majority (but only just) or in a minority.¹

During the discussions that had led to the agreement on the interest groups and their range of representation, the A.T.C.D.E. members had favoured a minimum of three university places which would have allowed somebody to have been included from a university other than the one to whose institute the college belonged. This had been opposed by Sir Robert Aitken, the Vice-Chancellor of Birmingham University, who had expressed anxiety about the amount of time which university staff would be devoting to college business and had suggested a range of two to four.²

The A.T.C.D.E. members had also preferred a range of two to four, instead of two, for "other persons interested in teacher training or in subjects in which the college specialises". Alexander, however, had argued that in his judgement this would not be acceptable to the Local Authority Associations unless there was a corresponding increase in the permitted number of local authority representatives. The two changes taken together, however, would have the unfortunate effect of making it possible for the size of the governing body to be unmanageably large and for representatives of the authorities to form less than one-third of the governors. Russell had considered one-third to be the

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 6, 15 September 1965, Minute 13. Also see Weaver Report, para. 93, p. 18.

2 Ibid., Minute 14(i).

minimum proportion desirable for the authorities' representation if sufficient strength was to be exerted in fighting for money for the college in the finance committee and city/county council. In the light of this assessment of the attitude of the Local Authority Associations, the A.T.C.D.E. members had agreed to accept two instead of a range of two to four.¹

The decision to give authorities the opportunity to opt for either a majority or minority of places on a governing body had been taken on the considered advice of the L.E.A. members that the Study Group's Report would be much less well received if it recommended directly that the authorities' representatives should be in a minority. It had been agreed, however, that the Report should specifically draw the authorities' attention to the option and to the fact that some governing bodies already had a minority of authorities' representatives and that there was no reason to think that these colleges were not efficiently and harmoniously governed.²

In the subsequent discussions on character of the local authority representation, it was agreed that the Report should suggest directly that it would be advisable for the L.E.A. representation to include representatives from authorities other than the providing authority and to express a hope that they would not be chosen from one political party.³ It was not thought

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 6, 15 September 1965, Minute 14(ii).

2 Ibid., Minute 14(iii). Also see Weaver Report, para. 93, p. 18.

3 Ibid., Minute 14(iv). Also see Weaver Report, para. 83, p. 16. No mention is made in the Report of the reference in the minutes to political parties.

desirable to stipulate that a minimum number of governors should be women.¹

The members of the Study Group were in general agreement that there were advantages in making some appointments to the governing body by co-option, especially in the case of the category "teachers serving in grant-aided schools and other persons interested in teacher training".² One view, however, was that the two teachers should be appointed by the authority since if they were co-opted by the governors it would reduce their capacity to criticise independently the work of the college. Briault responded that in the case of I.L.E.A. colleges, the practice of appointing two teachers by co-option worked very well. Furthermore, if the authority was to appoint the two teacher representatives there could be difficulties arising from teacher politics.³ It was eventually agreed that: members of the academic staff, other than the principal who would be an ex-officio member, should be nominated by the academic board; universities should be invited to nominate their representatives, but in the case of where the institute of education was independent it should be entitled to

-
- 1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 6, 15 September 1965, Minute 14(v). The sample of existing governing bodies of L.E.A. colleges carried out by the Secretary indicated that in three out of twelve authorities it was stipulated that a minimum number of the governors, or of the representative governors, should be women. See APPENDIX TWELVE.
 - 2 The Weaver Report, para. 90, regarded the procedure of co-option as important to give governing bodies the greatest possible freedom to choose persons who they judged best to make the richest contribution to the academic life of the college.
 - 3 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 6, 15 September 1965, Minute 15.

nominate a proportion of the university representatives; the group of four consisting of serving teachers and other persons interested in teacher training should be co-opted; and the representatives of the local authorities should be nominated by the authorities concerned.¹

On the sensitive and key appointment of the chairman of a governing body, the Study Group decided to leave the matter somewhat vague. They did not consider it politic to draw attention to the possibility of appointing somebody who was not a representative of the authority, and it was decided that the Report should merely state that the governing body should appoint a chairman from among its own members.² To facilitate the possibility of a co-opted member becoming the chairman, Alexander suggested that the first meeting of the governing body should elect a temporary chairman on the grounds that the governing body was not fully constituted until the co-opted members had joined it, and then proceed to appoint a chairman for the normal period of office at the second meeting.³

-
- 1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 6, 15 September 1965, Minute 18. Also see Weaver Report, paras. 82-90. Minute 18 does not make clear how the machinery would operate for the appointment of the local authorities' representatives, but para. 83 of the Report seems to place the initiative for action with the providing body.
 - 2 Ibid., Minute 17. The Report does not specifically state this, but it is assumed in para. 91.
 - 3 Ibid., Minute 16. Also see Weaver Report, para. 91, p. 18. The Report suggested this procedure should also apply in the case of voluntary colleges (see para. 97). In accepting that the chairman might come from among the co-opted members, the Report implicitly assumes that the chairman would not necessarily be a L.E.A. nominee.

Having settled the composition of the governing bodies of L.E.A. colleges, the members of the Voluntary Bodies were asked to submit proposals for the composition of the governing bodies of voluntary colleges. This had the effect of bringing out into the open what Harvey describes as a "radical difference" in approach towards the government of colleges between himself and the other three members of the voluntary colleges.¹

In response to the Study Group's request, Harvey prepared a formula for the composition of governing bodies of voluntary colleges based partly on a recognition of the diverse and complex character of voluntary bodies, partly on the spirit and principles of the settlement agreed in respect of L.E.A. colleges, and partly on the policies of the Council of the Church Colleges of Education² (see Fig. 5 overleaf).

-
- 1 Document produced by Harvey for the Council of the Church Colleges of Education (undated). Harvey writes that this difference had been apparent for some time, even before the Study Group was convened. It had not come out into the open before because the Study Group had been dealing primarily with L.E.A. colleges.
 - 2 The Council of the Church Colleges of Education had agreed that they would accept something along the lines of the Robbins' proposals and the A.T.C.D.E. policy that one-third of the members of the governing body should be appointed by the providing body. It was assumed that if there were one-third official Church representation there would be in total a majority of members on the governing body who were Anglicans, thus preserving the character of their colleges. Additional safeguards in the constitution would include the provisions that the principal must be an Anglican, there would be an Anglican Chaplain and the services in the college chapel would be in accordance with the practice of the Church of England. Harvey's formula, in fact, allowed the providing body the possibility of being in a majority.

Fig. 5 Harvey's Original Formula for the Composition
of Governing Bodies of Voluntary Colleges

<u>Interest Grouping</u>	<u>No. of Places</u>
Providing Authority	6-10
Principal (ex-officio) and representatives of the academic board	2- 4
Universities, including the institute of education	2- 4
Local Education Authorities	1- 3
Co-opted members, to include serving teachers and other persons interested in teacher training and education generally	3- 6
	<hr/> 14-27

The formula was discussed at a meeting with Cunningham and Osborn. Harvey reports that both Cunningham and Osborn, but especially Cunningham, were "violently" opposed to any suggestion that the representatives of the voluntary body should in any circumstances be in a minority. Although unable to attend the meeting, Robb had sent Harvey a letter indicating his support for the views of Cunningham and Osborn.

The attitudes of Cunningham, Osborn and Robb placed Harvey in a dilemma. He considered that it was a serious matter if the Voluntary Bodies, and particularly the churches, could not reach agreement in the Study Group, or in the Report which would receive wide publicity. Whilst Harvey wanted to avoid this situation, he did not want to prejudice the future development of the Church of England colleges and he felt that, if necessary, he must submit a separate paper to the Study Group to the one

Cunningham, Osborn and Robb were proposing to submit.¹

After discussing the matter with the Council of the Church Colleges of Education, Harvey submitted a revised set of proposals to the Study Group² (see Fig. 6 below). He noted in the paper that there had not been time to obtain detailed agreement with the other Voluntary Bodies, but he understood that they were in agreement with the general lines of the paper.

Fig. 6 Harvey's Revised Formula for the Composition
of Governing Bodies of Voluntary Colleges

<u>Interest Grouping</u>	<u>No. of Places</u>
Providing Body (These should include 1-3 serving teachers or other persons professionally interested in teacher training or education generally)	7-14
Principal and representatives of the academic board	2- 4
Universities, including the institute of education	2- 4
L.E.As	1- 2
Co-opted	2- 3
	<u>14-27</u>

The paper also included two caveats. Firstly, in the case of a college maintained by a Church provision should be made in the instrument of government for the principal to be a practising member of the Church concerned, for there to be a chaplain, and for services in the college chapel to be conducted in accordance with

1 Cunningham had prepared an alternative paper to Harvey's paper. The writer has not been able to trace this paper. Cunningham's paper was not submitted to the Study Group.

2 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/13, Composition of the Governing Bodies of Voluntary Colleges, prepared by Mr. R.J. Harvey.

the practices of the Church concerned. Secondly, any major change in the character of the college would require the agreement of a majority of the representatives of the providing body and, where appropriate, consultation with the appropriate central body of the Church or other authority concerned.

In introducing the paper, Harvey said that the governing bodies of voluntary colleges had a final authority which distinguished them from L.E.A. colleges because they made major decisions on the colleges, subject only to the approval of the D.E.S. He accepted that a fairly small governing body was preferable, but this was difficult to achieve when a college covered a number of dioceses. Although the composition suggested did not go as far as he personally would have liked in reducing the number of representatives of the providing body, it had to be remembered that some colleges had to cater for a wide range of interests. Nevertheless, he considered that the numerical range suggested allowed flexibility; and he hoped that the provision for any major change in the character of the college should need the agreement of a majority of the representatives of the providing body would offer an inducement to many colleges to have the representatives of the providing body in a minority.¹

Cunningham indicated that he was in general agreement with Harvey's paper, but the Roman Catholic view was that it was essential for the representatives of the providing body to constitute at least half of the governing body, if not a simple majority. He stated that

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 12.

governing bodies of Roman Catholic colleges, in fact, were likely to be nearer the lower than upper end of the suggested range of sizes.¹

Although Harvey's revised formula seemed to be acceptable to the Voluntary Bodies and raised no dissent from the A.T.C.D.E., the L.E.A. members expressed concern at the smallness of the L.E.A. representation. It was argued that since the local authorities paid students' grants they should have a stronger representation. The provision for only one L.E.A. representative at the lower end of the range could mean that a governing body would be without any local authority advice at all at a particular meeting if he was unable to attend. It was considered that if necessary, the total size of the governing body should be increased to allow greater L.E.A. representation. Alexander, however, suggested that this could be avoided by adjusting the balance within the total so that the range for the L.E.A. representation became 2-4 and the providing body 6-12. Cunningham accepted the point about the size of the L.E.A. representation and said that in recent years the Catholic colleges had, in fact, at least two L.E.A. representatives. The Study Group agreed that the Voluntary Bodies should look further into Alexander's suggestion.²

After further discussions among the Voluntary Bodies, it would appear that they were prepared to accept an increase in the range of L.E.A. representatives but they were not prepared to accept any

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 13.

2 Ibid., Minute 14.

reduction in the range of the providing body representation. During the drafting stage, the Voluntary Bodies submitted two possible alternative structures for consideration by the Study Group (see Fig. 7 below). Although there is no evidence to support the view, from the previous debate it would seem that Harvey preferred the first alternative, and Cunningham, Osborn and Robb the second alternative which ensured the providing body a simple majority even if the very bottom range was accepted.

Fig. 7 Composition of the Governing Body
of a Voluntary College¹

<u>Interest Grouping</u>	<u>First alternative</u>	<u>Second alternative</u>
Providing body (including serving teachers and other persons profes- sionally interested in teacher training or education gener- ally)	7-14	7-14
Universities including instit- utes of education	2- 4	2- 4
Local Education Authority	2- 4	2- 4
Principal and academic staff	2- 4	2- 4
Co-opted members	2- 3	
	<u>15-29</u>	<u>13-26</u>

The Study Group favoured the first alternative with one modification. It was recommended that governing bodies of voluntary colleges should include the category "teachers serving in grant-

1 Weaver Study Group document dated 14th December, 1965.

aided schools and persons with a concern for teacher training or specialist subjects" either among the representatives of the providing body or among the co-opted members.¹

The question of the number of governors that should constitute a quorum does not seem to have been discussed in the Study Group. It would appear that the principle enunciated by the Secretary that the principal and staff would not wish to constitute a majority of the governors present at a meeting was accepted.²

The Constitution of Governing Bodies of L.E.A. Colleges

If the governing bodies of maintained colleges were to exercise the functions and responsibilities which the Study Group felt that they should properly exercise, and if the colleges were to enjoy a measure of self-government, albeit within the context of social control, then one of the key questions was the constitutional relationship of the governing body with other local authority committees.

During the preliminary discussions on this problem at the Study Group's first meeting, the view was expressed that in the existing situation governing bodies had to be constituted as sub-committees of L.E.As if they were to exercise any executive authority and not to be restricted to considering and recommending.³ This meant that, in effect, governing bodies were subject to the procedures and standing orders of the local authorities. The

1 Weaver Report, para. 96, p. 19.

2 Ibid., para. 94, p. 18.

3 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 1, 17 May 1965, Minute 6.

A.T.C.D.E. members were strongly opposed to governing bodies being constituted in this way and they wanted legislation to take the governing bodies out of the L.E.A. committee structure. The A.T.C.D.E. case found strong support among some of the L.E.A. members and in particular Alexander and Russell. Alexander argued that whilst it was possible to exclude colleges from the scope of its standing orders, all authorities could not be relied on to do so voluntarily. Furthermore, he pointed out that some Education Committees had very little power delegated to them by their Councils. The general view to emerge from the meeting was that the changes necessary to liberalise the government of colleges could be secured only by amending the law and providing for the establishment of governing bodies under statute. Russell felt that the bill could be short and simple, and he said that some years ago Birmingham had taken powers in a private Bill to set up governing bodies for their institutions of further education. The Ministry had not raised any objections to the single clause dealing with this matter.¹

Nevertheless, there had been strong dissent from this general view by some L.E.A. members. Briault, anxious to preserve the existing system of college government in the I.L.E.A., had argued that there was no need for governing bodies to be sub-committees of a L.E.A. Although Weaver had felt that legally the L.C.C. governing bodies had no power since they were not sub-committees and the L.C.C. was not strictly obeying the law, Briault had maintained that the L.C.C. had taken legal advice to the effect that it was proper for a sub-committee of an authority to delegate to a body, constituted

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 1, 17th May, 1965, Minute 7.

under statutory regulations, powers which included the spending of money on behalf of the authority.¹ Lord had felt that L.E.As might object to legislation and that they should be left with the initiative in setting up governing bodies free from standing orders. Shearman had considered that D.E.S. "advice" on the matter might serve the same effect as legislation. In support of these views, even Crosland seemed to have had some doubts about the desirability of legislation. He had argued that legislation might cause a delay in the implementation of the Study Group's recommendations and that it might appear that they were attempting to modify a small piece of the local government system on their own. Alexander and the A.T.C.D.E. members had been sceptical of the effectiveness of Lord's approach. Alexander had argued that such an approach might require some form of D.E.S. sanction. In support of Alexander, Drew and Wormald had felt that this would be bad practice and should be avoided.²

Although the consensus view of the meeting had been that legislation seemed likely to be necessary, it had been agreed that it would be advisable to clarify the legal situation and to explore if any other alternative solution was available.³

When the Study Group returned to the problem at their sixth meeting, a paper was available setting out the advice of the D.E.S. Legal Adviser, Mr. G.E. Dudman, on the matter.⁴ The advice was

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 1, 17 May 1965, Minute 6.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Study Group member's notes.

3 Ibid.

4 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/10, Constitution and composition of governing bodies and academic boards.

based primarily on the principle that since a local education authority was a body corporate created by statute, it had only those powers which had been expressly conferred on it by, or which were necessarily to be implied from, the statute. Thus it could act only in the manner expressly authorised by Parliament or through its officers.¹ This was set out in Part II of the First Schedule to the Education Act, 1944. The L.E.A. could exercise its functions itself, but (unless there was urgency or there had already been sufficient consideration by a Divisional Executive) only after considering a report from the Education Committee. Under paragraph 8 of Part II of the Schedule, the L.E.A. could delegate to the Education Committee the exercise of any of its functions with respect to education except the power to borrow or raise a rate. In its turn, under paragraph 10, the Education Committee could appoint sub-committees and delegate to them the exercise of its functions. Further delegation, or delegation to a body which was not a sub-committee, was not expressly authorised and therefore, in accordance with the general principle, was not permissible. The Education Committee could, of course, constitute a body to which no executive functions were delegated and whose only activities consisted of considering and advising.²

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/10, Section A, Constitution of governing bodies, para. 3.

2 Ibid., para. 4.

The paper argued that Regulation 7 of the Training of Teachers (Local Education Authorities) Regulations, 1959, was of no real assistance in the matter since it did not confer, and in fact did not purport to confer any additional powers on L.E.As. In providing that a college should have a governing body, it merely assumed that the necessary powers to create a governing body existed and imposed a requirement that they should be exercised. Apart from any Local Act, the only power which existed in relation to a local authority college was the power to constitute a sub-committee of the Education Committee.¹

In the discussions on the paper, Weaver stated that Mr. A.R. Davis, Clerk of the Nottinghamshire County Council, and Mr. G.C. Ogden, Town Clerk of Leicester, were in agreement with the view of the Department's Legal Adviser. Briault, however, questioned the validity of the advice and reported that he had again consulted the I.L.E.A.'s Chief Legal Adviser who was not in accord with the Department's view. He saw no reason why, where the governing body was not a sub-committee of the Education Committee, the authority could not authorise the governors to act as the agent of the Education Committee, within reasonable limits, in spheres of action where powers had been delegated to the Committee.²

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/10, Section A, Constitution of governing bodies, para. 5.

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 6, 15 September 1965, Minute 6.

Once again some of the L.E.A. members used the opportunity to express reservations on legislation. Brown stated that he preferred to avoid legislation. Shearman, supported by Elvin, the Director of the University of London, Institute of Education¹, felt that the best approach would be to encourage voluntary improvement on the part of L.E.As. Alexander, however, again stressed that the only alternative to legislation was to try to persuade L.E.As to relax their standing orders, but he was not convinced that very large County or City Councils could be relied on to carry out such amendments for a small part of their machinery. Furthermore, he felt that technical colleges could also be included in the legislation.²

The general consensus within the Study Group was that if the advice of the Department's Legal Adviser was correct, then legislation would be necessary to provide for the establishment of governing bodies, and that it was an essential precondition for liberalising college government to place governing bodies outside the committee structure of L.E.As. The rationale for this was based on two major considerations. Firstly, where the governing body was a sub-committee of the Education Committee their decisions were often subject to review. As Alexander tellingly pointed out, that in authorities where no powers were delegated by the County Council or County Borough Council to the Education Committee, there

1 Elvin's attitude seems somewhat strange in view of his support on the Robbins Committee for taking colleges out of the control of L.E.As altogether. One can only suspect that he was trying to support the I.L.E.A. members in trying to retain their existing system of college government.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Study Group member's notes.

could be no delegation from the Education Committee to sub-committees so that, strictly speaking (even though this was not always observed in practice), all decisions of the sub-committees as well as of the Education Committee had to be confirmed by the Council. Secondly, all authorities could not be expected voluntarily to exempt a sub-committee from compliance with standing orders which imposed undue constraints upon the freedom of colleges. Russell argued that there was a third consideration. He felt that it might well be thought fitting by some authorities that on a major sub-committee the representatives of the authority should be in the majority, and he took the view that this was undesirable for the governing body of a college because of the need to secure adequate representation for several other bodies.¹

Alexander also suggested that as a further means of securing for the colleges the freedom that was required, the Bill should provide for the Secretary of State to approve articles of government for the colleges, as he did for secondary schools. The A.T.C.D.E. members clearly did not think this went far enough and expressed doubts about whether it would be possible by this means to relax certain controls such as those of the Establishment Committee over the non-teaching staff. Weaver, who obviously envisaged legislation which was limited in scope and was concerned to avoid a serious rift developing in the Study Group over the matter, said that he was anxious that the members should not proceed on the assumption that if governing bodies were no longer sub-committees, this would solve all their difficulties even though it might solve some of them.²

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 6, 15 September 1965, Minute 7.

2 Ibid., Minute 8.

In response to a request from Briault¹ and as a concession to the opponents of legislation, it was agreed that every effort should be made to resolve the difference of opinion about the legal position of governing bodies before finally proceeding to make a recommendation on legislation. It was generally accepted, however, that should legislation be required, in the interval before this could be enacted L.E.As should be encouraged to bring about the changes required to liberalise college government through amendments to standing orders.²

The legal dispute was taken up at the fourth meeting of the Study Group's Working Party which was attended by Mr. Davis, Mr. J.S. Phipps (Assistant Clerk of Leicester), Mr. Dudman, Legal Adviser of the D.E.S., and Mr. H.P. Christen and Mr. E.D.M. Farmer of the I.L.E.A.'s Solicitors' Department.³ Christen and Farmer made it clear that they were not claiming that an authority could give a governing body full power to act by delegation if it were not a sub-committee of the authority's Education Committee. They also drew a distinction between full power to act and powers of day-to-day management which they maintained that an authority had an inherent right to authorise a governing body to exercise as its agent. Briault gave two examples of the functions entrusted to the governors of the I.L.E.A. colleges: the selection of lecturers for appointment to the authority's service and decisions on what

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 6, 15 September 1965, Minute 6.

2 Ibid., Minute 9.

3 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 4, 4 October 1965.

items to buy within the sums approved for a range of purposes in the colleges' estimates. He found it difficult to see why a governing body could not be authorised to carry out limited functions of this kind.¹

In contrast, the view of Davis, Phipps and Dudman was that a local authority by virtue of the provisions of Education Acts could only act in one of three ways: as itself, when it could enter into contracts necessary for the discharge of its functions; through its officers; or by delegation to a committee. They doubted whether the I.L.E.A.'s relationship with the governing bodies of their colleges could be described as a real contract of agency. As the I.L.E.A. were not acting in any of these three ways, they considered that the I.L.E.A. were not acting lawfully.²

Dudman also made a further influential point in favour of legislation. He stated that where powers were delegated to a sub-committee, in law the delegating committee did not divest itself of these powers but merely authorised the sub-committee to exercise them as well; members of the Education Committee or the Council were thus fully entitled to question the actions of the sub-committee. On the other hand, the allocation of functions to a governing body set up under statutory authority would be absolute, and this would reduce the scope for questioning the governing body's action.³

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 4, 4 October 1965, Minute 3.

2 Ibid., Minute 4. At the subsequent meeting of the Study Group, Weaver described the action of the I.L.E.A. in a more diplomatic tone. He stated that whilst the governing bodies of the I.L.E.A. colleges might be acting with "common-sense and despatch", they were not acting lawfully. (See Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 7, 7 October 1965, Minute 7).

3 Ibid., Minute 6.

Whilst the meeting failed to resolve the difference of opinion on the legal question, it did reveal that there were limitations on the functions and powers of the I.L.E.A. governing bodies which were not in accord with the kind of freedom which the majority of the Study Group wanted for governing bodies. Furthermore, the meeting convinced the members of the Working Party, with the exception of Briault, that the advice of the Department's legal adviser was correct. Consequently, when the matter was reported back to the Study Group, it was finally agreed that legislation would be necessary, especially in view of the fact that there were legal ambiguities.¹

In spite of the Study Group's decision, Briault remained unconvinced that this was the right approach. The essence of his opposition lay not so much in the legal technicality, but in his concern to retain the existing structure of relationships and balance of power between the providing body and, more particularly, the authority's administrative officers with the I.L.E.A.'s colleges. He clearly saw this threatened by the general direction of the discussions in the Study Group and the proposed legislation.²

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 7, 7 October 1965, Minute 7.

2 See Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/11, The partnership between colleges of education and local education authorities, Note by Dr. E.W.H. Briault. Briault clearly felt the education officers had much to contribute to the provision of teacher training. For a similar view, see Joslyn Owen, "Teacher education - local education authorities as providing bodies: problems and issues" in Colston Papers No. 20, Towards a Policy for the Education of Teachers, (London, Butterworths, 1969).

Academic Boards

A fundamental assumption underpinning the Study Group's discussions was that the internal responsibility for the academic work of a college should rest mainly with the academic staff. Having established the general framework of responsibilities of the other bodies which affected the academic work of a college, the task of the Study Group was to determine the location of academic responsibility within the staff and how it should be exercised in relation to the other bodies.

In a paper submitted to the Study Group, the A.T.C.D.E. proposed that within the general framework of the responsibilities of the providing body, the governing body, the institute of education and the D.E.S., the curriculum should be the responsibility of the principal advised by the academic board of the college in conformity with the regulations and procedures of the institute of which the college was a constituent member.¹ The academic board was defined as "a duly constituted body of members of the staff set up by the governing body, in consultation with the staff, acting under the chairmanship of the principal to decide the academic policy in the college and to advise the governing body on all academic matters".² The functions of the board would also include making recommendations concerning the staff establishment, premises, equipment and other facilities, and any other matter as the board deemed relevant.³ The document tacitly made a distinction

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/3, B1 (ii).

2 Ibid. Note on the Academic Board of a College.

3 Ibid.

between "academic matters" and "the internal organisation and management" of a college which would be the responsibility of the principal in consultation with the staff and, where appropriate, with the student representative council.¹

During the discussions in the early meetings of the Study Group, it became clear that the wording of the A.T.C.D.E. paper in respect of the role of the principal vis-a-vis the academic board in respect of academic matters did not accurately reflect the A.T.C.D.E.'s intentions. Indeed, it was to emerge in later meetings of the Study Group that the Association had not yet worked out their detailed policy on academic boards beyond a general statement of principles. Whilst there was some ambivalence among the A.T.C.D.E. members outside the Study Group, they argued within the Study Group that they had intended that academic responsibility should be vested in the academic board rather than the principal. After several re-draftings to achieve the spirit of the relationships of the board to the governing body and the institute, the Study Group eventually decided on a working definition that read, "the academic board, in consultation with the institute of education and subject to the general approval of the governing body, will be responsible for the academic work of the college".²

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/3, B1 (iii). Also see Weaver Report, paras. 26-27, p. 6.

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 4, 5 July 1965, Minute 8 (5 of Paper SGG/6) (ii).

The proposal that the principal should be responsible for the internal organisation and management of a college, which had been accepted by both the A.T.C.D.E. and L.E.A. members, raised an interesting question from the university representatives when they joined the fourth meeting of the Study Group. They wanted to know whether the principal was to be in the position of a headmaster or of a vice-chancellor, i.e. was he himself to be responsible for the internal organisation, management and discipline or was he merely to be the chairman of the body that was responsible. One view which found some support in the Study Group was that as much responsibility as possible should be delegated to the academic board, including that for the internal organisation and management.¹ This suggestion was regarded by the L.E.A. members as a too radical departure from the traditions of local authority institutions. They argued that whilst the principal would not be in the position of a headmaster, the analogy to a vice-chancellor was misleading since a university was a much larger and complex organisation than a college. They insisted that a person rather than a body must be responsible for the general ordering of the college community, in student discipline, although it would be necessary to make clear that internal organisation and management did not refer to academic matters.²

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 4, 5 July 1965, Minute 8 (6 of Paper SGG/6) (ii).

2 Ibid., Minute 8 (6 of Paper SGG/6), (iii) and (iv).

The main point of dispute in the Study Group, however, centred on the size and composition of academic boards rather than their functions and constitution. In a section of a paper prepared for the Study Group by the Secretary, with the help of Briault, Elvin and Miss Simpson, it was pointed out that in a number of colleges academic boards were still in the process of developing out of staff meetings. It was considered important, however, that every academic board should have a formal constitution setting out the board's composition, functions, rules of procedures and relationships to the governing body.¹ It was further suggested that in a new college, or an existing college without a formally constituted academic board, the governing body might appropriately invite the principal to prepare in consultation with the academic staff a constitution for the academic board for consideration by the governing body.²

In regard to the composition of academic boards and their committee structures, it was noted that colleges would have different ideas on what would best suit their individual circumstances. Even so, it was suggested that in deciding the composition of their academic boards colleges should bear in mind two considerations which might not be easy to reconcile in a large college. Firstly, all members of the academic staff should have a chance to take part in discussions about the academic work and policy of the college. Secondly, meetings could not provide scope for fruitful discussion

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/10, para. 27.

2 Ibid., para. 28.

and expect to reach a common mind if they were too large.¹

By way of illustration, the paper set out three possible forms of an academic board:-

- "(a) it might consist of the whole academic staff but, in the belief that a meeting of, say, 70 or over is too big for effective discussion, a small standing committee (possibly supported by sub-committees) would be established which would consider many matters before or after initial discussion by the board;
- (b) it might consist of the whole academic staff and, in the belief that a body of up to, say, 100 can effectively discuss items of business if they have been properly prepared and mulled over by heads and staff of departments or ad hoc working parties, it would function without a standing committee;
- (c) it might consist of representatives only of the academic staff (e.g. principal, deputy principal(s), principal lecturers and a limited number of senior lecturers and lecturers elected by their peers), with an occasional conference of the whole academic staff in order to give all members a chance to express views on academic policy."²

When the paper was discussed at the sixth meeting of the Study Group on 15th September, Miss Paston Brown stated that the A.T.C.D.E. hoped that the Study Group would not give any precise guidance on the composition of an academic board since colleges were evolving their own patterns and their choice depended on the size of the college and other circumstances. Miss Simpson reassured the Study Group that all three forms described in the paper were in operation and all were found to work well. She also informed the

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/10, para. 29.

2 Ibid., para. 30.

Study Group that the Principals' and Lecturers' Panels of the A.T.C.D.E. would be meeting in October to consider a memorandum about academic boards.¹

In spite of the plea and reassurance, both the university representatives and L.E.A. members were far from satisfied with such loose arrangements for the composition of academic boards and with the idea of the board consisting of the whole of the academic staff. Sir Robert Aitken thought that the Study Group would have to give some guidance on the size of academic boards. Uncertainty was also voiced about the three forms described in the paper: in particular, where there was a standing committee as well as an academic board, what business was handled by each and who decided this? Some members of the Study Group regarded such imprecise structures as contrary to the Study Group's own stated objective to determine as far as possible where the authority and responsibility of each function of a college should be located. In view of the proposed discussions within the A.T.C.D.E., it was agreed that the Association should be invited to prepare a paper on academic boards to be submitted to the Study Group in the second half of October.²

The attitudes of the university representatives and the L.E.A. members placed the A.T.C.D.E. members in a difficult position. They were well aware that some colleges were strongly in favour of the whole of the staff of a college forming the academic board.

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 6, 15 September 1965, Minute 20.

2 Ibid., Minute 21.

This difficulty was to be compounded by a further factor. Although the deliberations of a hastily convened A.T.C.D.E. working party on academic boards were well under way by the second half of October, there were no signs that a memorandum would be available for internal discussions within the Association by the time the A.T.C.D.E. members had to submit their paper to the Study Group. Thus, although aware of the thinking within the working party, the A.T.C.D.E. members had to prepare a paper for the Study Group before an agreed policy had been reached in the Association. This was later to create an embarrassing situation for the A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee.¹

The paper² submitted to the Study Group by the A.T.C.D.E. members had been clearly influenced by the views expressed by the university representatives and L.E.A. members at the Study Group meeting on 15th September. The paper accepted that it was inappropriate for the whole of the college staff to form the academic board, especially in view of the increasing size of colleges and the nature of the responsibilities which would be delegated to the board. Thus it was recommended that the academic board should consist of about 15 members made up as follows:-

Principal (Chairman)	1
Deputy Principal	1
Departmental representation	6 - 10
Elected members of staff	3 - 7

1 See Chapter Seven.

2 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/12, Note on Academic Boards on behalf of the A.T.C.D.E.

The departmental representatives would be chosen from staff responsible for departments, or for a section of work within the college; the method of their choice and rotation would be a matter for discussion within each college.

In introducing the paper at the eighth meeting of the Study Group, the A.T.C.D.E. members explained that no provision had been made for the membership of a second deputy principal since the new Pelham Report would not be making provision for such a post, and that it was the intention that the elected members of the board would be elected by the whole of the academic staff.¹

The L.E.A. members and university representatives, however, were still not completely satisfied with the proposals. Briault and Alexander were critical of the paper because it did not make clear how the composition and method of election of the academic board would be decided. Miss Paston Brown replied that it had been assumed that the governing body would be responsible for deciding on proposals put up to it. Odger, who was acting as chairman for the meeting, supported this idea. He thought that the suggestion previously put forward in the Secretary's paper² that the governing body might appropriately invite the principal to prepare in consultation with the academic staff a constitution for the academic board, could well be applied to the composition of the board which the governing body would then have to approve.³

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 6.

2 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/10, para. 28.

3 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 7. Odger's suggestion appears in the Weaver Report, paras. 113 and 114, p. 22.

Noble expressed concern at the suggestion that some heads of department might not be represented on the board. Alexander explained that there were in fact no heads of department as such in colleges, but certain principal lecturers could receive an allowance under the Pelham Report if they were responsible for a subject or a group of related subjects and had charge of four or more staff. Nevertheless, he supported the contention that all such senior members of staff should be included on the board. The A.T.C.D.E. members were prepared to accept this approach although it meant that some subjects would be unrepresented since with the present size of colleges there would be only one person in some departments. They pointed out that in some colleges representation from each department could not be secured by definition since the colleges were not so departmentalised as universities. To overcome the problem, they suggested that the category of elected members could be raised and that it might be better to have lecturers without departmental responsibilities freely elected. Briault, however, felt that it was wrong in principle for some subjects to be unrepresented and that it was not the purpose of elected members to represent subject interests. Shearman, in support of Briault, also emphasised the need to safeguard the interests of those departments not represented by ex-officio members.¹

An acceptable solution of the problem to all sides was found by Parry. He proposed that in addition to the principal and deputy principal, the board should consist of three categories:-

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 8.

- "(1) ex officio representatives, i.e. principal lecturers with responsibility allowances (which under the new Pelham Report could be given for non-academic as well as academic responsibilities);
- (2) representatives from departments not represented under (1), elected by members of the department concerned; and,
- (3) other members, possibly elected by the whole teaching staff."¹

In the final Report, it is stated explicitly that the representatives in category (2) should be principal or senior lecturers. This, in effect, limited the choice of representatives within a department under (2), but was in line with the view of the L.E.A. members and university representatives that members of staff actually carrying the responsibilities in a college should be included on the board. The final Report also confirmed that the category (3) members should be elected by the "whole" of the staff. The Report envisaged a board of between 12 and 25 members.²

The A.T.C.D.E. paper also indicated two other important sections: one on the relations of academic boards to other bodies, and the other on the functions of academic boards.

The former section suggested that the board should elect the agreed number of members of the academic staff to the governing body;³ that subject to the board's overall responsibility for the

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 9.

2 See Weaver Report, para. 112, p. 22.

3 This merely confirmed an agreement that had already been reached in the Study Group. See SGG Minutes 6, 15 September 1965, Minute 18, and section above on

academic work of the college, the organisation and conduct of the work in departments or other sections of the college would be the responsibility of that department or section;¹ and that the whole of the academic staff, through the academic council, should be fully involved in a consultative capacity to the board with the power to make recommendations and the right to receive copies of the agenda and minutes of the board and its sub-committees.²

Some doubts were expressed in the Study Group as to whether this section sufficiently defined the relations between the academic board and governing body. For example, it was argued that it was not clear whether the minutes of the academic board should be made available to the governing body.³ Shearman felt that it would be stimulating for a governing body to hear of the academic progress of the college. It was agreed, however, that it should not be necessary for the governing body to see the board's minutes and an annual report from the principal on the academic work and the proceedings of the board should suffice.⁴ In addition, it was

-
- 1 No mention is made in the Weaver Report of the relations of the board to departments and sections.
 - 2 The principle and spirit of this idea is included in the Weaver Report, para. 111, p. 21, but stated in a more general way, viz. that the board should "be supported by effective arrangements whereby the advice and views of any member or members of the whole academic staff can be made to the academic board and its decisions reported back to the staff."
 - 3 It had been suggested in Paper SGG/10, para. 27, that the minutes of the board should go to the governing body, although in discussion the point had been made that they should not be circulated but lie on the table.
 - 4 The point about the principal's annual report is included in Weaver Report, para. 113, p. 22.

pointed out that the governing body would also receive recommendations from the academic board.¹ Moreover, the Study Group reaffirmed that the board should operate within the responsibilities and functions already agreed for governing bodies.²

The latter section outlined six main areas of proposed functions to be exercised by the board:-

- "1. To undertake general responsibility for the academic work in the college and for all matters relating to academic work and to advise the governors on all matters where academic policy involves financial commitment.³
2. To review methods of teaching in the college, such as lectures, seminars and tutorials; to provide a proper balance between the different areas of study and to decide on the principles governing school practice.⁴
3. To be responsible for the assessment of work and evaluation of students' progress during the college course.
4. To consider such items in college life and work as library provision, equipment, educational excursions and visits; and to review estimates of expenditure for these items.⁵

1 One member of the Study Group raised the interesting problem that a situation could arise where the principal failed to agree with the views of the academic board and had to advise the governing body against the advice of the board presented by the academic staff members of the governing body.

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 10.

3 At the suggestion of Miss Simpson, the words "and for all matters relating to academic work" were omitted to bring the wording into line with the Study Group's previous decisions.

4 It was agreed that the board should "consider" rather than "decide on" the principles governing school practice.

5 It was agreed that the board should "recommend" not "review".

5. To devise and propose means by which members of the academic board should take part in appointments to the lecturing staff; to make recommendations on the staffing requirements of departments; and to set up a small advisory committee from heads of departments to advise the governors on promotions within the staff.
6. To be responsible for the procedure on the interviewing and admission of candidates."

With some modifications in the wording to bring the proposals into line with the previous decisions of the Study Group, and a reassurance that the functions, where appropriate, would be exercised in conjunction with the institutes of education, the Study Group accepted the proposals¹ with the exception of proposal 5. Whilst it was accepted that the board should make recommendations on the staffing requirements of departments,² it was agreed that the small advisory committee should be made up of "senior members of staff", not "heads of departments". Elvin also stressed the need for the staff advising to hold posts senior to the one to which the promotion was to be made.³ The Report, in fact, makes no mention of the board setting up an advisory committee, but it does recommend that "appropriate" staff should have a role in the appointment and promotion of teaching staff.⁴

1 See Weaver Report, paras. 25, 28 and 110, pp. 6, 6, 21 respectively.

2 Ibid., paras. 33 and 110, pp. 7 and 21 respectively.

3 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 11.

4 Weaver Report, paras. 36 and 37, p. 7.

Finally, at the suggestion of Professor Stewart, it was agreed that the Report should state specifically that the academic board should proceed by regular meetings with agenda and minutes.¹ This reflected the insistence of the university representatives and the L.E.A. members that only a formally constituted body could be allocated the functions and responsibilities envisaged by the Study Group.

The servicing of governing bodies of L.E.A. colleges

One of the most contentious questions raised in the Study Group was whether the functions of the clerk to the governors of L.E.A. colleges should be discharged either by the senior administrative officer of the college or the chief education officer (or his representative). As the discussions progressed in the Study Group, it became increasingly clear that the issue was not just a matter of determining the most appropriate and efficient method of servicing the governing body, but it also had political and symbolic significance.

The issue was first raised at the first meeting of the Study Group Working Party. Both the A.T.C.D.E. and L.E.A. members were in agreement that the chief education officer must be in a position to advise the governing body and must be present at governing body

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 11. Also see Weaver Report, paras. 110 and 113, pp. 21 and 22 respectively. The Secretary's paper, Paper SGG/10, para. 27, had proposed that the formal constitution of the academic board should lay down the composition of the board, its functions and rules of procedure covering inter alia the minimum number of meetings to be held, the publication of agenda, voting and the circulation of minutes.

meetings. The view of the A.T.C.D.E., however, was that the clerk to the governors should be a "college" man, the senior administrative officer. The A.T.C.D.E. members argued that some chief education officers might use their position as clerk to prevent a principal from presenting his own reports to the governing body or to screen the governing body's decisions on the way to the authority. It was suggested that the chief education officer would be able to fulfil his role as adviser either by being a member of a governing body or by merely attending meetings as of right.¹

In contrast, the L.E.A. members pressed strongly for the chief education officer to be the clerk to the governors. It was contended that if he was a member of the governing body in a personal capacity, he could not advise in the name of the authority. Moreover, unless the chief education officer was the clerk, the authority would not be willing to give the maximum delegation of powers to the governing body. Although it was accepted that the aim of the Study Group was to give colleges absolute freedom in academic matters, so long as the authority was responsible for a college, there must be a direct administrative relationship between the chief education officer and the governing body. As the governing body's clerk, the chief education officer would interfere least with a college's freedom to run its own affairs.²

The case for the chief education officer being the clerk to the governing body was implicitly, if not explicitly, supported by

1 Weaver Study Group Working Party, SGG/WP Minutes 1, 20 July 1965, Minute 4(iv).

2 Ibid., Minute 4(iii).

Briault in his document "The partnership between colleges of education and local education authorities". Briault was anxious to secure that an authority's education officer should be fully involved in all aspects of the college's work and to act as a "bridge" between the college and the authority.¹

The issue was taken up at the seventh meeting of the Study Group by Alexander who felt that two important benefits would accrue to a college if a chief education officer was the clerk to the governors. Firstly, the resources of the authority would be more readily available to the governing body. Secondly, it would encourage an authority to agree to their representatives being in a minority on the governing body and to give the governing body generally greater freedom of action. He felt that it would be possible for the Study Group to protect colleges against possible abuses of the clerk's position by recommending that he should be required to consult the principal about dates and agenda for meetings and that the principal should be entitled to bring any matter he wished before the governors.²

The sympathy and support of the university representatives were clearly with the A.T.C.D.E. In response to Alexander's arguments, Sir Robert Aitken pointed out that if, as had been suggested at the sixth meeting of the Study Group, governing bodies needed to be placed outside the committee structure of L.E.As, then it was inconsistent for the chief education officer to be the clerk.³

1 Weaver Study Group, Paper SGG/11, para. 11.

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 7, 7 October 1965, Minute 4.

3 Ibid., Minute 4.

Russell, too, was not convinced of the necessity of the chief education officer being clerk. The vital point to him was that the chief education officer should be able to advise the governing body and to attend the meetings. He noted that there appeared to be complete agreement on this point by all sides.¹ Apart from Russell, however, the L.E.A. members refused to give ground on the issue.

Although not mentioned at the meeting, the L.E.A. members' case had already been weakened. In the discussions of the Study Group Working Party, the two local authority treasurers, Doodson and Woodham, had already accepted that the college's finance officer could be a member of the staff of the college rather than an officer of the local authority. It had been suggested that the finance officer would be regarded both as responsible to the principal and as owing a loyalty to the authority's treasurer for financial practices and standards.²

Following the seventh meeting of the Study Group, the A.T.C.D.E. agreed that Miss Simpson should seek informal discussions with Brown.³ Although the stated objective of the meeting was to ascertain the views of the L.E.As on the function of the clerk, the Association was anxious to use the meeting to move some way towards breaking the impasse between the two sides in the Study Group. The meeting, which took place in the second week of October, proved inconclusive but Simpson felt it highlighted the main issues.

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 7, 7 October 1965, Minute 5.

2 See section on Finance above.

3 A.T.C.D.E. Papers, Note of conversation with Mr. Brown, C.C.A., by H.M. Simpson, 25.10.65.

Simpson reported that the L.E.As saw the office of clerk as mainly one of liaison with the authority. Brown had described in detail the procedures followed in the West Riding which appeared to be typical of large authorities. Since it was impossible for the chief education officer to discharge the duties of the clerk himself, it was the usual practice to appoint a senior administrative assistant to fulfil the duties, to visit the colleges and to report to the chief education officer. The administrative officer had some responsibility for taking action, but the chief education officer himself remained the titular clerk. Brown, as Alexander and Briault had asserted, maintained that by this means the full resources of the authority were immediately at the disposal of the colleges.

In her "Note", Simpson observed that similar procedures were adopted in smaller authorities. The main difference, however, was that the administrative assistant would not be of senior rank. Such assistants had not the experience or background to understand the needs and life of a college and yet were required to undertake the responsibility of dealing with college affairs and of co-operating with the principal. Whilst some of the assistants were friendly and helpful within their limits, some had caused continual irritation and frustration by their restricted views in their dealings with colleges.

Simpson went on to point out that the A.T.C.D.E. concept of the clerk was somewhat different. They envisaged two types of function. Firstly there was correspondence, secretarial work, the writing of minutes and the preparation of agenda. Secondly, there

needed to be continuous contact with the principal and, at times, with other governors. Furthermore, the clerk was required to bring to the governors' meetings full and responsible information of an expert nature. The Association felt that this essentially administrative role would best be fulfilled by the senior administrative officer who should have sufficient authority and responsibility to co-operate with the chief education officer and his staff. The chief education officer would be present at the meetings of the governing body in an advisory capacity and would therefore be in a position to understand the college and its needs.

Apparently, both Simpson and Brown confirmed their agreement that the chief education officer must be present at governors' meetings in some capacity. Brown also mentioned that the local authority clerks considered that the chief education officer could not be a member of the governing body¹ and Brown did not think that mere attendance at meetings was adequate. Simpson suggested that it might be possible for the chief education officer to be an ex-officio member of the governing body.

The sensitive nature of the issue and the importance the A.T.C.D.E. attached to the senior administrative officer being the clerk was emphasised by the response of the Association to an article which appeared in the Times on 19th October.² The article, which

1 Brown's point is confusing. The clerks had argued that a chief education officer could not be a member of a governing body if it was a sub-committee of the authority. But the Study Group at their seventh meeting had agreed on legislation to constitute governing bodies other than sub-committees of local authorities.

2 The Times, 19th October, 1965, "More Freedom for colleges?", p. 8.

accurately recorded many of the decisions being made in the Study Group on several matters at that point in time, also implied that the Study Group would declare in favour of the chief education officer acting as the clerk to the governors. The Association immediately wrote to Crosland alleging that the article was a betrayal of confidence and could not have been written without full knowledge of the discussions that were taking place in the Study Group. In particular, the A.T.C.D.E. objected to the prejudicial terms in which the issue of the clerk to the governors was discussed as if it were a foregone conclusion.¹

The article was also referred to by Miss Paston Brown at the eighth meeting of the Study Group on 27th October. She stressed that the assumptions made in the article that certain decisions had been taken in the Study Group could only be detrimental to their work. Moreover, the A.T.C.D.E. were concerned that the proceedings of the Study Group should be regarded as strictly confidential. Other members agreed that the article was to be deplored, and Noble said that the Committee of Vice-Chancellors had recorded an expression of disapproval at their meeting on 22nd October. Odger, who was acting as chairman in Weaver's absence, confirmed how much the article had been regretted in the Department and said that, even if all the Study Group's papers were not confidential, they had the right to presume the confidentiality of their proceedings.²

1 A.T.C.D.E. papers, Letter to Crosland dated 20th October, 1965.

2 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 8, 27 October 1965, Minute 1. Some members of the Study Group suggested that enquiries should be made to ascertain how this information reached the Times. Odger, however, explained that it was not the Department's practice to seek to extract from the Press the sources of their information. It was also suggested that a letter of protest should be sent to the Times, but this was rejected as undignified (see Minute 2).

No evidence is available at present of the discussions within the Study Group at the drafting stage. The final Report, however, would seem to indicate that whilst the consensus reached in the Study Group favoured the senior administrative officer being the clerk, some of the local authority representatives had been reluctant to accept this decision and had been doubtful if it would be acceptable to their Associations. Indeed, in a somewhat tentative section of the Report on "The Servicing of the Governing Body", the Study Group sets out both sides of the argument and attempts to reassure local authorities that their responsibilities for the administration of their colleges will be adequately safeguarded if the senior administrative officer acted as the clerk.

The Report emphasises that one of the main objects of the Study Group had been to suggest machinery and procedures designed to encourage a close partnership between a maintained college and the authority responsible for it.¹ With this in mind, the Study Group accepted that there were three factors, which in essence were the arguments of Briault, Alexander and Brown, in support of the chief education officer or his representative being the clerk rather than attending governing body meetings merely in an advisory capacity. Firstly, the Study Group wanted a college to feel it could co-operate in working out and giving effect to the authority's policies and take full advantage of its administrative and technical resources without loss of proper independence as an academic community. Since

1 Weaver Report, para. 117, p. 22.

an authority was a complex organisation, it was felt that its resources could best be exploited by someone who had a close familiarity with its workings.¹ Secondly, it was considered that an authority was more likely to delegate as much responsibility as possible to its college and to limit the number of its own representatives on the governing body if a direct connection was being retained through its officers. Thirdly, through acting as the clerk, the chief education officer or his representative would more readily identify himself with the college's aims and concerns and thus would be a better advocate of its interests in the authority's education committee.²

Conversely, the Report goes on to state that there were arguments, to which the Study Group also attached great importance, which were against the chief education officer and in favour of the senior administrative officer acting as the clerk.³ These were, in fact, largely based on the views of the A.T.C.D.E. Firstly, it was considered that power should not be divorced from responsibility and nothing should be done to imply a lack of confidence in the governing body's capacity to act sensibly within its delegated powers. Secondly, it was natural that governing bodies should want "their own man", owing his allegiance to them and to the college, to act as the clerk. Thirdly, if on a question that had been delegated to the governing body to decide, the interests of the college and

1 Weaver Report, para. 118, p. 23.

2 Ibid., para. 119, p. 23.

3 Ibid., para. 120, p. 23.

the authority failed to coincide, then the chief education officer might be faced with a conflict of loyalty which he would not easily resolve in the college's favour. The Study Group noted that they were aware of cases where in the past this had led to strained relations between the principal and chief education officer.¹

In a paragraph which clearly refers to the A.T.C.D.E. criticism of some of the smaller authorities delegating the work of the clerk to an inexperienced member of the L.E.A. administrative staff, the Report stresses that whoever acts as the clerk he should be efficient, well-qualified and be able to interpret sympathetically the needs of an academic community to the officers of the authority, work on friendly terms with both, and understand their ways. The Study Group considered the chances of recruiting such an officer depended on the attractions of the post and the prospects of promotion it offered.²

In the light of all these considerations, the Study Group considered that the senior administrative officer of the college should act as clerk. But to reassure local authorities, the appointment would be subject to confirmation by the authority. He would be appointed in the service of the authority to a defined post in a particular college. Adopting the procedural device suggested by Doodson and Woodham in respect of the college's finance officer, the Study Group noted that the clerk/senior administrative officer would be a member of the college and owe his allegiance to the governing body, to whom he would be administratively responsible through the principal. Nevertheless, at the same time he would be regarded as

1 Weaver Report, para. 121, p. 23.

2 Ibid., para. 122, p. 23.

having a responsibility on behalf of the governing body to the chief education officer in the sense that he would be responsible through him for performing those functions arising from his college work which had not been delegated to the governing body.¹ As a further reassurance to the local authorities, the Study Group suggested that it was likely that the person who would be appointed as senior administrative officer would have served already in an education department. Indeed, it was suggested that such experience would help to make him a more useful servant of the governing body.²

The Report emphasised that the local education authority would be able to inform itself of the governing body's exercise of its delegated powers and of the college's efficiency in administration through the authority's members on the governing body. In addition, the Report recorded the Study Group's unanimous agreement that the chief education officer should have the right to attend any meeting of the governing body, to receive its papers and to put any question and to make any submission to it. In a reversal of Alexander's suggestion on the relationship between the principal and chief education officer if the latter was clerk, the Study Group suggested that it would help the chief education officer to facilitate the business of the governing body if the principal consulted him in advance over the preparation of agenda for the governing body's meeting.³

1 The Times, 23rd March, 1966, Leader article entitled "Writing on the Wall" states of the Report, "Its resolution of the controversy surrounding the status of the clerk to the governing body (should he be the governing body's man or the chief education officer's man?) is a splendid piece of committee work - he should be a bit of both".

2 Weaver Report, para. 123, p. 24.

3 Ibid., para. 125, p. 24.

Students

The Study Group appears to have devoted little time to considering the place of students in the policy-making and organisational structure of a college. Indeed, although the A.T.C.D.E. enjoyed amicable relationships with the N.U.S. there is very little mention of students in their documents submitted to the Study Group. Since the question of student participation in college government was to become an issue in the debate following the publication of the Report, it is perhaps important to mention briefly the Study Group's approach to this question.

During the early meetings of the Study Group when questions concerning the internal administration and organisation of a college were being discussed, it was accepted without dissent that there should be consultation with students within a college. Whilst it was noted that in most universities there was a statutory body through which students had to be consulted, in view of the discussions which had taken place between the A.T.C.D.E. and N.U.S. in 1964, it was agreed that it would be preferable for the Study Group Report merely to refer to the need for some machinery whereby student opinion could be consulted.¹

This cursory approach had to be reviewed following a visit of Mr. P.W. Savage, the President of the N.U.S., to see Weaver. Savage raised three matters on which it was hoped the Study Group would express views. Firstly, there should be a regular means for students to get their views represented in the counsels of a college. One

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 4, 5 July 1965, Minute 8(vii) and (viii).

possibility suggested was through a joint committee of staff and students. Secondly, there should be freedom of association and speech. A formal understanding was needed that each college should have a Students' Union which should enjoy reasonable freedom to manage its own affairs and to spend its funds. Thirdly, there should be formal machinery to protect students from unreasonable suspension or dismissal. Savage, however, recognised that a distinction could be legitimately drawn between dismissal for misconduct and dismissal for an unsatisfactory standard of work.¹

In the light of the subsequent events and demands by the N.U.S., it is important to note that Savage stated that he would not ask the Study Group to receive a deputation, nor would the N.U.S. submit a paper. He left it for Weaver to consider how best to deal with the points he had raised. Furthermore, Savage did not ask for student membership on the governing body or on the academic board.²

There is no evidence available of the discussions within the Study Group on these points raised by Savage. It would appear that the Study Group concluded that the proposals were legitimate demands. The Weaver Report recommended that in cases of expulsion or suspension students should be granted, and know that they possess, a clearly defined right to be heard if their suspension or dismissal is in question.³ The Report also recommended that formal provision should be made for the student body, within reasonable bounds set by

1 Weaver Study Group, SGG Minutes 7, 7 October 1965, Minute 20.

2 Ibid.

3 Weaver Report, para. 30, p. 6.

the principal, to be given freedom of association and expression and substantial responsibility for the democratic conduct and management of their own affairs and funds. Finally, it was stressed that through this formal provision or other suitable channels, systematic arrangements should be made whereby the students' views on matters of proper concern to them can be made known to the college authorities and discussed with them. It was pointed out that some colleges had found it helpful to create for this purpose a small joint committee composed of members of the tutorial staff and the students' union.¹

1 Weaver Report, para. 31, p. 6.

Section C: Conclusions

Whilst the Report places the recommendations and suggestions of the Study Group within the context of the broad principles enunciated by the Secretary of State at their first meeting¹ and by the Robbins Committee in respect of academic freedom², there is little evidence of the Study Group discussing or analysing what was meant by these broad principles. Fundamentally, the discussions, implicitly if not explicitly, had been mainly about adapting and modifying the existing system of administration and controls to meet the broad demands of A.T.C.D.E. policies, and devising operational techniques, procedures and structures to facilitate these changes. Given the statutory boundaries of the existing system, the political realities of the situation and the procedures of the Study Group, the Report was inevitably a compromise document consisting of a body of practical recommendations based partly on direct A.T.C.D.E. policies, partly on existing progressive practices, partly on compromise solutions reached in general discussion or contributed by individuals, partly on university experience and partly on political expediency.

As has been seen, the A.T.C.D.E. was by no means successful in securing all their policy objectives. Furthermore, in some matters L.E.A. colleges were not to be accorded the same degree of freedom that existed in voluntary colleges. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the Study Group's recommendations and suggestions offered to most colleges a greater degree of institutional and academic

1 Weaver Report, para. 10, p. 3.

2 Ibid., para. 11, p. 3.

freedom. Indeed, for some colleges the recommendations implied dramatic changes. Moreover, and perhaps more importantly from the A.T.C.D.E.'s point of view, the Report formalised the distribution of responsibilities and functions between the providing body, the governing body, the principal and the academic board.

The Report rightly emphasised that the quality and spirit of college government depended as much as the relationships and the attitudes of those involved as the formal distribution of powers and responsibilities.¹ Furthermore, the Report throughout stressed that there should be a liberal interpretation of its recommendations. These views were re-emphasised by Crosland in his "Foreword" to the Report.² It was clear, however, from the discussions within the Study Group that not all L.E.As would readily embrace the Report's recommendations or interpret them in a liberal manner. It was apparent that particular areas of difficulty were likely to arise over finance, the senior administrative officer acting as clerk to the governors and staff representation on governing bodies. In these circumstances, the key to the successful implementation of the Report's recommendations, at least in the formal respects, rested in the Department's approval of articles of government.

The Report's recommendations, however, were not solely concerned with the redistribution of authority, responsibilities and

1 Weaver Report, Chapter VI, "The Quality and Spirit of College Government", pp. 24-27.

2 *Ibid.*, p. iii.

functions between the providing body and the colleges. In recommending that the responsibility for the internal academic work of a college should be vested in a formally constituted academic board, the Report also had far-reaching implications for the relationships between the principal and staff of a college. It was likely that not all principals would welcome this recommendation.

In spite of the limitations of the Report, the A.T.C.D.E. members of the Study Group were well aware that the L.E.A. members would have difficulties in carrying their Associations with them on some of the recommendations. Consequently, they regarded the Report, in toto, as the best compromise in the circumstances. Given the fact that the Report did offer a way of progress for the colleges and given the political situation, the A.T.C.D.E. members had, in effect, no alternative but to recommend that the A.T.C.D.E. should accept the Report.

CHAPTER 7

INITIAL ACTION ON THE WEAVER REPORT

Press Reception

The Weaver Report was officially published on 23rd March, 1966. Evans records that the Report received a "favourable" press.¹ In fact, its reception was somewhat mixed. In any case, it tended to be overshadowed by the "Comprehensive debate" and a General Election, although the Teacher perceptively noted that the essence of the Report's recommendations were absorbed in the Labour Party Manifesto three weeks before the Report's publication.²

The Report hardly received extensive coverage in the Times Educational Supplement. The "Comment" column briefly welcomed the Report and noted that the compromise suggested by the Study Group promised to be important in paving the way for the colleges to have more autonomy.³

The "Leader" in the Times, however, seemed more concerned with the implications of the Report for the universities. The "Leader" appreciated the skilful committee work of the Study Group and described the Report as a "document full of judicious balances struck somewhere between the doctrine of academic autonomy and the truism that he who pays the piper calls the tune". Whilst

1 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 9.

2 The Teacher, 25th March, 1966, "College pudding", p. 12.

3 Times Educational Supplement, No. 2653, 25th March, 1966, Comment, p. 877.

acknowledging that the Report gave "slightly" more autonomy to the colleges, the "Leader" believed that it would be read with despondency in those institutions which had a history of genuine autonomy. The "Leader" regarded the fundamental proposition of the Report, that those institutions which had a part to play in the national system and were maintained out of public funds had to be subject to social control, had applications to the post-Robbins concept of a university. It warned "universities can read in this report the writing on the wall."¹

The Teacher commended the Report for saying all the right things about the need to liberalise college government and to increase their academic responsibility. It was scathing, however, that there should need to be a Report at all. "Indeed, the wonder is (or would be to anyone coming on this report with no knowledge of the training colleges) how the colleges can have survived as viable educational institutions this far into the twentieth century under the regime so many of them have had to endure." The Teacher was also decidedly lukewarm about three of the Study Group's proposals. Firstly, it noted that the heavy emphasis on the L.E.A. component on governing bodies in contrast to the university representation was hardly going to commend itself to the "acolytes of Robbins". Secondly, it considered that the Report had too little to say on students, especially in view of the absence of mature attitudes towards students in too many colleges in the past. Thirdly, it was critical of the absence of teacher representation

1 The Times, 23rd March, 1966, Leader, "Writing on the Wall".

on academic boards. It was argued that to have teachers represented on academic boards would strengthen their relationships with schools, and it was felt that an analogy could be drawn with the boards of medical schools. The Teacher concluded, "No one can doubt that the colleges of education will be better places if the Study Group's proposals are applied; but not necessarily that much better."¹

The leading article in Education gave the Report full support.² Fully aware that the Report was not likely to be well received by some L.E.As, the leading article carefully presented the Study Group's proposals, particularly the more controversial ones, in a judicious and persuasive manner. Anxious that the ~~recommendations~~ ^{recreminations} of the past should now be forgotten, it was argued that one of the things to emerge from the Study Group was that, until brought face to face with the facts, it was easy for both sides to take refuge in airy generalisations and insubstantial appeals to impeccable principles. "The time has passed (and the study group has helped to make it pass) when this matter could be discussed in terms of bogey men - power hungry administrators in conflict with status-seeking academics; or in slogans about the defence of academic freedom against administrative expediency". In the view of the leading article, there now had to be a reconciliation of diverse, but not necessarily conflicting, interests. The L.E.As and the colleges and other interest groups involved had to "join in working

1 The Teacher, 25th March, 1966, "College Pudding", p. 12.

2 Education, Vol. 127, No. 3296, 25th March, 1966, "Change of Government", pp. 609 and 610.

out a new synthesis of power, influence, administration and policy; a new expression of academic freedom within the context of social control". It was rightly emphasised that this, in fact, had already been happening in some colleges for many years and would not strike every L.E.A. or college principal as revolutionary. But in some places it demanded big changes involving a rethinking of relationships between Education Committees and governing bodies, chief education officers and college principals, and not least between college principals and members of their staff.

Similarly to the Times, the leading article also saw the Report as having wider implications than merely for the colleges of education, but in the context of the role of L.E.As in the Binary system of higher education. It regarded the need to achieve a satisfactory compromise between academic freedom and internal self-government, on the one hand, and the social control which democratically elected representative bodies were required to exercise, on the other, as being "one of the key topics of our day". Thus, it was felt that, in a very large measure, the future of L.E.As in higher education depended on their willingness to accept the Report and the success of its implementation.¹

Alexander also hoped that the Report would be given full support and would be carried into effect as soon as possible. Moreover, he attempted to allay the fears of the L.E.As on the more controversial issues such as staff representation on governing bodies and the senior administrative officer acting as the clerk to

1 Education, Vol. 127, No. 3296, 25th March, 1966, "Change of Government", pp. 609-610.

the governors. He hoped that the Report would be regarded as a very good compromise which afforded the colleges the fullest academic freedom while securing for the local education authorities the essential elements of control which were necessary in a democratically controlled organisation.¹ It is likely that Alexander's commitment to the Report reflected his concern for the government of other institutions of higher education which would be provided by L.E.As as well as for the colleges of education.

The A.T.C.D.E. and the Weaver Report

The Weaver Report was discussed at the A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Meeting on 10th June, 1966. Whilst it was recognised that there were aspects of the Report with which the members of the Association were not in agreement², the Executive Committee felt that it was of the utmost importance that other interest groups, particularly some of the Local Authority Associations, should not be given an opportunity to re-open the debate on the many recommendations of the Report which represented a great gain for the colleges. It was agreed that the Association must insist that the Report was the minimum that would be acceptable and that it was not open to further negotiations. The A.U.T. was reported

1 Education, Vol. 127, No. 3297, 1st April, 1966, "Week by Week", pp. 691-2.

2 See, for example, A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel Minutes, 20 May 1966, Minute 106. Disappointment was expressed at the small number of staff representatives recommended to serve on the governing body. Some colleges also felt very strongly that the whole staff should form the academic board.

as sharing this point of view and would press for the adoption of the Report as it stood for the same reason.¹ The Executive Committee resolved:-

"That the Secretary of State be informed that the Association fully accepts the recommendations of the Study Group Report and hopes that the necessary legislation to implement them will be introduced at the earliest possible date. The Secretary of State should be informed that it is the opinion of the Association that in view of the Government's decision in 1964, 'that for the present the colleges should continue to be administered by the existing maintaining bodies under the present system of overall supervision', the Study Group Report represents the best compromise solution in the existing situation. It should be made clear that the Association could not accept anything less than the provisions of the Report."²

Perhaps the main source of internal embarrassment for the Association arose from the Study Group's recommendations on the composition of academic boards. As has been observed already, during the course of the Study Group's discussions the Association had set up its own Working Party to consider the composition and functions of academic boards with a view to offering guidance to colleges in the process of establishing boards.³ The Working Party's Memorandum was not available for circulation until the end of January, 1966.⁴ The Memorandum was very similar in many

1 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 10 June 1966, Minute 418.

2 Ibid., Minute 421.

3 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 29 October 1965, Document H - Report of the Education Policy Committee.

4 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 4 March 1966, Document F - Report of the Working Party on Academic Boards, dated 28 January 1966.

respects to the paper which had been submitted to the Study Group by the A.T.C.D.E. representatives. The most important difference, however, appeared in section I,3 of the Memorandum. Although it was suggested here that it was inappropriate that all members of staff should form the academic board, it was also suggested that "each college should be free to develop the particular type of structure which would suit its needs."¹ By this time, however, the Study Group had decided on modifications to the A.T.C.D.E. representatives' proposals of which the Working Party was unaware. Consequently, several suggestions in the Memorandum were at variance with the recommendations which would emerge in the Study Group Report. Thus, the A.T.C.D.E. had been faced with the dilemma of whether or not to circulate the Memorandum.

When the Association's Education Policy Committee, which had been monitoring the developments, had considered the Memorandum on 3rd March, 1966, it had been reported that the Weaver Report would probably be published on 21st March. In an attempt to avoid a possible controversial situation, the Education Policy Committee had seized on this information as a reason why the Memorandum should not be circulated. It had been argued that it would be unwise to circulate a statement by the Association which did not take full account of the Study Group's recommendations immediately before the publication of the Report.²

1 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 4 March 1966, Document F - Report of the Working Party on Academic Boards, dated 28 January 1966.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Education Policy Committee Minutes, 3 March 1966, Minute 116.

This decision, whilst providing a temporary respite for the Education Policy Committee, hardly solved the dilemma. When the Education Policy Committee returned to the problem on 26th May, the Committee were clearly concerned that the provisions of the Weaver Report on the composition of academic boards might meet with considerable opposition in some colleges. Moreover, they felt that the Memorandum could aggravate this situation. Whilst it was accepted that the matter would eventually have to be fully debated in the colleges and by the Association, it was decided once again that it would be prudent to delay the circulation of the Memorandum until the issue had been further discussed.¹

In accepting the recommendations of the Weaver Report in toto, the problem of what to do about the Memorandum passed to the Executive Committee. After some debate within the Executive Committee, the majority opinion was that it would be unwise to issue the Memorandum as it stood containing proposals that were, to some extent, contrary to the provisions of the Weaver Report. This was considered particularly important in view of the strong preference that already existed in a number of colleges for the whole staff to form the academic board. Given the political situation, it was evident that there was a strong feeling among some of the Executive Committee members that the Association should present a united front in accepting the Report. The Executive Committee decided that the members of the Association should be made aware of the reasons for the Study Group's insistence that the powers and responsibilities, particularly in financial matters, which academic boards would be

1 A.T.C.D.E. Education Policy Committee Minutes, 26 May 1966, Minute 10.

expected to undertake, were only appropriate for a smaller formally constituted body.¹ It was agreed that the Education Policy Committee should meet with the Working Party on Academic Boards to consider appropriate amendments to the Memorandum.²

Subsequently on 14th July, the Education Policy Committee met with the Working Party on Academic Boards to amend the Memorandum. In the revised Memorandum stress was laid on adopting the recommendations for the composition of boards on the basis of the Weaver model and the fact that the board's responsibilities could not be carried by a full staff.³

Recommendations for Action

The Weaver Report had concluded with seven specific recommendations for action:

- "1. all local education authorities maintaining colleges of education, and the voluntary bodies and the Department of Education and Science in relation to voluntary colleges, should review their methods of control and general relationship with the colleges in the light of this report;
2. local education authorities and voluntary bodies should take such steps as may be necessary to reconstitute the governing bodies of their colleges in the light of the recommendations of this report and should inform the Secretary of State accordingly;
3. the governing bodies of all colleges of education should review the present arrangements for the organisation and management of their colleges, in the light of this report, with particular reference

1 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 10 June 1966, Minute 420.

2 Ibid., Minute 423.

3 A.T.C.D.E. Education Policy Committee Minutes, 14 July 1966, Minutes 19 and 20.

to the need to establish properly constituted academic boards;

4. the Secretary of State should be invited to introduce legislation to provide for the making by local education authorities of instruments of government for the constitution of the governing bodies of maintained colleges of education, and to provide that these colleges should be conducted in accordance with articles of government made by an order of the local education authority and approved by him;
5. the Secretary of State should be invited to amend Regulation 7(2) of The Training of Teachers (Local Education Authorities) Regulations, 1959, in its application to voluntary colleges, so as to make rules of government subject to his approval;
6. the rules (or articles) of government for voluntary and maintained colleges should be based on the recommendations of this report;
7. the Secretary of State should establish a small committee to draw up, and keep under review, a body of guidance on the number and grading of posts for non-academic staff in maintained colleges of education of differing sizes.¹

The seventh recommendation had, in fact, been an interim recommendation made at the seventh meeting of the Study Group and action had already been taken on this recommendation before the publication of the Report. In January, 1966, the D.E.S. had written to the appropriate bodies seeking their views on the setting up and composition of the "small committee". The letter had stated that the Study Group hoped that the committee's conclusions would, if acceptable to the Local Authority Associations, be commended by them to local education authorities. Whilst it was desirable that the committee should be regarded by the authorities as speaking authoritatively on its subject, it was suggested that

1 Weaver Report, p. 26.

the committee should be small in size. It was further suggested that it might comprise of one representative each from the C.C.A., the A.E.C., the A.M.C., the I.L.E.A., and the W.J.E.C. and three representatives nominated by the A.T.C.D.E. In addition, two bursars of L.E.A. colleges and possibly other experts should be invited by the committee to join its deliberations at an appropriate stage. The Department offered to provide a chairman and secretariat if the associations thought that this was appropriate.¹

It is not surprising that the associations, particularly the Local Authority Associations, should readily accept the proposal. As has been already observed, it was the Local Authority Associations which had successfully requested that the Study Group should examine non-academic staffing structures in L.E.A. colleges. Indeed, for some time there had been a growing concern among the Local Authority Associations at the disparity in non-academic staffing between colleges and in September, 1964, they had reached an agreement to press for the establishment of a working party, representative of their Associations and the D.E.S., to formulate advice which might be given to the L.E.As concerned on the numbers and gradings of administrative staff at colleges of education maintained by them.²

Although it would appear that there had been some disagreement on the part of some of the associations on their representation, the Committee on Non-Teaching Staff in Maintained Colleges of Education met for the first time in July, 1966.³ The membership of the

1 A.E.C. Executive Committee Minutes, 28 January 1966, Minute 5, Report of the General Purposes Committee, section (9), letter from P.R. Odgers dated 3rd January, 1966.

2 Ibid., Minute 5.

3 D.E.S., First Report of the Committee on Non-Teaching Staff in Maintained Colleges of Education, Section One, para. 3.

Committee consisted of Mr. P.R. Odgers, Chairman (D.E.S.); Sir William Alexander (A.E.C.); Mr. K.A. Baird (A.T.C.D.E.); Dr. E.W.H. Briault (I.L.E.A.); Mr. A.R. Davis (C.C.A.); Mr. L.J. Drew (W.J.E.C.); Mr. A.A. Evans (A.T.C.D.E.); Mr. P. Lord (C.C.A.); Mr. J.P. Parry (A.T.C.D.E.); Mr. E.G. Peirson (A.T.C.D.E.); Sir Lionel Russell (A.M.C.); with Mr. T.A.J. Warlow and Mr. C. Wigful as Assessors for the D.E.S. and Mr. S.B. Hallett (D.E.S.) as Secretary.¹ It will be noted that the Local Authority Associations had a majority on the Committee. Furthermore, seven of the members of the Committee, viz. Alexander, Briault, Drew, Lord, Parry, Peirson and Russell, had been members of the Study Group; the Chairman, Odgers, had been D.E.S. Assessor to the Study Group; and Hallett had been the Assistant Secretary of the Study Group.

In respect of the fourth and fifth recommendations of the Study Group, the Secretary of State set out to ascertain the views of the interested parties before taking action.²

A.T.C.D.E. Pressure for Action

By the Autumn of 1966, there were few signs of the Secretary of State taking early action on the Report and the A.T.C.D.E. became increasingly restive. It was well known within the Association that the A.M.C. and C.C.A. had serious reservations on the Report, particularly on the composition of governing bodies, the

1 D.E.S., First Report of the Committee on Non-Teaching Staff in Maintained Colleges of Education, Section One, para. 2.

2 Weaver Report, Foreword, p. (iii).

clerkship to the governors, methods of appointment of staff and the financial arrangements.¹

At the Association's Executive Committee meeting on 28th/29th October, 1966, the Chairman confirmed that the A.T.C.D.E.'s policy was to press for the implementation of all the recommendations of the Weaver Report and for the introduction of the necessary legislation as soon as possible. In response to reports that various bodies, including some individual L.E.As, were reluctant to accept the Weaver proposals, fears were expressed that unless the Secretary of State made an announcement on Government action to be taken on the Report in the near future, resistance would increase and harden.²

To further A.T.C.D.E. policy, an Action Committee was established³ which quickly mounted a Parliamentary campaign. Contacts were made with the Parliamentary Education Committees of both parties and with members of the Government and Opposition. College correspondents were encouraged to write to their constituency MPs and arrangements were made for questions to be asked in Parliament.⁴

In the Commons on 10th November, 1966, Boyle invited the Secretary of State to make an announcement on when he intended to implement the Weaver Report.⁵ Crosland replied circumspectly:

1 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 9.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 28/29 October 1966, Minute 46.

3 Ibid., Minute 49.

4 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 9.

5 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 735, 1966-67, Oct. 31 to Nov. 11, 10th November, 1966, col. 1516.

"I confirm once again my warm support for the recommendations of the Study Group, and I can now tell the House that the organisations concerned have endorsed its general conclusions, with some reservations on points of detail. I am now considering both the terms of a circular which I shall issue for guidance and also the question of possible legislation. Meanwhile, I hope that pending the issue of a circular all authorities concerned will consider most carefully (as many of them are already doing) how best to give effect to the Report."¹

Boyle went on pointedly to ask if the A.M.C. and C.C.A. had sent back favourable replies. He also added that the Government would have the co-operation of the Conservative members of the House in carrying through appropriate legislation. Crosland, however, responded guardedly that the Local Authority Associations had welcomed the general spirit and purpose of the Report whilst making recommendations on points of detail.²

Meanwhile, stirrings within the National Union of Students began to promise to complicate the issue. At the N.U.S. Conference on Colleges of Education in October , a motion was passed regretting that there had been no student representation on the Weaver Study Group. It was also stressed that there should be student representation on the governing bodies of colleges, and that a student should have the right of a fair hearing, impartial judgement and a right of appeal in disciplinary matters.³ Whilst

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 735, 1966-67, Oct. 31 to Nov. 11, 10th November, 1966, col. 1516.

2 Ibid., cols. 1516-17.

3 Education, Vol. 128, No. 3324, 7th October, 1966, p. 564.

it is true that the N.U.S. had not been offered representation on the Study Group, the N.U.S. had, in fact, been given the opportunity to present its views to the Study Group and the Union had not asked, at that point, for student representation on governing bodies. The N.U.S. motion, however, was indicative of the growing militancy among students for participation in the government of institutions and student unrest in the universities.¹

By the beginning of 1967, it was becoming increasingly clear that in some L.E.As the main areas of controversy would be over the clerk to the governors and the nature of academic representation on governing bodies. For example, the governors of the City of Leeds College accepted that academic staff representatives should be present at all meetings of the governing body with the right to speak on any occasion but without voting powers. It was argued that this in fact would give staff the substance rather than the shadow of participation for their representatives' position as expert advisers would place them in a stronger position than if they were ordinary members of the governing body. The governors also insisted that the chief education officer should be the clerk to the governors, it being claimed that the Weaver Report itself had not committed itself strongly on this issue.²

Such contraventions of the spirit of the Weaver Report served to strengthen the A.T.C.D.E. view that Government action was

1 The Colleges of Education were not affected by the student unrest in the same way as some universities.

2 Education, Vol. 129, No. 3339, 20th January, 1967, Letter from the Chairman of the Leeds Education Committee, p. 128.

urgently needed. In frustration, the A.T.C.D.E. Council passed a resolution which was conveyed to the Secretary of State in January, 1967. The resolution noted "with grave concern the delay in the implementation of the Report", and pressed the Secretary of State "for immediate and full implementation of the Report and the introduction of any legislation which may be necessary."¹ The Association, however, took encouragement from a speech which Crosland was to have made at the University of Lancaster on 20th January, 1967, but since he was prevented from doing so, the speech was later published. In the speech Crosland re-affirmed his determination to see the Report's recommendations carried out.²

D.E.S. Circular 2/67 and Partial Progress

After consultations with the Local Authority Associations, the long awaited Department Circular (2/67) on college government was issued on 7th February, 1967. The Circular stated that the Secretary of State had now received the views of the representative bodies concerned who had welcomed the general spirit and purpose of the Report and generally endorsed its conclusions.³

The Circular announced that the Secretary of State intended "as soon as possible to arrange for a Bill to be introduced to provide for the making by local education authorities of instruments

1 Reported in A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 9. Also see A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 6 January 1967, Minute 128.

2 Ibid., p. 9.

3 D.E.S. Circular 2/67, The Government of Colleges of Education, 7th February, 1967, para. 3.

of government for the constitution of governing bodies of maintained colleges of education and to provide that the colleges should be conducted in accordance with articles of government made by an order of the local education authority and approved by him."¹ The Teacher Training Regulations were also to be amended so as to make articles of government for voluntary colleges also subject to the Secretary of State's approval.² Furthermore, the D.E.S. was reviewing its methods of control and general relationships with the voluntary colleges in accordance with the first recommendation of the Report, and L.E.As and Voluntary Bodies were asked to do the same in relation to the colleges they sponsored.³

On the assumption that the legislation and amendment of the Regulations would not be delayed⁴, L.E.As and Voluntary Bodies were asked to reconstitute their governing bodies in the light of the Report's recommendations. The instrument of government, or in the case of voluntary colleges the trust deed or scheme, was to specify the arrangements to be made for the participation of the principal and representatives of the academic staff in the government of the college. In addition, the providing bodies were asked to draw up rules or articles of government which would give effect to the general tenor and liberal attitudes which the Secretary of State had commended in the Report. The Circular advised that the Secretary

1 D.E.S. Circular 2/67, The Government of Colleges of Education, 7th February, 1967, para. 4.

2 Ibid., para. 5.

3 Ibid., para. 6.

4 Ibid., para. 7.

of State would wish "to satisfy himself that the articles reflect a genuine desire to give the colleges substantial responsibility for their academic task and increased freedom in the performance of it."¹

Local authorities were requested to let the Secretary of State have a report of the action that they had taken to reconstitute the governing bodies of their colleges together with draft articles of government for them before the end of June.² In the case of many voluntary colleges, it was suggested that it would be more convenient to give effect to both the reconstitution of the governing body and the articles of government in a single scheme made under the Charities Act. The Secretary of State wished to be in a position to publish schemes for voluntary colleges by the end of June. Therefore he had circulated to the Voluntary Bodies a draft model scheme for their consideration.³

The Secretary of State accepted that there would be some variations in the articles of government made by L.E.As to accord with local circumstances and traditions. Even so, L.E.As were asked to draft them on a common pattern set out in an annex to the Circular which very pointedly drew the attention of local authorities to specific sections of the Report.⁴

1 D.E.S. Circular 2/67, The Government of Colleges of Education, 7th February, 1967, para. 8.

2 Ibid., para. 9.

3 Ibid., para. 10.

4 Ibid., para. 11. See APPENDIX TEN.

It was recognised that it would be impossible to make final arrangements for the organisation and management of colleges until the necessary changes had been made in the constitution and articles of their governing bodies. The Secretary of State hoped, however, that existing governing bodies would review their present practices in the light of the Report and in particular initiate discussions with the principal and representatives of the staff with a view to establishing properly constituted academic boards where they did not exist.¹

In effect, the Circular gave public notice of the Secretary of State's intention to press on with the reform of college government on Weaver lines. It would seem that Crosland was determined to exercise close supervision over the developments in the voluntary sector where he had more direct control and influence. His approach to the L.E.A. sector, however, appeared to be more cautious. Clearly, at this stage, Crosland could not compel L.E.As to reconstitute the government of their colleges on Weaver lines, or even to submit information. But by openly accepting that there would be some variation in the articles of government made by L.E.As, it seemed to the A.T.C.D.E. that the D.E.S. was leaving open a way of retreat, at least on some of the Report's recommendations. There was no question over the Secretary of State's intention or desire to move towards a liberal pattern of government based on the Weaver Report. The point at issue was whether he had the will and determination to secure the implementation of all of the Report's recommendations in the face of opposition from the A.M.C., the C.C.A.

1 D.E.S. Circular 2/67, The Government of Colleges of Education, 7th February, 1967, para. 12.

and some L.E.As. Though welcoming the Circular, the A.T.C.D.E. expressed concern on this point. In particular, the A.T.C.D.E. were concerned that the Circular did not specifically state that the senior administrative officer should be the clerk to the governors and that the principal and representatives of staff should have full rights of membership on governing bodies.¹

The Circular was given a favourable reception in the "Leader" of Education.² It was argued that L.E.As ought to welcome the Circular and the Secretary of State's declared intention to reform college government. In a critical attack on some of the providing bodies, it was pointed out that it was well known that there was a "black dossier" of horror stories which had been culled from more than a handful of colleges and that there was no denying that some L.E.As and Voluntary Bodies had kept too rigid control over their colleges. "There seems to be no point in mincing words on this matter as a number of colleges were administered in a way which was quite out of keeping with their role as institutions of higher education".

The "Leader" felt that the Circular held out prospects for fruitful developments within the colleges and the kind of institutional evolution which offered hope of a vigorous and independent life to the polytechnics as well. But the "Leader" also had some critical points to make about principals. It was stated that college principals had often exercised a great deal

1 See below.

2 Education, Vol. 129, No. 3342, 10th February, 1967, "New Deal for Colleges", pp. 277 and 278.

of authority which had rightly belonged to L.E.As, yet it was the L.E.A. which had provided the "whipping boy" for academic discontent often "expressed most eloquently by the principals". Principals were reminded that in the new situation there would have to be a new measure of academic democracy which would limit their authority and require academic leadership to be shared more widely.

Support was also given to the position of students. It was contended that the exercise would have failed if some of the new freedom did not extend to students who, in spite of their bad press, had a legitimate claim to more say in the affairs that affected them, particularly in matters of discipline. The "Leader" stressed that a more liberal appreciation of what were the appropriate conditions of student life in institutions of higher education was needed in the colleges.

In a letter to Education, the A.T.C.D.E. General Secretary welcomed the support of the leading article and confirmed that there was indeed a "black dossier" of illiberal treatment of colleges. In a more conciliatory tone, which was aimed at retaining the support of sympathetic L.E.As, the letter also noted that many L.E.As had governed their colleges wisely and liberally. The General Secretary re-affirmed that it was A.T.C.D.E. policy to secure the full implementation of the Weaver Report, but refrained from commenting on the article's points on principals and students.¹

¹ Education, Vol. 129, No. 3344, 24th February, 1967, Letters to the Editor, 'New Deal', p. 383.

The A.T.C.D.E. Action Committee considered Circular 2/67 on 27th February. Anxious to maintain a united front amongst principals in securing the full implementation of the Weaver Report, it was recommended that a letter should be sent to principals asking for information on the dates of governors' or other meetings when the Weaver Report would be considered; any indication as to whether the L.E.A.'s proposals for reform would be in line with the Weaver Report; and any consultation there had been with the institute of education.¹ The Executive Committee shared this concern endorsing the recommendations of the Action Committee and resolving that a letter should be sent to principals as soon as possible stressing the urgency of ensuring the full implementation of the Report. It was also resolved that the Association's solicitor should be asked to prepare a model scheme of government for L.E.A. colleges for the guidance of members.²

Events began to move forward rapidly in the voluntary sector. Following consultations with the Voluntary Bodies, the D.E.S. circulated a Model Scheme of Government for Voluntary Colleges of Education³ with College Letter No. 7/67 dated 21st March, 1967. The model, in fact, closely followed that which had been used for schemes made by the Department, and previously the Ministry, for the

1 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 3 March 1967, Minute 216.

2 A.T.C.D.E. News Sheet, No. 56, April 1967, p. 3. See Report of Executive Committee held on 3 March 1967, Section II, Action Committee.

3 For the Model Scheme see APPENDIX ELEVEN.

previous eight years. The only amendments of substance were those giving effect to the recommendations of the Weaver Report in respect to the composition of governing bodies and the framing of articles of government.¹ In the accompanying College Letter, governing bodies were asked to consider the instrument of their own college in the light of the model. Where a scheme would be required, the Secretary of State hoped to be in a position to publish proposals for the scheme by the end of June and to make any necessary revisions by 31st July.² It was stressed that the model was intended as a general guide to all voluntary colleges and that there might be circumstances affecting individual colleges which would justify variations in particular clauses. Where this was the case, colleges were asked to supply a brief statement setting out the reasons for the proposed variations.³ In spite of this degree of latitude, some voluntary colleges regarded the model scheme as a threat to their independence⁴ and their case was taken up by Mr. William van Straubenzee^e with the D.E.S.

In view of the difficulties being experienced in the L.E.A. sector, two clauses in the model scheme were of particular importance to A.T.C.D.E. policies. Firstly, under clause 4(i)(d), the principal and representatives of the staff of the colleges were

1 See Model Scheme, Commentary, para. 1, APPENDIX ELEVEN.

2 D.E.S. College Letter No. 7/67, 21st March, 1967, para. 3.

3 Ibid., para. 4.

4 A.T.C.D.E. News Sheet, No. 57, September, 1967, p. 21. See Report of Executive Conference, 6-10 April 1967, Section B.

to have full membership on the governing body. Secondly, under clause 39, the senior administrative officer of the college was to act as the clerk to the governors.

Even more encouraging was the issue of Administrative Memorandum No. 8/67, "Polytechnics", by the D.E.S. on 5th April, 1967. This announced the technical colleges and colleges of technology which had been chosen for potential development into polytechnics and invited schemes for their establishment from the appropriate authorities. Before finally sanctioning the approval of an institution as a polytechnic, the Secretary of State indicated that he would be required to be satisfied that its mode of government and academic organisation was appropriate for an institution of higher education.

In Appendix A of the Memorandum, the Secretary of State set out "Notes for Guidance" on the form of government and academic organisation to ensure the degree of autonomy he regarded as necessary. The recommendations corresponded very closely with the recommendations of the Weaver Report with the necessary modifications to take into account the nature of the academic work and structure of polytechnics. For example, governing bodies were to consist of: representatives of the maintaining L.E.A. and the L.E.As of the catchment area; strong representation from industry, commerce and the professions from fields relevant to the work of the polytechnic; the Director, at least five nominees of the academic board and at least one other member of the teaching staff; representatives of universities; teachers from schools and further education institutions in the region; and co-opted members. The governing

body was to appoint the polytechnic's own chief administrative officer who was to act as the clerk to the governors. The chief education officer of the maintaining authority was to be empowered to attend and speak at all governing body meetings but was not to be a member. The academic board was to consist of the Director, all heads of departments, other senior officers as appropriate and other members of the teaching staff to secure adequate coverage of the different fields of work. The board would also have the power to co-opt members from universities and further education colleges.¹

Thus it appeared to the A.T.C.D.E. that polytechnics were to be assured of a "Weaver" form of government from their inception² while the issue still seemed to be in balance for the colleges of education. Evans rightly argues that the essential difference between the two situations was that colleges of education were already in existence under the authority of L.E.As, but L.E.As could not have polytechnics unless they agreed to a Weaver form of government.³ Even so, it must be noted that the "Notes for Guidance" were not readily accepted by some L.E.As invited to establish polytechnics, and the delay in the approval of schemes and the

1 For interesting commentaries on the "Notes for Guidance", see, e.g. T. Burgess and J. Pratt, "Polytechnics", article 45 in R. Bell, G. Fowler and K. Little, Education in Great Britain and Ireland (London and Boston, RKP in association with the Open University Press, 1973); and M. Locke, "Government of Polytechnics", in L. Dobson, T. Gear and A. Westoby, Management in Education (Ward Lock Educational in association with the Open University Press, 1975).

2 For a more critical approach to "Notes for Guidance" see M. Locke, op. cit.

3 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 10.

designation of polytechnic status on some institutions was attributable partly to the need to persuade some L.E.As to agree.¹

In spite of these encouraging signs, the General Secretary of the A.T.C.D.E. foresaw a struggle ahead to secure the full implementation of the Weaver Report, both in spirit and in fact, for all colleges of education. In a letter to all members of the Association, he warned:-

"The battle is not yet won. The opposition of many Chief Education Officers and Clerks is too open a secret to be regarded as a secret at all. And although the Weaver Report was signed by all the representatives of the administrative organisations on the Working Party, it is known that advice has been given to their members by two of these organisations which pushes the permissiveness of Circular 2/67 to a rejection of the Weaver Report both in spirit and letter, on key issues such as the position of the Senior Administrative Officer, the appointment of staff and membership of the Governing Body by representatives of the Academic Board. Should they gain their point by the kind of pressure which they are skilled in using, we could have a virtual rejection of the Weaver Report and the anomaly of a Students' Union, enjoying far more self-government in the College than the Academic Staff."²

From enquiries to colleges during the ensuing months, the A.T.C.D.E. was able to build up a patchwork picture of the developments that had taken place in the L.E.A. sector in response to Circular 2/67. Although the draft proposals of some authorities conformed to the Weaver recommendations, others did not. Some of the proposals made inadequate provision for staff representation on the governing bodies either in numbers or in voting power and

1 For a detailed account of the problems, see M. Locke, op. cit.

2 Letter dated 21st April, 1967, "Government of Colleges of Education", from the A.T.C.D.E. General Secretary to A.T.C.D.E. members.

proposed to retain the chief education officer as clerk to the governors. One authority decided to increase the spending power of the principal from £3 to £5, whilst another decided that the financial administration of the college should continue to be the full responsibility of the City Treasurer's Department. In some cases principals and staffs were not being consulted about the drafting of proposed instruments and articles, or even the constitution of academic boards. Some L.E.As were not proposing even to draft instruments and articles until after legislation had been passed.¹

Meanwhile the A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee, on the advice of the Action Committee, had decided to abandon the attempt to draw up a model instrument of government for L.E.A. colleges. It was felt that to issue a model scheme might only create further controversy in an already difficult situation and it was recognised that there would be considerable problems in drafting a precise scheme to cover the variety of financial administrative arrangements in local authorities.²

On the positive side, as far as the A.T.C.D.E. were concerned, the Committee on Non-Teaching Staff in Maintained Colleges of Education had completed their First Report³ by the end of March and

1 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 11. Also see A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel Minutes, 17 February 1967, Minute 69, and 2 June 1967, Minute 95; and, A.T.C.D.E. News Sheet, No. 57, September 1967, p. 7, Report of Principals' Panel Meeting, 19 May 1967, and p. 9, Report of Lecturers' Panel Meeting, 2 June 1967.

2 A.T.C.D.E. News Sheet, No. 57, September 1967, Report of Executive Meeting, 9 June 1967, section III Action Committee on the Government of Colleges, p. 5.

3 D.E.S., First Report of the Committee on Non-Teaching Staff in Maintained Colleges of Education, July 1967.

the Association pressed the D.E.S. to publish it as a matter of extreme urgency.¹ The First Report, which was based on the principles of the Weaver Report, set out a model structure for the administrative, clerical and secretarial staff of maintained colleges on the assumption that colleges would be responsible for administrative and financial functions which had formerly been undertaken on their behalf by the L.E.As. Of particular significance to the political debate was the section on the importance and role of the senior administrative officer² and the appendix on his duties.³ The Report saw the senior administrative officer's post as having three responsibilities: the general running of the non-academic side of the college; finance; and the clerkship of the governing body. Such duties, however, were to be interpreted in the light of the responsibilities of the principal as described in the Weaver Report.⁴ The Report also emphasised the need to attract a competent, able and well qualified person to the post which carried a wider range of duties and greater responsibility than had formerly obtained⁵, and a commensurately higher salary grading was recommended.⁶ It was

1 A.T.C.D.E. News Sheet, No. 57, September 1967, p. 5.

2 First Report of the Committee on Non-Teaching Staff in Maintained Colleges of Education, Section III, The Senior Administrative Officer.

3 Ibid., Appendix A. Also see APPENDIX THIRTEEN for a copy of this appendix.

4 Ibid., para. 13.

5 Ibid., paras. 15 and 17.

6 Ibid., para. 15.

acknowledged, however, that there would be variations in the extent of delegation to colleges by L.E.As in such matters as arranging contracts for supplies and building work.¹

The Revised Teacher Training Regulations and growing areas of
A.T.C.D.E. concern

At the beginning of June 1967, the revised Training of Teachers Regulations² together with Circular 4/67³ were issued. The Regulations combined in one instrument the provisions of the Training of Teachers (Local Education Authorities) Regulations 1959 and the Training of Teachers (Grant) Regulations 1959 as subsequently amended. Regulation 12 stated:

"Every college shall be conducted in accordance with articles of government made with the approval of the Secretary of State, which shall in particular determine the functions to be exercised in relation to the college by the body providing the college, the governing body, the academic board and the principal."

As an interim measure pending the making and approval of revised articles of government and the enactment of legislation, the Secretary of State approved the continued use of existing articles of government of the colleges.⁴

-
- 1 First Report of the Committee on Non-Teaching Staff in Maintained Colleges of Education, Appendix A.
 - 2 Training of Teachers Regulations, 1967, S.I. 1967 No. 792, June 6, 1967.
 - 3 D.E.S. Circular 4/67, The Training of Teachers Regulations 1967, June 5, 1967.
 - 4 Ibid., para. 4.

During the debate on the Regulations in the Commons on 10th July, 1967, Boyle took up the main concerns of the A.T.C.D.E.¹ He emphasised that since the Government's non-acceptance of the Robbins' proposals had caused considerable disappointment in the colleges, it was all the more important that the legitimate aspirations and concerns of the colleges regarding their internal self-government must be met. He stated that there was deep concern in the colleges about a number of matters relating to the Weaver Report and a certain amount of low morale which had to be taken into consideration. In particular, he felt that it was essential that the Secretary of State should express a clear view on two matters.

Firstly, there was real concern that some local authorities would not accept the proposal that the senior administrative officer of a college should be the clerk to the governors rather than the chief education officer. Secondly, although most authorities were reluctantly accepting the principle of staff representation on governing bodies, in some cases there were suggestions that the staff representatives should not have full rights of membership. Boyle felt that it was very important that the Government should clarify their position on these issues especially since the Secretary of State had laid down that the clerk to the governors in polytechnics must be the chief administrative officer and some very definite conditions on academic

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 750, 1966-67, July 10 to July 21, 10th July, 1967, cols. 10, 11 and 12.

representation on governing bodies of polytechnics. He asserted that it would be "quite intolerable"¹ if in these respects colleges of education "were given less favourable treatment than polytechnics"² and local authorities were allowed to "drag their feet"³ where colleges of education were concerned.

Boyle was also concerned about two other matters: one concerning financial discretion and the other student unions. On the former, he maintained that one of the best features of local administration in recent years had been the greater financial discretion given by some L.E.As to their headteachers. He hoped the situation would not be reached in which financial discretion of a reasonable kind was given to headteachers but denied to college principals "because that obviously would be absurd"⁴. On the other matter, which was not a direct concern of the A.T.C.D.E. at that point in time, he argued that "we have to live with the fact today that the student body is a state of the Realm within higher education"⁵. Consequently, the position of the students' unions had to be taken into account.

In a reply which confirmed that there was some equivocation over these matters in the D.E.S. in the face of opposition, Mr. Goronwy Roberts, Minister of State at the D.E.S., stated that it was not intended to impose any rigid uniformity in the articles

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 750, 1966-67, July 10 to July 21, 10th July, 1967, col. 12.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.

of government although L.E.As had been provided with a pattern in the annex of Circular 2/67 to assist with the task of drafting and scrutiny. He added that far more detailed consideration of college government might well have to wait legislation.¹

When ~~passed~~^{pressed} by Boyle to give a fairly clear undertaking that colleges of education would not be treated any more unfavourably than polytechnics in the position of the clerk to the governors and academic representation on governing bodies, Roberts was extremely vague. He stated that:-

"We expect that both types of college will approximate in the levels of academic and, indeed student autonomy which they attain in relation to the arrangements which are made for each type. There may be differences; they will not be differences which indicate a classification or a superiority of the one over the other in this matter. That is an assurance which I can give, that we hope that both will emerge with the fullest possible academic and student autonomy consonant with their nature and not with their position in the educational hierarchy."²

Roberts, however, did not wish to be pressed on the question of the professional identity of the clerk to the governors. He stated that it was the Government's view that the clerk to the governors should not be the "clerk of the authority", but he said that certain education authorities and colleges took another view. He said that when the proposed legislation was published there would be an opportunity, within the bounds of order, to go into the details of what was proposed and the arguments for variations.³

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 750, 1966-67, July 10 to July 21, 10th July, 1967, col. 36.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

The debate in the Commons hardly allayed the A.T.C.D.E.'s fears that the D.E.S. might be reserving their position on the issues of the clerk to the governors and academic staff having full rights of membership on governing bodies. The A.T.C.D.E. News Sheet argued:-

"If the intentions of the Government were sincerely and unequivocally to implement the Weaver Report, which has been openly accepted by Mr. Crosland, then Mr. Goronwy Roberts would not have been so coyly reluctant to be pressed on the question. Indeed, he would have welcomed pressure so that he could tell the Authorities precisely what he wanted them to do."¹

From their past experience, however, the A.T.C.D.E. should have known that the D.E.S. preferred to work in more recondite ways. Given the situation, all the A.T.C.D.E. could do was to await the proposed legislation.

1 A.T.C.D.E. News Sheet, No. 57, September 1967, p. 4.

CHAPTER 8

THE EDUCATION BILL AND THE EDUCATION (No. 2) ACT, 1968

The Education Bill in the Lords

The promised Bill, "to make further provision for the government of colleges of education and other institutions of further education maintained by local education authorities and of special schools so maintained",¹ was introduced in the Lords by Baroness Phillips on 1st November, 1967. The Bill received its first reading and was ordered to be printed.²

Clause One of the Bill stated:-

- "(1) For every institution maintained by a local education authority, being either -
- (a) a college for the training of teachers
(in this section referred to as a college of education);
 - or
 - (b) an institution, other than a college of education, providing full-time education pursuant to a scheme of further education approved under section 42 of the Education Act 1944
- there shall be an instrument (to be known as an instrument of government) providing for the constitution of a body of governors of the institution.
- (2) The instrument of government for any such institution shall be made by order of the local education authority, and the body of governors to be constituted thereunder shall consist of such numbers of persons, appointed in such manner as that authority may determine.

1 Education Bill (H.L.).

2 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXXXVI, 1967-68, Oct. 31 to Nov. 23, 1st November, 1967, col. 43.

- (3) Every such institution shall be conducted in accordance with articles of government, to be made by order of the local education authority with the approval of the Secretary of State; and those articles shall determine the functions to be exercised respectively in relation to the institution, by the local education authority, the body of governors, the principal, and the academic board, if any."¹

The A.T.C.D.E. was given an early warning by a member of the Lords that the Bill would receive its second reading on 23rd November. After studying the Bill closely, the A.T.C.D.E. Action Committee felt that it was too imprecise and inadequate.² As the A.T.C.D.E. General Secretary was to write later, it was felt that:-

"The Bill is satisfactory as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough as it leaves too much to the spirit in which the L.E.As implement it - and there is sufficient evidence that many L.E.As will only go as far as they are compelled."³

The Action Committee and the Association were particularly perturbed that only the articles of government required the approval of the Secretary of State. They accepted that the Weaver Report had not specifically recommended that the instrument should be submitted for approval, but they were concerned at the restrictive nature of some of the instruments that had already been submitted. Although it was known that local authorities were proposing the inclusion of teachers, university representatives and representatives of the college academic board on the governing bodies, some of the proposals submitted did not give voting rights to the academic board representatives. Furthermore, in the absence

1 Education Bill (H.L.), Clause 1.

2 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 12.

3 A.T.C.D.E., News Sheet, No. 58, December 1967, p. 2.

of a clear legal distinction on what should be included in instruments and articles, it was feared that some L.E.As might include the office of clerk to the governors in the instrument rather than in the articles as had been requested by the Department in Circular 2/67. They were also unhappy about the phrasing of sub-section (3) which referred to the academic board "if any".¹

These matters were discussed with members of the A.P.T.I. and with officials of the D.E.S. The Action Committee also enlisted the aid of Lord Aberdare to raise the concerns of the Association in the Lords.²

In introducing the Bill for the second reading in the Lords on 23rd November, 1967, Baroness Phillips outlined the events which formed the background to the Bill and stressed that its purpose, as far as colleges of education and further education were concerned, was to facilitate the implementation of the principles of the Weaver Report.³ Lord Aberdare welcomed the Bill but with reservations. He was concerned that under Clause 1(2) of the Bill the L.E.A. alone was responsible for the instrument of government and the Secretary of State had no power to insist on properly constituted governing bodies. He was anxious that colleges of education should not be treated any worse than polytechnics which

1 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 12. Also see A.T.C.D.E., News Sheet, No. 58, December 1967, pp. 2 and 3.

2 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 12.

3 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXXXVI, 1967-68, Oct. 31 to Nov. 23, 23rd November, 1967, cols. 1170-1172.

had been given firm guidance on the composition of their governing bodies and whose instruments would come under the scrutiny of the D.E.S. He noted, also, that the governing body of a polytechnic was to appoint its own chief administrative officer who would act as its clerk. He observed that there was nothing in the Bill to ensure this for colleges of education. He recognised that if the clerkship was included in the articles, then it would come under the surveillance of the Department. He pointed out, however, that a local authority might include in the instrument that the clerk should be the chief education officer. He felt that this would go against the Weaver Committee's recommendations and in his view would severely restrict the independence of the colleges. He argued that if the Bill was to be effective in giving a measure of internal self-government to institutions of higher education, it must ensure proper representation on the governing bodies and an independent clerk. He suggested that the simplest way to achieve this would be to make the instrument as well as the articles of government subject to the approval of the Secretary of State.¹

Baroness Phillips, however, was unmoved by Lord Aberdare's request to amend the Bill. She replied that the Secretary of State:-

"does not think it would be appropriate for him to require his formal approval to the instruments of government, but in examining the articles of government which do require his approval, he will naturally have to take into account how they are likely to be affected by the composition of the governing body the

1 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXXXVI, 1967-68, Oct. 31 to Nov. 23, 23rd November, 1967, cols. 1175-1178.

authority has in mind, and by their proposals for servicing the governing body. I hope the noble Lords will accept that this will be sufficient protection ..."¹

She also added that as a result of Circular 2/67, articles of government were being submitted to the Secretary of State and these generally showed that L.E.As were following closely the model for the composition of governing bodies set out in the Weaver Report.²

The A.T.C.D.E., however, was not reassured by Baroness Phillips' reply. Now committed to a policy of securing that the instrument of government should be subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, the Action Committee continued to exert political pressure through personal contacts and correspondence with Members of Parliament.³

When the Bill came before the Lords at the Committee stage on 5th December, 1967, Lord Aberdare proposed two amendments to make the Bill more specific and clearer. Firstly, he moved that the words "each separate" should be inserted into Clause 1, subsection (1) to read, "there shall be an instrument (to be known as an instrument of government) providing for the constitution of a body of governors of each separate institution". He stated that he presumed that it had been the intention of the existing subsection (1) of Section 1 that there should be a separate board for each

1 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXXXVI, 1967-68, Oct. 31 to Nov. 23, 23rd November, 1967, col. 1181.

2 Ibid.

3 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 12.

college covered by the Bill but it did not seem clear to him that this was imported by the Bill. He argued that it might well be the case under the Bill that one governing body might serve more than one college, and the purpose of his amendment was to make it quite clear that each college should have its own governing body.¹

It is not clear whether Lord Aberdare was referring to both colleges of education and further education or just to colleges of education. In fact, there is no evidence to suggest at this stage that any L.E.A. was proposing to group the government of colleges of education although this had been the practice of some L.E.As in the past. Baroness Phillips seemed to assume that he was referring to colleges of education. She reassured him that the Bill, as it stood, did not give L.E.As power to group two or more colleges of education under a single governing body so no amendment was necessary. She stressed that it was the Secretary of State's intention that each college of education should have its own governing body and he had no intention of conferring a power to group the government of colleges of education. On this reassurance the amendment was withdrawn.²

Lord Aberdare's second amendment was to add to subsection 2, "Provided that in a college of education these persons shall include the principal and representative members of the academic staff together with university representatives, members of the teaching profession and other persons with a concern for the training of

1 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXXXVII, 1967-68, Nov. 28 to Dec. 20, 5th December, 1967, col. 548.

2 Ibid., cols. 548-549.

teachers as full voting members".¹ He said that he had sympathy with the view expressed by Baroness Phillips at the second reading that it was not appropriate for the instrument of government to be subject to the approval of the Secretary of State. Nevertheless, he insisted that it was essential to ensure the implementation of the Weaver Report's recommendations and that colleges of education should enjoy the same level of independence as polytechnics. He recognised that the words "full voting members" did not appear in the Weaver Report, but he felt sure that this was the intention of the Study Group. He believed that if the words were not included, it would be possible for a local education authority to establish a governing body on which the principal and representatives of the staff were included, but without full voting powers. He hoped Baroness Phillips would be able either to accept the amendment or give some fairly definite assurance that the position of colleges of education would be safeguarded.²

The amendment was supported by the Bishop of Chichester. He informed the House that in respect of voluntary colleges, this aspect of the Weaver Report had already been examined very carefully in the negotiations between the Voluntary Bodies and the Department over articles of government and that, so far as he was aware, the principle had been fully established in the voluntary sector. He admitted that some voluntary colleges had not shown as much freedom from rigidity as he would have liked to have seen and he hoped that

1 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXXXVII, 1967-68, Nov. 28 to Dec. 20, 5th December, 1967, col. 549.

2 Ibid., cols. 549-551.

they would reconsider. Even so, the Voluntary Bodies had shown great understanding on staff representation with voting power on governing bodies and this was very much to the profit of the colleges.¹

In reply, Baroness Phillips reminded the House that the purpose of the Study Group was to find the correct balance between the freedom which institutions of higher education should enjoy and the social control which democratically elected bodies were required to exercise. Furthermore, the Study Group had reached unanimous recommendations after long and friendly discussions. Consequently, the Secretary of State did not think it "necessary or desirable to alter the nice balance" that had been achieved by the Study Group, and to which the Bill was designed to give effect. She emphasised that the Secretary of State was concerned to see that the several partners concerned in the enterprise, including the L.E.As, between them governed the colleges in accordance not only with the letter but also with the spirit of the Study Group Report. To lay down in the Bill the composition of a governing body of a college, or to make the instrument of government subject to the Secretary of State's formal approval would not, in his view, improve the balance of interests that had been achieved. In the light of this explanation and of the fact that local authorities could be expected to act on the unanimous recommendations of the Study Group that principals and members of the academic board should

¹ Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXXXVII, 1967-68, Nov. 28 to Dec. 20, 5th December, 1967, col. 551.

be members of the governing body, she hoped that Lord Aberdare would not press an amendment which the Government would feel bound to reject.¹

Lord Aberdare agreed not to press the amendment. He stated, however, that he was far from satisfied. It seemed to him that the balance would not be upset by putting into the Bill something that was a direct recommendation of the Weaver Report.²

At the Report Stage in the Lords on 12th December, 1967, Baroness Phillips moved an amendment to add to Section 1 a subsection which stated:-

"(4) A local education authority may, with the approval of the Secretary of State, make an arrangement for the constitution of a single governing body for any two or more such institutions maintained by them as are mentioned in paragraph (6) of subsection (1) of this section; and the governing body constituted in pursuance of any such arrangement shall consist of such number of persons, appointed in such manner, as the local authority may determine".³

Baroness Phillips stressed that this subsection referred only to colleges of further education and, even then, grouping arrangements were subject to the approval of the Secretary of State. She emphasised that there would be no question of the power being used

1 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXXXVII, 1967-68, Nov. 28 to Dec. 20, 5th December, 1967, cols. 552-553.

2 Ibid., col. 553.

3 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXXXVII, 1967-68, Nov. 28 to Dec. 20, 12th December, 1967, col. 1090.

in the case of polytechnics or other major colleges, and the amendment did not extend to colleges of education.¹ The addition of the subsection, in effect, served to clarify the position of colleges of education.

Lord Aberdare welcomed the amendment.² Since he did not make any further objections to the Bill, it would appear that he was now prepared to accept it as it stood. Lord Heycock, however, warmly welcomed the Bill. He pointed out that he had served on the Weaver Study Group, but had not signed the Report because he could not agree on the question of academic freedom as between the "colleges of advanced technology" (?) and the local education authorities. He stated that on reflection he realised that he had been mistaken. As the chairman of a large education committee, he pledged that he would do everything he could to see that the Bill was implemented.³

Progress in the submission of schemes

The A.T.C.D.E., however, remained dissatisfied with the Bill and with the progress being made in the submission of schemes by the local authorities. The Association's suspicions were also

1 Hansard (Lords), Fifth Series, Vol. CCLXXXVII, 1967-68, Nov. 28 to Dec. 20, 12th December, 1967, cols. 1090-91.

2 Ibid., col. 1091.

3 Ibid., col. 1097. It is not clear whether Lord Heycock meant to say "colleges of education" or "colleges of advanced technology".

heightened by the refusal of the D.E.S. to make public the precise criteria which would be used in approving articles of government and the action which would be taken where schemes were unacceptable.

Towards the end of November, 1967, it was reported at the Association's Finance and General Purposes Committee that information collected from principals of colleges showed that so far about half the local authorities had submitted schemes to the D.E.S. and that some were not intending to proceed until after the legislation had been effected.¹ An analysis of the replies received from principals up to Nov./Dec. 1967 (see Fig. 1 below) revealed few surprises. As might have been expected, the most widespread problem centred on the position of the clerk to the governors, and some local authorities were proving difficult on the delegation of financial responsibilities to the colleges. Perhaps most surprising was the fact that three local authorities were not proposing the establishment of an academic board with powers as defined in the Weaver Report. It is interesting to note, however, that the replies did not substantiate the A.T.C.D.E.'s claim that some L.E.As were proposing to deny voting rights to the representatives of the academic board on governing bodies, although this was known to be the case in some colleges from other sources. The survey also suggested that there had been inadequate consultation by some L.E.As with the governors, the principal and other members of staff.

1 A.T.C.D.E. Finance and General Purposes Committee Minutes, 24 November 1967, Minute 110.

Fig. 1 Analysis of replies received from principals on progress in the implementation of the Weaver Report up to Nov./Dec. 1967

(Being Appendix 19, Government of Colleges of Education, of the A.T.C.D.E. Finance and General Purposes Committee Minutes, 2 February 1968)

	Yes	No	Don't Know
1. Has a scheme been submitted to the D.E.S.?	54	24	5
2. If 'yes' was there consultation with			
(a) Governors?	51	8	4
(b) Principal?	58	7	-
(c) Any other Staff?	36	26	2
3. Do the proposals include the Principal as a member of the Governing Body?	65	-	2
4. Do the proposals include other members of staff with full voting rights?	65	-	2
How many? One ... 9			
Two ... 39			
Three . 16			
5. Is the Senior Administrative Officer to be Clerk to the Governors?	23	35	10
6. If the answer is 'no' to No. 5, who is?			
C.E.O. 28 : Town Clerk 5			
7. Do the proposals include the establishment of an Academic Board with powers defined in the Weaver Report?	56	3	7
8. Do the proposals include freedom to spend within the approved estimates as defined by the Weaver Report?	43	8	16

In the December News Sheet, the A.T.C.D.E. General Secretary wrote:-

"Many of the proposals now before the Department are in keeping with the spirit and intention of the Report, but too many are paying only the most formal lip-service to it, with a substantial built-in majority of Education Committee representatives on the governing body and a denial of voting rights to representatives of the academic board. In the regulations on the spending power of the principal, some authorities are placing him under restrictions more severer than those under which many head-teachers work. Indeed, some authorities are attempting to take away student responsibility by requiring the approval by the governing body of the constitution of students' unions and even of the auditing of the accounts of student societies."¹

Following the meeting of the A.T.C.D.E. Council at the Christmas Conference, the A.T.C.D.E. once more intensified its political campaign to secure the approval of instruments of government by the Secretary of State. Members of college staffs wrote to their local M.P.s and the General Secretary wrote to M.P.s who were likely to contribute to the debate when the Bill came before the Commons. The A.T.C.D.E.'s case was supported by the Chairman of the Division of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors concerned with academic matters who wrote to the Permanent Under-Secretary of State indicating that his committee fully shared the misgivings of the A.T.C.D.E. and that the Bill fell far short of what was required. Their three main objections were: that the instruments should be subject to the approval of the Secretary of State to ensure proper representation on governing bodies of the

1 A.T.C.D.E. News Sheet, No. 58, December 1967, "Bill of Rights", pp. 3 and 4.

universities, the college academic staff and teachers; that the Bill should be clear that academic boards were mandatory; and that the senior administrative officer of the college should be the clerk to the governing body.¹

Rather belatedly at an informal meeting with D.E.S. officials on 5th February, 1968, Mr. Harding reassured the A.T.C.D.E. Officers that as far as the Department was concerned the recommendations of the Weaver Report were binding. He stated that up to that date the schemes submitted by only two authorities had been approved. Furthermore, he convinced the A.T.C.D.E. Officers that the D.E.S. was making efforts to find out whether the governing body, the principal and members of staff had been consulted about the proposed articles and their reactions to them.²

The Bill in the Commons

The Bill came before the Second Reading Committee of the Commons on 7th February, 1968. The Committee consisted of twenty members with Sir Barnett Janner in the Chair.³ If the subsequent debate on the Bill was to show that the A.T.C.D.E. had been successful in persuading M.P.s to press for an amendment to make the instrument of government subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, it was also to reveal that the Local Authority Associations had been no

1 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 13.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 8 March 1968, Minute 259.

3 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 758, 1967-68, Feb. 5 to Feb. 16, 7th February, 1968, cols. 569-570.

less successful in exerting pressure on the Secretary of State to resist such an amendment.

Mrs. Shirley Williams, Minister of State at the Department of Education and Science, in introducing the Bill said that she trusted it would be substantially uncontroversial.¹ After describing the background to, and the purposes of the Bill, she significantly went on to distinguish between instruments and articles of government.² On the claim that instruments should be subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, she admitted that her original attitude had been sympathetic. Since the intention of the Bill was to liberalise the government of colleges, she accepted that it could be argued that the simplest way was by legislation.³ On the other hand, she suggested that there were three factors that had to be taken into consideration which justified the Secretary of State's decision not to require instruments to be subject to his approval.

Firstly, she emphasised that the Bill had been brought forward on the basis of the recommendations of the Weaver Report which had been agreed unanimously by the representatives of the local authorities, the colleges' staff association and the universities. At no time, however, during the Study Group's discussions had the colleges' staff representatives indicated that they wished the instruments to be subject to the approval of the Secretary of State.

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 758, 1967-68, Feb. 5 to Feb. 16, 7th February, 1968, col. 570.

2 Ibid., cols. 573 and 574.

3 Ibid., col. 575.

This, in fact, had only been suggested after the publication of the Report and not before.¹

Secondly, she argued that, given the nature of the Weaver Report, it was binding on all parties to the Report in so far as they all felt that each party was following the recommendations agreed. But if one party was to amend the recommendations to suit their own purposes, then it was reasonable for another party to take the view that they, too, were no longer bound by any other recommendations. Consequently, she maintained that it would now be difficult to amend a recommendation so far as it applied to one party and to trust that the other items in the Report which were not present in the legislation would then be duly, fairly and voluntarily carried out by the other parties represented on the Study Group.²

Thirdly, she agreed that it would be fair to include the requirement if there was substantial evidence to show that authorities were not willing to be liberal. Furthermore, she pointed out that the local authorities, which were partners in the education system, had to be relied upon to do what they said they would, and that it was not possible to invariably oblige them to do these things. "If one did, one would destroy the autonomy of local government". She stated that, in fact, there was no evidence that authorities intended to be illiberal. Whilst it was possible for a local authority, in the first instance, to bring

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 758, 1967-68, Feb. 5 to Feb. 16, 7th February, 1968, col. 575.

2 Ibid., cols. 575 and 576.

forward a scheme which was not satisfactory, after discussion with the Department, the L.E.A. on reflection liberalised its recommendations. She said that this was the way in which the system worked. "It operates by a process of discussion and negotiation".¹

As far as the post of the clerk to the governors was concerned, Mrs. Williams stated that it had been submitted by some authorities that the chief education officer should be clerk. Since this matter, however, appeared in the articles, it was subject to the approval of the Secretary of State. She reassured the Committee that recommendations put forward by local authorities in this respect would be considered most carefully by the Department and, in particular, by the Secretary of State.²

Eleven other members of the Committee, representing both sides of the House, spoke in the debate and all, without exception, considered that the instruments should be subject to the approval of the Secretary of State.³ Sir Edward Boyle, for example, reflected the views of many of the speakers in expressing anxiety that the composition of governing bodies should have the right balance. He did not dispute L.E.As having a strong and continuing interest in college government. But he argued that if the majority of the

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 758, 1967-68, Feb. 5 to Feb. 16, 7th February, 1968, cols. 576 and 577.

2 Ibid., col. 577.

3 Ibid. McNamara, col. 574; Boyle, cols. 578-581; Mitchell, cols. 582-584; Hill, col. 584; Price, col. 590; Morrison, col. 591; Hornby, col. 595; Carter-Jones, col. 597; Maude, col. 600; Newens, col. 601; and van Straubenzee, cols. 606-609.

members were political members of the local authority education committee, and above all, if there was any question of the outside representatives and members of staff not having voting rights, then these two things together would mean that the greater independence of colleges as important institutions of higher education could not be achieved. He also stressed that colleges of education and polytechnics should be treated in the same way. He said that he would find it difficult to accept a solution which gave the impression that colleges of education were the Cinderellas of the education system and subject to less freedom than other non-autonomous bodies.¹ Mr. Mitchell challenged the Minister's explanation for refusing to amend the Bill. He did not think that L.E.As would be too upset if the Government changed the Bill, nor did he think they would take any retaliatory action. He felt that there would be a "few moans and groans" but that it would be accepted in the long run.² Mr. van Straubenzee also chided the Minister for being too hard on the representatives of the colleges' staff for not putting their views forward at the time of the Weaver Report.³ He accepted that the majority of L.E.As would respond to the Weaver Report in a liberal way, but the fact that they were having to legislate was because of occasional laggards.⁴

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 758, 1967-68, Feb. 5 to Feb. 16, 7th February, 1968, cols. 579-580.

2 Ibid., cols. 583-584.

3 Ibid., col. 606.

4 Ibid., cols. 608-609.

The members of the Committee also raised several other important concerns in respect of the Bill and the Department's policy in approving articles of government. Mitchell could not understand the necessity for the words "if any" in Section 1(3) in respect of academic boards and insisted that it was essential that colleges should have academic boards.¹ McNamara was even more emphatic on this point and stated "we want to see these words deleted from the Bill".²

In respect of the articles of government, Hill wanted to know the Department's minimum requirements before approval. He felt that there must be some aspects of the Weaver Report which were sine qua non.³ He also urged the Government to ensure that the senior administrative officer was the clerk to the governing body.⁴ Price, whilst supporting Hill's point on the clerk to the governors, warned that the senior administrative officer might not be in such a strong position vis-a-vis the city treasurer as the chief education officer had been.⁵

Several members, including Hill⁶, McNamara⁷ and Straubenzee⁸ pressed the claim for student representation within the decision-

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 758, 1967-68, Feb. 5 to Feb. 16, 7th February, 1968, col. 583.

2 Ibid., col. 594.

3 Ibid., col. 585.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., col. 588.

6 Ibid., col. 586.

7 Ibid., col. 593-594.

8 Ibid., col. 609.

making structure of the colleges and felt that students had much to contribute. This view, however, was vigorously opposed by Hornby.¹

On the question of student representation, Mrs. Williams replied that because the Bill covered a wide range of institutions the Department took the view that it was for the institutions themselves to decide the best arrangements for their own purposes. She said that the Department was not hostile to the idea of student representation and the Department had advised student bodies to make representations in the first instance to the institutions on which they wished to be represented, and then, if necessary, to the Department.²

In respect of Clause 1(3), she stated that the words "if any" had been included because the Bill also dealt with colleges of further education, some of which had very few full-time courses and, in some cases, almost no full-time staff. She gave an assurance, however, that the words did not apply to colleges of education or to major colleges of further education which did full-time and advanced work.³

On the key question of the debate, whether the instruments should be subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, Mrs. Williams refused to give ground. She accepted, however, that given the views expressed by both sides of the Committee it

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 758, 1967-68, Feb. 5 to Feb. 16, 7th February, 1968, col. 595.

2 Ibid., cols. 611 and 612.

3 Ibid., cols. 614 and 615.

must be looked at again at the Committee Stage. She agreed with Price that instruments and articles of government of schools had been flouted by many local education authorities and that legislation was no guarantee that there would be a liberal approach to the interpretation of it. This was why she was anxious to carry the good will of most of the L.E.As with them. She considered that Mitchell was altogether too optimistic in his views of the possible reactions of the L.E.As.

"The local education associations - and I am authorised to say this - have made it clear that their members would feel that a decision to require authorities to obtain approval for instruments of government would impugn the competence of local education authorities and - this is the important point - would re-open the whole question of their acceptance of the Weaver Report as a whole."¹

Since the Weaver Report covered much more than the establishment of more liberal governing bodies, Mrs. Williams asked the members to take seriously the possibility of non-co-operation by L.E.As in an area for which they and not the Department were responsible. She pointed out that the Department had so far considered the articles and instruments of 64 colleges from 39 L.E.As. In every case, the L.E.A. had agreed to the representation of two or more members of the staff of the college on the governing body; had allowed for university representation; had made provision for the co-option of teachers; and had made provision for the inclusion of other people with special contributions to make.²

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 758, 1967-68, Feb. 5 to Feb. 16, 7th February, 1968, cols. 615-616.

2 Ibid., col. 616. Mrs. Williams confirmed that Leeds had re-submitted its articles of government after reconsideration following negotiations with the Department. She understood that staff members were now to have voting rights (col. 617).

In her concluding comments, Mrs. Williams refused to be drawn on the criteria for the Department's approval of articles of government and how this affected instruments. She merely stated that the recommendations of the Weaver Report were, in effect, a model scheme. She re-affirmed her belief that L.E.As would prove co-operative and that the local authorities, themselves, would bring pressure to bear on recalcitrants to conform to the Weaver Report.¹

Thus it appeared that the Government was implacably opposed to any amendment to the Bill to make instruments subject to the approval of the Secretary of State; that great pains were being taken over the approval of articles by the D.E.S.; that the D.E.S. was having to exert pressure on some L.E.As to bring their instruments and articles into line with the Weaver Report; that the Department, by keeping a secret the precise criteria for the approval of articles, was determined to keep this matter very much within their own discretion; and that any amendment to the Bill might endanger the full implementation of the Report. Indeed, the A.T.C.D.E. was informed that the Government would rather withdraw the Bill than accept an amendment on the approval of instruments.²

In view of this situation, on 20th February, 1968, the A.T.C.D.E. Chairman wrote to the colleges stating that it would be helpful to the cause of liberalising college government if the Bill

1 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 758, 1967-68, Feb. 5 to Feb. 16, 7th February, 1968, col. 618.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 8 March 1967, Minute 261.

was to be passed as it stood with the assurances that had been given. She suggested that members should write to M.P.s urging them to secure assurances from the Government that only those articles would be approved which were fully in accordance with the spirit and the agreed recommendations of the Report, particularly with regard to the constitution and powers of the academic board, the power of the governing body to spend within the approved estimates without reference back and to exercise virement where appropriate, and the recognition of the senior administrative officer as clerk to the governors.¹

Nine days later, however, the A.T.C.D.E. received information of a dramatic change in Government policy. On 29th February, the Officers of the Association entertained Mrs. Williams and Mr. Weaver. In discussions on the Bill, Mrs. Williams indicated in confidence that an agreed amendment would probably be introduced in the Commons' Standing Committee providing that the instruments of government of colleges of education should be subject to the approval of the Secretary of State and that this would be accepted by the Government.² The reason given for the change in the Government's policy was that the opposition of the Local Authority Associations to such an amendment had weakened, but it was clear that the Government as well as the Local Authority Associations had been under considerable pressure from both Labour and Conservative M.P.s to amend the Bill.

1 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 14.

2 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 8 March 1968, Minute 259.

This reversal in Government policy was confirmed publicly by both Mrs. Williams and Sir Edward Boyle on 2nd April at the A.T.C.D.E. Conference at Nottingham. At the joint conference of bursars of maintained and voluntary colleges on 18th April, Mrs. Williams confirmed further that the Government would require a clause in the articles stating that the senior administrative officer should be the clerk to the governors, but that the position of smaller colleges and administrative problems might prevent an immediate implementation of this clause in all colleges.¹

When the Bill came before the Commons' Standing Committee G on 9th May, Mrs. Williams moved three amendments to Clause 1(2).² The composite effect of the amendments was to change Clause 1(2) to read:-

"The instrument of Government for any such institution shall be made, in the case of a college of education, by order of the local education authority with the approval of the Secretary of State, and in any other case by order of the local education authority, and the body of governors to be constituted thereunder shall consist of such number of persons, appointed in such manner as the local education authority or, in the case of a college of education, that authority with the approval of the Secretary of State may determine."³

-
- 1 A.A. Evans, The Government of Colleges of Education, p. 14.
 - 2 Parliamentary Debates, Standing Committees 1967-68, Vol. IX, Standing Committee G, Education Bill (Lords), 9th May, 1968, cols. 5 and 6.
 - 3 Ibid., col. 6.

In moving the amendments, Mrs. Williams stated that it was still the view of the Government that there was no necessity to lay down that the instruments should be subject to the approval of the Secretary of State because the Government believed that the local authorities fully intended to implement the Weaver Report. All of the schemes received so far indicated that the local authorities were adopting a liberal approach to college government.

"However, in view of the fact that on Second Reading both sides of the Committee strongly expressed their feeling that there might be some exception to that generally liberal trend and the view that instruments of colleges of education in particular should be made subject to the approval of the Secretary of State for Education and Science, the Government have responded to that view from both sides of the Committee by putting down the three Government Amendments."¹

In welcoming the amendments, Sir Edward Boyle stated that he had been in contact with the C.C.A., the A.M.C. and the A.E.C., as well as the A.T.C.D.E., since the debate in February and had been impressed by the commendable spirit of give and take on the issue.² He pressed Mrs. Williams not to approve instruments of government which were not at least as liberal as the model instruments suggested by the D.E.S. in the Administrative Memorandum 8/67 for polytechnics. He said:-

"We ought always to remember that colleges of education are not simply teacher factories. They are, in their own right, a major share of our whole higher

1 Parliamentary Debates, Standing Committees 1967-68, Vol. IX, Standing Committee G, Education Bill (Lords), 9th May, 1968, col. 6.

2 Ibid., cols. 7 and 8.

education system. None of us, I hope, believes that we have yet reached the last word with regard to either the future of the colleges or their relationship with the university system."¹

Boyle also emphasised that it was essential that the senior administrative officer should be the clerk to the governors. He stated that if the governing body was to exercise any degree of autonomy, its chief administrative officer must feel that he could act as the servant of the college.²

After the amendments had been approved,³ Mrs. Williams welcomed Boyle's praise for the colleges. She stated:-

"The Clause, and the Bill, may surely be said to be their coming of age. It is, I think, high time that their independence and autonomy were recognised, because they have made a major contribution over the last 10 years, in particular, to the tremendous onrush and growth of education. The colleges of education, it is fair to say looked at from a point of view of either an educationist or an economist, have been one of the most fast-growing and, to use a very unpleasant phrase, cost-effective sectors of education. The least that one can do is now to recognise their contribution by conceding to them the sort of autonomy that is embodied in the Bill."⁴

On the question of the criteria which was being used by the D.E.S. in approving articles of government, which had been raised by Hill at the Second Reading, Mrs. Williams was now more forth-

1 Parliamentary Debates, Standing Committees 1967-68, Vol. IX, Standing Committee G, Education Bill (Lords), 9th May, 1968, col. 9.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., col. 10.

4 Ibid., col. 11.

coming. She stated that the Department required that the articles should give the governing body responsibility for: determining the establishment within approved estimates; appointing members of staff subject only to confirmation by the L.E.A.; defining the posts to which appointments were to be made; dismissal of staff subject to confirmation by the L.E.A.; and establishing an academic board with autonomy in academic matters. It was also required that the articles should give the principal power to suspend a student and students a right to appear before a disciplinary body set up by the governing body.¹ Furthermore, the articles would be required to make provision for a channel of consultation between staff and students, and between students and the governing body although the Department did not wish to lay down a tight form which this might take. In respect of finance, the Department expected to see delegated to the governing body adequate virement within the broad financial field, freedom of spending within certain agreed limits and adequate control over minor repairs and purchase of supplies. Mrs. Williams added, however, that the D.E.S. was still discussing with the local authorities the amount of financial freedom that could be delegated to L.E.A. colleges. She pointed out that the local authorities were under pressure due to cuts in expenditure and were rightly concerned to make very clear the borders between their own responsibilities and the freedom of governing bodies in the field of spending.²

1 Parliamentary Debates, Standing Committees 1967-68, Vol. IX, Standing Committee G, Education Bill (Lords), 9th May, 1968, col. 12.

2 Ibid., col. 13.

On the issue of the clerk to the governors, Mrs. Williams said that the Government wished to go as far as possible in making the senior administrative officer the clerk, but that this could not be achieved immediately in all cases. Firstly, some colleges were too small to sustain a full-time clerk to the governors who was the senior administrative officer. Secondly, some colleges had sent requests to the D.E.S. that the chief education officer and not the senior administrative officer should be the clerk.¹ Thirdly, the Report of the Committee on Non-teaching Staff had not yet received the approval of the Local Authority Associations. Where the senior administrative officer was not the clerk, arrangements would have to be made to safeguard the position in the future. In all colleges, however, the senior administrative officer would be a full-time member of the college staff.²

The Education Bill, as amended in the Standing Committee, received its Third Reading without further amendments in respect of colleges of education on 14th June, 1968,³ and became the Education (No. 2) Act, 1968.⁴

1 Parliamentary Debates, Standing Committees 1967-68, Vol. IX, Standing Committee G, Education Bill (Lords), 9th May, 1968, col. 13.

2 Ibid., col. 14.

3 Hansard (Commons), Fifth Series, Vol. 766, 1967-68, June 11 to June 21, 14th June, 1968, col. 587 et. seq.

4 The Education (No. 2) Act, 1968, (1968 c. 37), 3rd July, 1968.

Circular 22/68 announced that the Secretary of State intended to bring the Act into force in relation to colleges of education on 1st April, 1969.¹ Due to pressure for student participation in the government of educational institutions² and the acceptance by the D.E.S., the Local Authority Associations and the A.T.C.D.E. of student representation on governing bodies and academic boards and their committees, it became necessary to amend instruments and articles of government.³ Thus Circular 8/69 postponed the date of implementation to 1st July, 1969, and requested that all L.E.As should submit their revised drafts of the instruments and articles for the approval of the Secretary of State not later than 1st May, 1969.⁴ Even so, as late as October, 1969, the A.T.C.D.E. General Secretary reported some fifteen schemes had not yet been submitted and several awaited final approval after having been returned by the D.E.S. for modification.⁵

-
- 1 D.E.S. Circular 22/68, The Education (No. 2) Act, 1968, 9th October, 1968, para. 8.
 - 2 See, for example, N.U.S. Press Statement, 13.6.68.
 - 3 See the Local Authority Associations, Memorandum on the Government of Polytechnics, Colleges of Education and Other Colleges of Comparable Status (March, 1969), and the A.T.C.D.E., Draft Policy Statement on Student Participation in College Government (A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 25 October 1968). For D.E.S. policy and agreement with the Voluntary Bodies on student representation, see D.E.S. College Letter 18/69, 25th September, 1969, and D.E.S. Voluntary College Letter 10/70, 6th April, 1970.
 - 4 D.E.S. Circular 8/69, The Education (No. 2) Act, 1968: Colleges of Education, April 10, 1969. See also, the Education (No. 2) Act, 1968 (Commencement No. 1) Order, 1969, S.I. 1969 No. 709 (c. 16).
 - 5 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 24/25 October 1969, Appendix 7, Draft of General Secretary's Report, 1968-69.

The A.T.C.D.E. regarded the Act as a notable victory for their policies, although it was recognised that much depended on the spirit in which instruments and articles of government were operated. Perhaps the greatest disappointment to the Association was the approval by the D.E.S. of about 30-40 schemes in which the chief education officer would continue to act as the clerk to the governors, but on the understanding that the position would be reviewed in two years' time when views, including those of the academic boards, would be obtained as to the clerkship.¹

1 A.T.C.D.E. Executive Committee Minutes, 16/17 October 1970, Appendix 2, Draft of General Secretary's Report, 1969-70.

CONCLUSION

The overriding objectives of the A.T.C.D.E.'s policies were to establish the colleges as part of the structure of higher education and to secure for them a contingent form of administration appropriate for institutions of higher education. The rejection of the Robbins' proposals on the administration of colleges was regarded as a serious set-back to these objectives and the Weaver Report was very much seen as the "consolation prize" of the colleges.

The extent to which the Weaver Report and the Education (No. 2) Act were successful in securing a more liberal structure of college government and a greater degree of freedom and responsibility for the colleges, particularly L.E.A. colleges, to administer and manage their own affairs remains a matter for further research. The approval of the instruments and articles of government by the D.E.S. no doubt went some way towards ensuring a more uniform and "formally" liberal pattern and structure of college government, but the D.E.S. could hardly enforce a liberal interpretation of articles of government or the adoption of a more liberal style within the structures.

Whilst, henceforth, L.E.A. colleges were to have their own individual governing bodies with defined constitutions and functions, they still remained embedded in the local authority committee structure. Although most colleges now reported directly to the Education Committee, the older system of reporting through a sub-committee still prevailed in some authorities. The extent to which the colleges were subject to the policies of, and undue interference

from, the Finance, Architects and Establishments Committees continued to vary from authority to authority. Furthermore, the final responsibility for determining major decisions in changes in the size and character of the college still rested with the local authority. The key to the problem still remained, as stated in the Weaver Report, that so long as a local education authority maintained a college it felt itself in the last resort responsible for the college, for its general efficiency, for financing its expenditure, for its staff and for its premises. Thus much depended on the way in which the various elected members, officers and committees of a local authority interpreted their responsibilities. Moreover, so long as the colleges were maintained by local authorities they were bound to be affected by local issues, the problems of local government finance and the question of the relationship of the Education Committee to other committees of the authority, a question which was to become an increasing source of conflict with the introduction of corporate management. Whilst the Weaver Report secured improvements in the government of many L.E.A. colleges, the extent of the improvements remains a matter for research. Whether L.E.As were the most appropriate bodies to maintain colleges of higher education with a national function, and whether the colleges would have fared any better in some respects under another system remain open questions.

In several areas of administration and policy-making, as has been seen, voluntary colleges continued to enjoy greater discretion than L.E.A. colleges, although financial constraints could be no less insistent. In any case, the financial boundaries in which both

types of college had to operate were narrowing with the establishment of the Pooling Committee in 1968 on which the A.T.C.D.E. had no representation. Although the recommendations of the Pooling Committee were not mandatory, both maintained and voluntary colleges and those local authorities which maintained colleges were expected to keep an observant eye on the unit costs, the cost-bands and other recommendations of the Pooling Committee.

Internally, however, the Weaver Report brought a greater degree of participation of academic staff and, eventually, students, in college government.

The A.T.C.D.E. still remained firmly committed to securing the implementation of the Robbins' proposals, although the introduction of the Binary System had effectively ended any hopes of achieving this objective. Whilst college government continued to remain a live issue, the Association's attention was becoming increasingly preoccupied with other matters: the difficulties of university control of B.Ed. degrees; the failure of the D.E.S. to reconvene the National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers; the effects on teacher supply of the deteriorating economic situation of the country; and the implications of possible spare capacity in the colleges by the late 1970s.

APPENDIX ONE

Draft Instrument of Government for
Voluntary Teachers Training Colleges

N.B. This Instrument of Government can form a Schedule to a Conveyance, Lease, Deed of Appointment, or other Instrument under which property is to be held in trust for a Training College, or it can in the alternative be the substance of a Scheme under the Charitable Trusts Acts for the regulation of a Training College.

I. The Governors

1. The College shall be conducted in conformity with this Instrument of Government by the body of Governors hereby constituted under the name of

2. The body of Governors shall, when complete, comprise not more than thirty persons, that is to say:-

(a) Ex officio members not exceeding one quarter of the total number of members.

(b) Elected or nominated representatives of Diocesan or other Church authorities with which the College has an historical association.

(c) Elected or nominated representatives of bodies with which the College has special associations, e.g.

(i) The University with which the College is directly associated.

(ii) Local Education Authorities in whose field the College works.

(iii) The Local Authority in whose area the College is situated.

(d) If considered advisable, representation from the Principal and other members of the teaching staff.

(e) Co-opted members up to one quarter of the total number of Governors.

- (Notes: 1. The object of this reconstruction is to make the composition of the Governing Body approximate more closely to that of University Bodies.
2. We consider that 30 is the maximum size compatible with efficiency, but a smaller body might be preferable where local conditions permit.
3. (a) In the case of the Women's Colleges, at least half the members of the Governing Body, other than ex officio members should be women.
- (b) In the case of the Men's Colleges, some members of the Governing Body should be women.
4. Provided that a large majority of the members of a Governing Body are practising members of the Church of England, room should be found for a limited number of non-Anglicans whose special knowledge, interest and sympathy obviously fits them for membership. This will apply particularly to representatives of Universities and statutory educational bodies.)

3. Representative Governors, nominated or elected, shall be appointed each for a term of three years, and the Co-optative Governors each for a term of five years.

4. The first meeting of the Governors shall be summoned by as soon as conveniently may be after (the execution of these presents) (the date of this Scheme), or if he fails to summon a meeting for two months after that date, by any two Governors.

5. No person shall be entitled to act as a Governor, whether on a first or any subsequent entry into office, until he has signed a declaration of acceptance and of willingness to act in the government of the College.

6. Except in special circumstances, with the approval in writing of the Minister of Education (hereinafter called 'the Minister') no Governor shall take or hold any interest in any property belonging to the College, otherwise than as a trustee for the purpose thereof, or be interested in the supply of work or goods at the cost of the College.

7. Any Governor (other than an ex officio Governor) who is absent from all meetings of the Governors during the period of one year, except for reasons considered by the Governing Body to be sufficient, or who is adjudicated a bankrupt, or is incapacitated from acting, or who communicates in writing to the Governors a wish to resign, shall thereupon cease to be a Governor.

8. Every vacancy in the office of Governor shall, as soon as possible, be notified to the proper appointing body or person as the case requires. Any competent Governor may be re-appointed. A

Governor appointed to fill a casual vacancy shall hold office only for the unexpired term of office of the Governor in whose place he is appointed.

9. The Governors shall hold ordinary or stated meetings at least twice in each year. A special meeting may at any time be summoned by any two Governors upon two clear weeks' notice being given to the other Governors of the matters to be discussed.

10. There shall be a quorum when Governors are present at a meeting. Every matter shall be determined by the majority of the Governors present and voting on the question. In the case of an equality of votes the Chairman of the meeting shall have a second or casting vote.

(The quorum to be not less than one quarter, except for special meetings as provided for in Clause 14(b), when the quorum shall be one third).

II. College Organisation

11. The College shall be conducted so as to comply with the Education Acts, 1944 and 1946, and with any Regulations for the Training of Teachers made by the Minister thereunder.

12. (a) The Governors shall appoint a suitable and duly qualified Principal of the College, and for that purpose shall take suitable measures to obtain applications from qualified candidates, which applications shall be considered by the Governors who, before making an appointment, shall interview not less than three, if there be so many, of such applicants who appear to them to be likely to be qualified for the post.

(b) The Governors shall also, in consultation with the Principal, appoint an adequate and suitable staff of lecturers and may, if they think fit, delegate such power of appointment within the limits of an establishment fixed by them, to the Principal, whether generally or on any particular occasion.

13. All persons employed by the Governors on the teaching staff of the College shall serve under a written contract of service with the Governors, which contract shall be in conformity with any Regulations made by the Minister for the Training of Teachers and in conformity with the next following (clauses) (articles) relating to dismissal and suspension.

14. (a) The Governors may at pleasure dismiss any person employed by them in connection with the College without assigning cause upon notice being given in accordance with the provisions of the contract between the Governors and such person; they may also, for misconduct or other good and urgent cause, dismiss any such person without notice.

(b) A resolution to dismiss the Principal shall not take effect unless it has been passed by not less than votes at a special meeting convened for that purpose.

15. No person shall be dismissed by the Governors without an opportunity of appearing in person before them accompanied, if so desired, by a friend.

16. Any lecturer in the College may be suspended from duty by the Principal for misconduct or other good and urgent cause, provided that the Principal shall report such suspension as soon as may be to a special meeting of the Governors to be summoned by them under (clause) (article) 9 of this (Scheme) (Instrument).

17. (a) The Governors shall regulate the admission to and the removal of students from the College. The admission shall be within the limits of numbers for which the College is approved by the Minister, and no students shall be refused admission to, or excluded from, the College on other than reasonable grounds.

(b) The Governors may, subject to such restrictions (if any) as they may think fit, delegate to the Principal the execution of their functions in regard to the admission of students. Any case of dismissal shall require the confirmation of the Governors and must at once be reported to the Minister.

18. The Governors shall cause to be kept a suitable register of all the students attending the College, showing which of them are resident and which are day students.

19. Within the limits fixed by this (Instrument) (Scheme) and subject to the Regulations of the Minister, the Governors shall, after consultation with the Principal:-

- (i) prescribe a suitable curriculum for use in the College, which curriculum shall include a systematic study of the principles and practice of teaching;
- (ii) make suitable arrangements for the examination of the students of the College in the courses taken by them;
- (iii) make arrangements for students to obtain practice in teaching in schools approved for that purpose and under proper supervision;

(iv) prescribe what reports shall require to be made to them by the Principal;

(v) make suitable arrangements as to College terms, vacations and occasional holidays.

20. (a) The Governors shall secure that the College premises are kept in good repair and condition and that the furnishings and equipment are suitable and adequate.

(b) The Governors shall, in consultation with the Principal, make suitable arrangements for the choice and supervision of lodgings outside the College which may be required for the accommodation of resident students.

21. Subject to any rules prescribed by or under the authority of this (Instrument) (Scheme) the Principal shall have under his control the choice of books, methods of teaching, the arrangement of classes and generally the internal organisation and discipline of the College, including the power to suspend students for any adequate cause to be judged by him. Upon suspending any student the Principal shall at once report the case to the Governors.

22. The Governors shall afford to the Principal the fullest opportunity of making known to them his views and proposals in regard to the College, and to the making, rescinding or altering any rules within the Governors' province. The Governors shall fully consider such views and proposals and shall decide upon them.

23. The religious instruction, and the classes in religious subjects in the College shall be in accordance with the doctrine,

rites and practices of but any student who, when offered a place in the College, claims exemption on conscientious grounds of not belonging to the shall not be required as a condition of entering or continuing in the College to comply with any rules of the College as to attendance at religious worship or observance or instruction in religious subjects.

III. Fees, Finance and Endowments

24. The Governors shall (subject to the approval of the Minister) fix the tuition and maintenance fees payable in respect of students of the College.

25. (a) The Governors shall receive all fees payable in respect of students, all grants made by the Minister, and all donations given to the College.

(b) The Governors shall pay all expenses connected with the College.

26. The Governors shall keep true accounts of their income and expenditure in such form as the Minister may require, and shall forward copies thereof to him at such time as he may direct.

IV. General

27. Within the limits prescribed by this (Instrument) (Scheme) the Governors shall have full power to make rules for the management of the College and for the conduct of their business, including the summoning and chairmanship of meetings, the deposit of money at a proper bank and the custody of documents.

28. The Governors may appoint such of their number as they think fit to form a Standing Committee, and may appoint such Sub-Committees as they consider necessary.

29. The Governors shall appoint some fit person to act as a Clerk or Secretary (to hold office at their pleasure) at such salary (if any) as may be approved by the Minister. Such Clerk or Secretary shall act as correspondent of the College.

30. Any question as to the construction of this (Instrument) (Scheme) or as to the validity of any act done or about to be done hereunder shall be determined conclusively by the Minister on application made to him for that purpose by the Governors.

31. The Interpretation Act, 1889, applies to the interpretation of this (Instrument) (Scheme) as it applies to an Act of Parliament.

C.C.T.C.

February, 1948

Council of the Church Training Colleges
Church House, Dean's Yard,
Westminster, S.W.1.

Secretary:

The Rev. R.W. Stopford, C.B.E., M.A.

Tel. ABBEY 4355

52/2

15th January, 1952

The Council of the Church Training Colleges, at its meeting on 6th December, 1951, gave further thought to the Draft Instrument of Government and instructed me to inform you that it is its considered opinion that Clauses 12(a) and 14(b) should be amended to read as follows:-

Clause 12(a)

The Governors shall appoint a suitable and duly qualified Principal of the College, who shall be a communicant member of the Church of England, and for that purpose shall take suitable measures to obtain applications from qualified candidates, which applications shall be considered by the Governors, who before making an appointment shall interview not less than three, if there be so many, of such applicants who appear to them to be likely to be qualified for the post. Neither the Principal nor any member of the Staff of the College shall be present at any meeting at which the candidates are interviewed or at which the appointment is made, and no business not immediately connected with the appointment to the Principalship shall be transacted at any such meeting.

Clause 14(b)

A resolution to dismiss the Principal shall not take effect unless it has been passed by not less than (two thirds) votes at a special meeting convened for that purpose, at which neither the Principal nor any member of the Staff of the College shall be present.

The Council suggested that the Governing Bodies of Colleges might wish to consider incorporating these amendments in existing or proposed Instruments of Government.

Yours sincerely,

APPENDIX TWO

Minutes of the meeting of the A.T.C.D.E. Committee
on the Government of Training Colleges held on 2nd May, 1956;
being Document 1 attached to the agenda for the A.T.C.D.E.
Executive Committee Meeting, 29th June, 1956

Minute 6. "Governing Bodies of Colleges - The Committee Reports
on the government of colleges

College A:- College is governed by Local Authority Training of Teachers Committee. Membership of this committee varies annually. Its administrative officer is the Deputy Director of Education. A House Committee has recently been established (a sub-committee of the Training of Teachers Committee) to deal with the institutional side of the College; the only members of this who attend meetings are local school representatives, a farmer, an ex-Treasurer of the County. The A.T.O. is not represented on the House Committee. All aspects of work in the College are controlled by the House Committee, including teaching practice and other educational matters; much is done without the knowledge of the Principal.

College B:- Governing Body a sub-committee of the Further Education Committee plus local representatives. A.T.O. not represented as such.

College C:- College has Governing Body. British and Foreign Society has some power, e.g. appoints Principal, but lecturers appointed by Governing Body. Principal is a member of Governing Body. A.T.O. is represented. Staff sends representations to the Governing Body.

College D:- Governing Body is a delegacy of the University; Chairman at present Vice Chancellor. Members of Governing Body: Chairman of Convocation, President of University, five members of the Senate, two representatives of L.C.C., one representative each of Kent, Surrey and Middlesex, two representatives of the Goldsmith^s Company, one or more professors of education, the Principal (ex officio). The College has Articles of Government. The Minutes of the Academic Board are sent to the Delegacy.

College E:- Governing Body consists of: Diocesan members, University members, representatives of neighbouring county authorities, members of old students' association, the Principal, 11 co-opted members (Church of England representatives, etc.; one member of staff). Correspondence between Governing Body and Academic Board. Appointment of staff made by Principal."

APPENDIX THREE

Appendix 2 to the Minutes of the Meeting of the A.T.C.D.E.
Committee on the Government of Training Colleges
of 6th February, 1959
A.T.C.D.E. Document dated 5.2.59

Extracts from letters from Principals, A.T.C.D.E. Correspondents
and a Director of an A.T.O.

County Councils preferred to County Boroughs

1. "The taking-over of the government of training colleges in the smaller boroughs and divisional executives if, for example, the L.C.C. were re-organised would be a retrograde step. There would be a great danger that the governing body of a college would consist of local interests, not mindful of the essential point that a Training College no matter by whom governed, is a national establishment, open to students from and supplying teachers to the whole country" (Principal of St. Mark and St. John College).
2. "... there was much more freedom when one was a little further from the centre of government and the County College was administered by an ad hoc governing body whose members had special experience to offer. The municipal college was administered by a sub-committee of the local education authority, most of whose members had no idea of the life and work of training colleges" (Principal of Derby Training College).

3. "... the general feeling was that there was no advantage in belonging to the smaller unit; in fact, a training college was better to be under a wider and larger authority" (College Correspondent; Phillippa Fawcett College).
4. "We recommend ... that County Councils are preferable to Borough Councils - the former are usually able to draw on larger and wider interests among people concerned" (College Correspondent, Bognor College).
5. "County Councils, for geographical reasons if no other (and London must be excepted in all matters of Gov./ Admin. for it is so different in character) are unable to meet very frequently. The normal pattern is about four meetings per year as compared with the Borough/ City Council which holds a monthly and sometimes fortnightly meeting. This fact makes greater delegation to Committees and sub-Committees inevitable in Counties and a Training College Committee would tend to have more powers, in the real sense of this word, of its own. This must, I feel, be reflected in the position and power of the Principals" (Principal of St. Katharine's College, Liverpool).
6. "Our experience of local government is a thoroughly happy one ... I have found County Council administration highly satisfactory" (Principal of Gipsy Hill College).

Proper Constitution of Governing Bodies

1. "Local government education committees are rarely well equipped to deal with primary and secondary education. It is most unlikely that they will provide from their number an adequate governing body for a training college. The governing body should be much broader based than is usual in local education authority colleges. It is sometimes only by chance that even the Institute of Education has a representative. As long as the local education committee is the preponderating influence this state of affairs will continue" (Principal of Bognor College).
2. "As much support as possible should be given for extending the influence of the Universities on the controlling body ... Colleges should be free to form their governing bodies from among people who are genuinely interested in education" (College Correspondent: Bognor College).
3. "What seems to me to be really important is that a concerted effort should be made to secure that every training college has its governing body" (Director of Sheffield Institute).
4. "I am certain that the efficient administration of Teacher Training by County Councils can never be satisfactory ... After the Governing Body, (a sub-Committee of the County Education Committee which has power only for expenditure up to £200 on a single item), all matters affecting the

College must go to the Further Education and Full Education Committee, and may go to the Sites and Building Committee or Establishment Committee, and/or to the Finance Committee and finally to the County Council. At any one of these, matters can be referred back to the College Governing Body ... The reference back at any stage may be the result of someone, often with some quite irrelevant axe to grind, asking a quite unexpected question and no one at the meeting has the necessary information about the College to provide the answer" (Principal of Exmouth College).

5. "The governing body is in effect a sub-committee of the Education Committee, and is extremely reluctant to co-opt members from outside, though it is free to do so. The main disadvantage of the situation is that discussion in the governors' meetings, as in the Education Committee is so highly coloured by political considerations. There is, too, general disadvantages of having decisions made about the college by local government officers and councillors who have no experience of the needs of a residential college, this being the only one with which they have contact" (Principal of Redland College).
6. "... if ever the Local Authority began to "work to rule" the position could probably change rapidly for the worse so that you must regard our Director, rather than our non-existent Articles of Government, as above reproach. For this reason, and at the appropriate time, we shall

probably ask for Articles of Government here which would fit in with the findings of the Committee when they are published" (Principal of Loughborough College).

Training College Grants Committee

(a) Considered favourably

1. "I think there is much to be said for the establishment of a Training College Grants Committee, which would make possible a more easily co-ordinated national system of teacher training than is at present possible. I think, for instance, that under such a scheme longer distance planning (as in the case of the quinquennial budgeting by the University Grants Committee) might be possible ... It would also bring training colleges more in line with the universities" (Principal of Leeds College).
2. "I take it that if there were such a Grants Committee it would function much as the present University Grants Committee which entails budgeting for quinquennia. Such a practice would be quite unworkable in the situation in which the colleges find themselves, where the Ministry of Education so frequently makes unexpected and sudden demands on resources. If one could be relieved of this hand to mouth procedure, I think it well might be a good thing to have a Training College Grants Committee" (Principal of Gipsy Hill College).

3. "I would press for serious consideration of the possibility of a Training Colleges Grants Committee ... The L.E.As have played their historical part in establishing Training Colleges since the 1902 Act, and the more progressive Authorities undertook the responsibility magnificently both in the post 1902 and the post 1944 periods. But the establishing of Training Colleges, the policy behind them, in, e.g. buildings, staffing and government admit of too wide a variation of attitude. With the block grant system this might well be aggravated.

Moreover, tied to the Ministry of Education and to the L.E.As the Colleges lack one of the essentials which contribute to the prestige of the Universities, their freedom from the inappropriate kind of control. The U.G.C. is responsible for the disbursement of millions of pounds annually to organisations which provide incomparably the most expensive form of education existing in this country, and would seem to be doing it economically and efficiently. And the economical and efficient budgeting and expenditure of each University is subject to the control and inspection of the U.G.C. which negotiates directly with the Treasury" (Principal of St. Mark and St. John College).

4. "I am not sure how far a Training College Grants Committee would improve matters. Everything would depend on the source of their income. L.E.As are going to begrudge

Training College contributions wherever they go. If there were direct payments by the Ministry or the Treasury to a Training College Grants Committee, there might be a very real advantage" (Principal of Redland College).

5. "Suggestions for an alternative form of administration for L.E.A. Colleges are not easy. For them to come directly under university rule would, I fear, lead to a poor relation status ... A Training College Regional Board is indicated, which would presumably have to be the A.T.O., but direct financial control by the university would, I consider, be undesirable. At this stage it would seem that an Independent Training College Grants Committee might operate advantageously" (Principal of Exmouth College).
6. "I feel that it would be a very much healthier situation for all Colleges to be free from the domination of purely local interests, and to have academic and administrative independence which is regarded as essential for the Universities ... The provision of Training Colleges needs to be seen from a completely national point of view" (Unattributed).

(b) Considered undesirable

1. "I find the present arrangement of financial and administrative control by a County, and professional and academic control by a University, creates an admirable

balance ... I am very doubtful of the advisability of establishing a Training College Grants Committee.

Local Education Authorities supply our raw material in the shape of pupils from their grammar schools and they are entitled to some say in the government and administration of those establishments which turn the raw material into the (more or less) finished product. I am afraid that if the government of Training Colleges were left entirely to the Universities, or to a Committee parallel to that of the university, the policy might become too academic, rather unrealistic and not related to the actual needs of schools" (Unattributed).

2. "The present grant system seems satisfactory ... I should be sorry to see a change" (Principal of Bognor College).
3. "... any attempt to ^spr~~i~~te the control of colleges out of the hands of either county boroughs or county councils would in my opinion be abortive" (Director, Sheffield Institute).

APPENDIX FOUR

Extract from the A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel Document C
circulated with the agenda for the Lecturers' Panel Meeting
of 14th October, 1960

The document includes the following examples of the arrangements for staff participation in the decision-making processes in two colleges. The two colleges are not identified by name.

College A

CONSTITUTION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

1. The Academic Board shall consist of the Principal and all members of the teaching staff.
2. It shall be the duty of the Board to meet for discussion in order to formulate and express corporate policy on academic matters, and to take part in the management of the College.
3. It shall meet at the time provided in the college timetable and at any time should need arise.
4. The chair may be taken by the Principal, or from time to time by any other member of the Board.
5. Items for the Agenda shall be submitted to the College Secretary by the day preceding the date of the meeting.
6. The Agenda should be circulated prior to the meeting.

7. Minutes of the meetings shall be recorded, and the Minute Book kept in the staff room so that it is available to all members.
-

College B

At _____ we have a Staff of 24 (including the Principal) and our full Staff Meetings are used to discuss all matters concerning the teaching and general management of the College, though not usually including hostel matters.

Meetings are held several times a Term, more or fewer according to need. All Members of Staff attend on equal footing. A simple Agenda is posted by the Principal before the meeting, and this includes any items which Members of Staff have proposed to hear. If there has been any Department discussion of these items before the meeting, this will have arisen in the normal discussions of Departmental planning and will have the full knowledge and consent of all in the Department. School Teaching arrangements will have been discussed with the Principal by the Education Tutors simply on account of their detail. We have not felt the need to divide into Departmental sections by formal arrangements, and we should rather regret such a separation of our interests.

Discussion at meetings is informal, and decisions are taken on all matters concerning courses, timetables, the position of students, etc.

We do keep brief Minutes, written by the Deputy Principal and available to the Staff at any time.

APPENDIX FIVE

Document C attached to the minutes of the
A.T.C.D.E. Lecturers' Panel Meeting of 12th May, 1961

Constitutions of Academic Boards at

- I. Dartford College of Physical Education
- II. Goldsmiths' College
- III. Worcester Training College

I. Academic Board of Dartford College of Physical Education

CONSTITUTION

- 1. The Academic Board shall consist of the Principal and all members of the lecturing staff.
- 2. It shall be the duty of the Board to meet for discussion in order to formulate and express a corporate policy on academic matters, and to take part in the management of the College.
- 3. It shall meet at the time provided in the college timetable and at any time should need arise.
- 4. The chair may be taken by the Principal, or from time to time by any other member of the Board.
- 5. Items for the Agenda shall be submitted to the College Secretary by the day preceding the date of the meeting.
- 6. The Agenda should be circulated prior to the meeting.
- 7. Minutes of the meetings shall be recorded, and the Minute Book kept in the staff room so that it is available to all members.

II. University of London - Goldsmiths' College Training Department

CONSTITUTION OF THE ACADEMIC BOARD

Voting Members

Ex Officio

- (i) The Warden
- (ii) The Vice Principals
- (iii) The Senior Tutor
- (iv) The recognised teachers of the University
- (v) Principal Lecturers in the Training Department who are appointed as Heads of Department and are paid a responsibility allowance
- (vi) The Librarian

Elected

- (vii) Six members elected by the Staff Council

Nominated

- (viii) Two members, other than those covered by (v) above, appointed by the Delegacy on the recommendation of the Warden after the election required by (vii)

Non Voting

- (ix) The Principal of the School of Art
- (x) The Head of the Evening Department of Adult Education

Terms of Reference

"The Delegacy shall consult the Academic Board on matters of educational policy and the Board shall be empowered to submit from time to time through the Warden,

representations to the Delegacy on the academic work of the College. The Board shall take into account the views expressed by the teaching staff of the Training Department at the Staff Council."

Standing Orders

- (a) Ordinary meetings of the Board shall be held at least once a term.
- (b) An extra-ordinary meeting may be summoned at any time by the Secretary on the direction of the Chairman or receipt of a written request from four or more members of the Board.
- (c) Notices of motions shall be sent to the Secretary at least a week before the date fixed for a meeting and the Agenda shall be circulated at least five days in advance.
- (d) The proceedings of the Board are to be regarded as confidential to members of the Staff Council. The Minutes of each meeting shall be recorded and a copy sent to each member of the Staff Council.
- (e) One half of the members shall constitute a quorum.
- (f) The Academic Board should have the power to appoint standing sub-Committees to advise it in relation to any matter affecting the academic welfare of the College.
- (g) Prior to the annual election to the Academic Board, the Constitution and terms of reference of the Academic Board and also its Standing Sub-Committees should be

notified to every member of the full-time teaching staff.

- (h) As far as possible meetings of Staff Council should precede meetings of the Academic Board.

Standing Sub-Committee

- (1) Library Committee (including Visual Aids Sub-Committee)
- (2) Post Graduate Course Sub-Committee
- (3) Arts Degree Sub-Committee

Membership for Session 1960-61

Members ex-officio, 13: Members elected by Staff, 6:

Members appointed by the Delegacy, 2.

III. City of Worcester Training College Academic Board

This Board is set up under the authority of section 17 of the Articles of Government for the City of Worcester Training College.

Constitution

1. Membership. The Principal, Vice-Principal and all full time members of the tutorial staff shall be members of the Board and such part-time members as the Board may co-opt.
2. Chairman. The Principal shall be chairman of the Board.
3. Secretary. A Secretary shall be elected by the Board from among its members at the first meeting in each

Academic Year. The Secretary shall hold office for one year and shall be eligible for re-election but shall not serve beyond a maximum of three consecutive years.

Functions of the Academic Board

1. The Board shall be responsible for the formulation of policy in relation to:-
 - (a) the curriculum to be followed by students taking courses provided by the College under regulations of the Birmingham University Institute of Education;
 - (b) the organisation of the timetable;
 - (c) the examination of students.
2. The Board shall be responsible for the examination of students taking the Certificate in Education and other courses in accordance with the regulations of the University of Birmingham Institute of Education including the approval of pass lists in the Practice of Teaching and the examination as a whole.
3. The Board may formulate an opinion on any matter connected with the academic work of the College as it thinks fit and on any question referred to it by the Principal or the Governing Body.
4. The Board may appoint such sub-committees as it considers necessary (a) to formulate advice in relation to any matter affecting the academic work of the College,

(b) to execute any policy decision requiring executive action.

Conduct of Business

1. Regular Meetings of the Academic Board shall be held at least once in each term. Meetings may be called at any time by the Chairman either on his own initiative or at the request of five or more members of the Board.
2. The agenda for each meeting shall be prepared by the Secretary in consultation with the Chairman and shall be published at least three days before the meeting is to take place. At least seven days notice of meetings shall be given except when circumstances make this impracticable.
3. Any member of the Board may submit items for inclusion in the agenda and must do so in writing to the Secretary at least five days before the meeting is to take place.
4. In the event of the absence of the Principal the chair will be taken by the Vice Principal. Should both Principal and Vice Principal be absent the Board shall proceed as its first item of business to elect one of its members to be chairman for the meeting.
5. All decisions shall be reached by a simple majority of those voting but shall not be valid unless the voting support for the decision exceeds 50% of the total membership of the Board.
6. The Chairman at any meeting shall have a vote as a member of the Board and also a casting vote.

7. The Secretary shall keep minutes of each meeting to include a complete record of all decisions reached by the Board. The minutes of each meeting shall be confirmed at the next meeting and a copy filed and made available for reference by any member of the Board.
8. All sub-committees appointed by the Board shall keep minutes of their meetings and shall report their decisions and recommendations to the Board at regular intervals.
9. The staff representative for the time being on the Professional Board of the University of Birmingham Institute of Education shall report its decisions to the Academic Board at regular intervals.
10. This constitution shall only be amended, after due notice has been given, by a vote of two-thirds of the total membership of the Board.

APPENDIX SIX

Joint letter dated 23rd December, 1963, sent to the Prime Minister,
Sir Alec Douglas-Home, by the County Councils Association,
Association of Municipal Corporations, Association of
Education Committees, Welsh Joint Education Committee and
London County Council

(To be found in the A.T.C.D.E. Archives attached to the Executive Committee Minutes 3/1/64; and under Minute 5, Report of the General Purposes Committee, A.E.C. Executive Minutes, 31st January, 1964, inset in Education, Vol. 123, No. 3189, 6th March, 1964, page 457)

"The Associations of local education authorities and education committees and the London County Council - from now on described, for simplicity, as the Associations - have been asked to inform Her Majesty's Government of their views on the arrangements recommended by the Robbins Committee for the future supply, education and professional training of teachers in England and Wales. While each Association will inform the Minister of Education of their views as soon as they have studied the recommendations in their totality, the expansion of training college facilities is of such crucial importance that they have had immediate consultations on this aspect of the Robbins recommendations so that they could give their joint views on it to the Government at once.

The Associations agree with the views of the Robbins Committee on the expansion of the colleges. Under the current programme 27,500 students will be entering the colleges by 1968; the Committee recommend that by 1974 the entry should be 40,000. This rate of growth, they say, is the fastest practicable but they regretfully conclude that it is too slow to meet the full needs of the schools. Yet it has to be

achieved at a time of unprecedented expansion in universities and, indeed, according to the plans of the Government, in the whole public sector of capital investment. Thus speed and value for money will be more than ever needed in the training college programme.

The Associations agree, too, with the Robbins Committee on the importance of developments within the colleges. Far more of their students should have the opportunity to take degrees and as successive educational reports have shown, the rapidly changing needs of schools and further education are making fresh demands on the colleges. This, too, at a time when the universities and technical institutions are under comparable pressures.

In a situation of such challenging educational and building demands, it is imperative that the Ministry of Education, local education authorities, universities, colleges and schools should work in closest co-operation and each partner should be as free as possible to apply their peculiar resources and skills where they can be most effective. None should have their energies diverted to tasks which others can do better or which do not immediately further the main aims they have in common.

Against this background, the Association wish to bring three major points to your attention:

First, many of the Robbins recommendations have to be worked out in detail before their combined effect can be assessed. For their part the Associations, in view of the statutory responsibilities of local education authorities, will wish to be assured that the supply of teachers would respond quickly to the changing needs of schools and further education. For that they will require to know more about

such matters as the proposed arrangements for earmarked grants, the complicated consultative machinery, the position of the smaller colleges, especially those where no degree work would be taken, the colleges for housecraft, for physical education, for mature students and for technical teachers. Discussion of these and many other points will take time. Meanwhile the expansion programme demands action.

Secondly, under the Robbins proposals about 100 colleges maintained by local education authorities would be transferred to independent governing bodies. This involves the making of separate trust deeds, conveyances, constitutions and articles of government, transfer of staff at many levels, new salary and superannuation arrangements and so on. In most cases contractual and architectural responsibilities would also have to be transferred. The recent transfer of a mere handful of colleges of advanced technology has shown how burdensome and time consuming these administrative formalities are. Simultaneously the University Grants Committee, the universities and the training colleges would have to create and man new administrative machinery. All these efforts would hinder, not further, the expansion of the colleges and the educational developments within them.

Thirdly, the Robbins Committee have pointed out the striking increase in training college places since the war; while the number of university students has doubled the number in training colleges has increased fourfold. This expansion has had at its back the initiative and resources of local education authorities and all the advantages that flow from the close partnership between authorities and the Ministry of Education with its well known success in educational building. The Associations and their members would be deeply troubled if at this critical moment in the development of higher education and

the supply of teachers, those advantages were to be abruptly ended and the colleges deprived of the wide range of resources and skills that local education authorities can provide. If this were to happen, it is most unlikely that the present rate of growth could be kept up or the same value for money obtained; it is certain that the combined resources and skills of the educational world would not be deployed to the best advantage.

In the light of these considerations the Associations strongly believe that two things need to be done immediately and without prejudice to the long term decisions on the Robbins recommendations. First, it should be agreed that during the period of rapid expansion administrative and financial responsibility for the colleges should remain as at present. Secondly, action should be taken to increase the independence and academic status of the colleges. For this the Associations recognise that a special responsibility rests with them and their members. On the academic side they would welcome early discussions with the Minister, the universities and the colleges. On the administrative side they propose forthwith to examine on a national basis the existing arrangements for colleges maintained by local education authorities with particular reference to the freedom and responsibility of their governing bodies. As a first step, they are inviting representatives of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education to meet them at the earliest opportunity.

A copy of this letter has been sent to the Minister of Education. Further copies have been sent to his Department with a request that they be forwarded to all the other bodies whose views have been invited by the Government."

APPENDIX SEVEN

Extract from a letter sent to the Prime Minister by the A.T.C.D.E.
dated 3rd February, 1964 concerning the joint letter of
Associations of Local Education Authorities and Education
Committees dated 23rd December, 1963

(To be found as Document B to the A.T.C.D.E. Executive Minutes,
6.3.64)

"They* have urged that colleges are not fitted to undertake the plans for expansion during the coming years and, in particular, that they need the expertise of the architects' departments of the local education authorities. This argument ignores two facts: that the colleges are disposed among a large number of authorities many of whom have no such resources and, indeed in many cases colleges have had the major responsibility for planning; and that for many years the voluntary colleges have successfully carried out plans in the way suggested by the Robbins Committee. They have dealt with large sums of money and with extensive building operations. Given adequate machinery, administrative and financial responsibility could well be undertaken by Colleges of Education within Schools of Education.

It is assumed by local education authorities that conditions have in general been satisfactory for the colleges, but this is not the case. We fully appreciate the happy relations existing between some authorities and the colleges under their administration, but we would point out that in a considerable number of cases, colleges have been hampered in administration by the fact that they are subject to the standing orders of the local council, and to regulations applying to all educational institutions within the authority. We feel bound

* the l.e.a. associations.

to add that there are also a certain number of authorities which are illiberal in outlook and administration.

On the question of supply, we believe that if the machinery suggested by the Robbins Report were established, co-operation would be possible between all those concerned in meeting the national need. We are confident, too, that if colleges were granted the full university status which in their opinion is the proper development from the McNair position, they would approach the problem with determination and good heart. On them will fall the immediate burden of carrying out the training of teachers.

We are, of course, as much aware as the local authorities that changes of this magnitude could not take place suddenly, and that a transition stage would in practice be necessary; but we are convinced that the principle of administrative control through Schools of Education must be established as the first step.

Finally, we firmly believe that the Robbins Report through its recommendations offers at last a coherent and unified national scheme for Colleges of Education, and we further hold that by full representation on appropriate bodies and committees, the contribution of the local education authorities through their particular expertise and experience could be no less important and significant."

APPENDIX EIGHT

Statement by the Secretary of State for Education and Science
on the Future of Teacher Training Colleges
in England and Wales

The Government have now had an opportunity of considering the recommendations of the Committee on Higher Education, presided over by Lord Robbins, on the future of the teacher training colleges in England and Wales. They have taken account of the views expressed on this matter by the various interested bodies since the Report's publication a year ago.

The main recommendations of Lord Robbins' Committee on this matter were that the training colleges should be enabled to provide for suitable students a four year course leading to a university degree as well as a professional qualification and that the colleges should be given independent governing bodies and be federated in "Schools of Education" of the universities through which the colleges would be administered and financed by means of an earmarked grant made by the University Grants Committee.

There has been widespread agreement with the Robbins proposals for closer academic links between the training colleges and the universities, including the grant of degrees. For their part the Government share the view that wider opportunities should be provided for suitable training college students to obtain a degree together with a professional teaching qualification by means of a four year course. They would think it appropriate that the relationship between the universities and training colleges already existing should be

further extended in the academic sphere through the development of the present institutes of education. They are glad to know that most universities have expressed their readiness to consider making degrees available to suitable students, subject to appropriate arrangements for the safeguard of standards, and they hope that the universities will now proceed to work out with the colleges the form which such courses should take and the nature of the degrees to be awarded.

There has been far less agreement over the Robbins Committee's proposals for the administration and finance of the training colleges. The Government, after considering the advice given them by the University Grants Committee, have concluded that the academic, and the administrative and financial aspects are separable, and that fundamental changes should not be made in the administrative and financial structure of the teacher training system, particularly at a time when the colleges are engaged in a very large and rapid expansion, and when the problems of teacher supply are especially difficult. They have, therefore, decided that for the present the colleges should continue to be administered by the existing maintaining bodies under the present system of overall supervision. They intend, however, to secure that the present arrangements for the internal government of colleges are reviewed forthwith by all those concerned in the light of the Robbins Committee's recommendations on this subject. The Government also agree with the Committee that the training colleges could appropriately be renamed "Colleges of Education".

APPENDIX NINE

Extracts taken from "The Government of Colleges of Education"

(A memorandum prepared for discussion at the D.E.S. Study Group - Appendix 1 of C.I.D./C.H.U.D.E./A.T.C.D.E. Liaison Committee 29/3/65)

"The following typical extracts are quoted verbatim from the reports made by colleges. (a) The majority of them illustrate conditions which are felt to be inimical to the growth and development of the college. Additional specific instances are given in an appendix. (b) There are some, however, which point the way towards liberal and generous conditions which will, we hope, be common to all colleges and governing bodies in the future. The examples given refer to procedures, supplies, repairs, appointments both academic and non-academic, and the composition of governing bodies."

(a)

College 1. "Standing orders define the number of committees through which resolutions of the Governors must pass before becoming effective. Here the Governors are a sub-committee of the Further Education Committee, and the minutes go to that Committee. From there they go to the Education Committee and from there to the County Council. The administrators take risks on implementation of decisions once they are past the Further Education Committee, but anything of major importance would need to go to the Education Committee itself and matters such as estimates to the County Council. In addition to this wearisome journey, all ancillary staff, even maids, are referred to the Establishments Committee. Matters of policy, especially in comparison with other Colleges, are often

referred to the Policy Committee and above all, all purchases have to go to the Purchasing Committee of the County Supplies Department. You can imagine what happens in this complicated situation."

College 2. "Sound administration depends on direct responsibility, direct negotiations and above all on unity. This College is subject to the Clerk of the County Council, the Chief Education Officer, the County Architect, the County Surveyor, the County Mining Engineer, etc., etc.! All seem to have authority in their own right. For example, it seems difficult for the County Education Officer to ensure that the County Architect does what the Governors really want. The Clerk can cut across any or all of the decisions of these officers. Communication between them obviously fails. This has just been a very big contributory factor with regard to the delay in our new building project."

College 3. "A discussion was held on the way in which a new Governing Body - responsible only for this college - could be constituted, and it has been agreed that the Standing Orders of the City Council can be suspended for this body, which need not have more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of its members from the elected representatives of the corporation. Representation has been extended from the University, the Teaching Profession, etc., and most important of all, from the Academic Board of the college which now has two representatives, and I, myself, am now a full member of the body, so that the college staff have three full representatives.

The Director of Education also attempted to obtain a greater measure of financial freedom, and also a greater measure of freedom

to appoint non-academic staff outside the structure of the Local Authority employees.

The results so far have been entirely negative on these last two points. The Governing Body of the College in fact in spite of its changed position remains a Sub-Committee of the Local Authority and all its decisions are subject to confirmation by various Committees of the Corporation."

College 4. "The college is not allowed to get in touch directly with any other Department of the L.E.A. other than the Education Department. Nor must it get in touch with the Department of Education and Science with the exception of the College H.M.I. This causes interminable delays, and interferes with the confidential relationships between Principal and students.

The application forms and references of all grades of staff are kept in the Town Hall, so that it is not easy to refer to them. All interviewing is in the hands of a largish Staffing Sub-Committee.

The College cannot place an advertisement in a paper. All draft advertisements must be sent to the Higher Education Department, and after approval they are sent to the Education Stationery Department who will send them to the appropriate papers. Several times advertisements have been "corrected" at some point after leaving the College, resulting in something which was not intended. After protest, the Town Hall has always been willing to insert an amended advertisement but this has caused delay and frustration."

College 5. "Finance. The regrading of posts recommended by the Governors has been referred back by the Establishment Committee. This resulted in a delay of 21 months in one case before final approval was received. Special Allowances for Heads of large departments were objected to by the Finance Committee owing to a complete lack of understanding.

Staffing. The fact that academic appointments are in the hands of the Governing Body and not in a specially appointed sub-committee means that for any interview any Governor may decide to attend. They do not delegate their power to appoint, and expect to arrive at a decision on the spot. This is normally possible, but makes it difficult for the Principal to have further discussion with her colleagues and time for reflection, if any particular problem presents itself."

College 6. "Library Books. The College is bound by the L.E.A. contract to produce all books from one supplier. We cannot buy any books, even in an emergency anywhere else. We employ a qualified full-time Librarian who is also a Cambridge graduate in English and much of his time is wasted in dealing with a firm who are not Library Suppliers in the full meaning of that term and who cannot provide the service we need. Despite many discussions with the Authority it has proved impossible so far to obtain any freedom of action outside the contract which is primarily arranged for the schools and the supply of their text books.

Catering and Food Supplies. The College is bound by contracts negotiated for school meals. There is no consultation between the

College and the L.E.A. before these contracts are placed and they are frequently unsuitable for a residential college serving all meals on seven days a week.

Leave of absence for further study. A lecturer in Music who had already passed the Intermediate examination for B.Mus. degree applied for leave of absence to complete the course. The Department of Education and Science agreed, but the L.E.A. refused on the grounds that he already held a First Degree in Classics and an L.R.A.M. and that teachers generally were not granted paid study leave for second or higher degrees. Here again, the policy of the L.E.A. as laid down for teachers in the schools was applied to the training college and this decision has been a great handicap to us in carrying out work of an advanced standard."

College 7. "Clerical staff are appointed to the service of the authority and not to the College. In theory they could be moved anywhere within the Education Department. In practice the views of the Principal are consulted, but this does tend to divide the loyalty."

College 8. "One further problem in relation to the Constitution of the Governing Body is that because the City Council and the Finance Committee have so much power, and because Governors' decisions are so frequently reversed and so much time is spent on talking about unimportant matters that should never be discussed, the really competent members of the Governing Body, mostly co-opted, cease to attend. They are often busy people, some of them with University commitments and they cannot afford to waste so much time."

(b)

College 1. "Standing Orders. I have not found any local restrictions here.

Finance. It is only where large items are concerned that we have delays. When it comes to furnishing, equipping and layout we are glad to have the technical experts who can advise, and we don't have to take their advice. In small items we spend our budget as we decide. A capitation fee is given to us, which the finance sub-committee of the Academic Board divides up between departments. Governors are responsible for the way we handle our budget, and do not ask for more than regular reports.

Supplies. There is no evidence of undue delay here and sometimes the Supplies Department advises us to go direct to an outside firm to save time.

Membership of the Governing Body. The principal and two members of the staff are full members of the Governing Body."

College 2. "We do, in fact, have the best of both worlds, partly due to the policy of the L.E.A., which places great reliance on the voluntary principle, partly because we are extremely fortunate in our Governing Body.

College 3. "Finance. My governing body has full power to spend, having obtained the necessary teachers, etc., all the money agreed by estimate, and this of course is over £400,000 a year. This means in turn that they delegate all the final ordering to me, helped of course by my registrar, but that they trust me to put bigger items to the governors for their approval.

Appointment of Staff. The governing body has complete power over the appointing and establishment of tutorial staff and over the appointing of all other staff."

College 4. "Governing Body. The Governing Body is required to meet not less than three times a year, and actually meets four times. I am not a member of the Governing Body but I attend all the meetings.

Finance. In October of each year, I am asked to submit estimates in draft, and these are discussed first at an informal meeting which I attend with the Assistant Director of Education and his clerk, a member of the County Architect's Department, the Works Manager and his assistant. Repairs and maintenance of buildings, grounds, playing fields, etc. are the main concern at this stage. Plans for capital expenditure on buildings or land will already have been discussed at meetings which I attend.

I have never experienced any difficulty on estimates and once the estimates have been approved I can place orders within those estimates without further reference to the Governing Body, provided no single item costs more than £150."

Appendix

College 1. "Problem.

Sept. 1961 Urgent need for shelving in Library.

Procedure

Oct. 1961 Put in estimates.

Dec. 1961 Governors approve estimates.

May 1962 Receive information that Education Committee has approved estimates but no action may be taken until capital loan is raised.

Sept. 1962 Capital loan raised.

Shelving put out to tender (and tender not given to firm which did original shelving so new shelves do not match).

Dec. 1962 Governors accept tender (Item over £100).

Jan. 1963 Education Committee confirms above. Order placed.

Mar. 1963 Shelves received.

Similar case histories could be presented for movie camera, teaching machine, photo-copier, etc."

College 2. "Subject of enquiry - 12 Shuttlecocks.

Your Requisition No. 831

A complaint from the auditors that we should always issue an order before the receipt of goods coincided with the arrival of this requisition.

I am to enquire

- (i) Why it was not possible to issue the order before the goods were received.
- (ii) Why the shuttles were ordered from X instead of the approved supplier Y.
- (iii) Why X's a/c is made out to the "Men's Sports Club".
- (iv) Why X's a/c is a private white a/c instead of a yellow a/c for official goods."

College 3. "Requisition. In the matter of requisition of art and craft equipment, three quotations for each small item of expenditure e.g. one pen knife, one $\frac{1}{4}$ " wood chisel, one hack saw are required, with the further implication that the lowest estimate will be accepted."

College 4. "You will know that we have a highly qualified Drama staff, and that we have just developed an experimental drama studio. The staff recommended that the fitting should be carried out by an expert firm whom they trusted, and who carry out seventy-five per cent of the expert work in theatres throughout the country. It was necessary that there should be two competitive tenders. There was little in the tenders, and another firm obtained the contract. The work has been badly done and the result is substandard in many respects."

College 5. "Apart from the twenty-one L.E.A. members of the Governing Body, the only academic member is one representative appointed by the Institute of Education.

If there was a much stronger academic representation on the Governing Body, including College staff representatives, and a greater willingness by the Governors to delegate, we probably already have the basis of an administrative framework which could fairly easily be adapted to suit our needs. The College Academic Board is still in an experimental stage. Its existence is recognised by the Governors, but its composition needs reconsideration, so as to be more fully representative of the staff as a whole, and its responsibilities would then be extended and more precisely defined."

College 6. "The College opened in September 1963, and is still without a Board of Governors and Instrument of Government. At present we are managing with a panel of Councillors. The majority of this panel are members of the F.E. Committee, and I have no recollection of them meeting specifically as a Board of Governors since September 1963, only as a sub-Committee of the F.E. Committee.

Ever since the College opened, except on one occasion, the Principal has never been invited to discuss College business with the Chairman.

As a result of the May elections, there have been several changes in the Committee membership, with a new Chairman and Vice Chairman."

College 7. "Standing Orders. Leave of absence has to be obtained for every engagement which a member of staff undertakes outside College premises, excluding visits to schools for teaching practice purposes.

The Director (of the Institute of Education) feels obliged to request leave of absence for the Principal to attend the Principal's Panel, for all members of staff, including the Principal, to attend meetings of the Professional Committee of the Institute of Education and its sub-committees, including the Board of Studies and the Board of Examiners."

APPENDIX TEN

Annex to Circular 2/67

	Relevant paragraph in Study Group Report	Points to be covered
1. Interpretation		
2. Conduct of colleges	19	Formal requirements to comply with Education Acts, Regulations made under the Acts, and regulations of Area Training Organisation or other relevant body
3. Academic Board	109-114	Provision for constitution of Board by Governing Body
4. Organisation and Curriculum (including teaching practice and terms and holidays)	20-21, 24-27	Respective functions of the L.E.A., Governing Body, Academic Board and Principal
5. Establishment	32-33, 45-47	(i) Teaching staff, (ii) non-teaching staff: functions of L.E.A., Governing Body and, in relation to (i), Academic Board
6. Appointment, suspension and dismissal of staff	34-44, 48-53	Teaching and non-teaching staff
7. Finance	14, 54-74	Preparation and submission of estimates, virement, accounting, supplies

8. Premises and Equipment	75-80	Responsibility for upkeep, use, repairs and alterations
9. Admission, suspension and dismissal of students	28-30	Respective functions of Governing Body, Academic Board and Principal
10. Association and representation of students	31	
11. Clerk to the Governors	115-125	
12. Returns		
13. Copies of Articles		
14. Date of Articles		

APPENDIX ELEVEN

Model Scheme of Government for Voluntary Colleges of Education

The model is drafted in the form of a scheme under the 1960 Charities Act. It was circulated to Voluntary Colleges with College Letter No. 7/67 dated 21st March, 1967: Department reference R 436 (3)/42.

I

INSTRUMENT OF GOVERNMENT

The College

1. In this Scheme the expression "The College" means the [.....]

Administration

2. The College and its endowments shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this Scheme by the Governing Body hereinafter constituted [as the Administering Trustees thereof] under the name of [.....] or such other name as the Governing Body with the approval of the Secretary of State for Education and Science (hereinafter called "the Secretary of State") shall decide.

*

[Custodian Trustee

3. The Body Corporate called shall be the Custodian Trustee of the College and its endowments and the provisions of Section 4(2) of the Public Trustee Act 1906 shall apply accordingly to the said Board and the said Governing Body as they apply respectively to the Public Trustee and managing trustees].

Governing Body

4. (i) The Governing Body of the College hereinafter called "the Governors" shall when complete consist of not more than (.....) persons as follows:-

(a) ——— members representative of the (providing body)

.....

(b) ——— members representative of Universities

.....

(c) ——— members representative of local education authorities

.....

(d) The Principal and (.....) members of the staff of the College elected by the Academic Board constituted in accordance with Clause 25 hereof.

(e) Not more than members (not being members of the teaching staff) co-opted by the Governors at a duly constituted meeting.

(ii) A Representative Governor need not be a member of the body which he is appointed to represent.

(iii) The Governors shall be appointed for a period of three years.

(iv) Retiring Governors shall be eligible for re-appointment.

(v) The first Chairman of the Governors shall be and thereafter the Governors at their first meeting in each year shall elect from among the Representative and co-opted Governors a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman who shall be eligible for re-election.

Alteration of Governing Body

5. The foregoing clause may on the application of the Governors be altered from time to time by Order of the Secretary of State.

First Governors and Meeting

6. (i) The first Governors to be appointed under this Scheme shall be appointed as soon as possible after the date of this Scheme and their names shall be notified to the Clerk of the Governors.

(ii) The first meeting of the said Governors shall be summoned by the Clerk as soon as conveniently may be after all the Representative Governors have been appointed or if he fails to summon a meeting for two months after the appointment of all the Representative Governors by any two Governors.

Transfer of Administration to Governors

7. Until the opening of the first meeting of the Governors appointed under this Scheme the present Governors shall administer the College in accordance with the Scheme.

Declaration by Governors

8. No person shall be entitled to act as a Governor whether on a first or any subsequent entry into office until he has signed a declaration of acceptance and willingness to act in the trusts of this Scheme.

Governors not to be personally interested in the Foundation

9. Except in special circumstances with the approval in writing of the Secretary of State no Governor shall take or hold any interest in any property belonging to the College otherwise than as a trustee for

the purposes thereof or receive any remuneration (other than that payable in respect of salary or other emoluments as Principal or member of staff of the College) or be interested in the supply of work or goods at the cost of the College.

Determination of Governorship

10. Any Governor other than a Governor ex officio who is absent from all meetings of the Governors during a period of one year except for a reason approved by the Governors and any Governor who is adjudicated a bankrupt or who is incapacitated from acting or who resigns by notice in writing to the Governors shall cease to be a Governor.

Vacancies

11. Every vacancy in the office of Representative or elected Governor shall as soon as possible be notified to the proper appointing or electing body and any competent Governor may be re-appointed or re-elected. A Governor appointed or elected to fill a casual vacancy shall hold office only for the unexpired term of office of the Governor in whose place he is appointed or elected.

Chairman

12. If the Chairman is absent from any Meeting the Vice Chairman shall take the Chair. In the absence of both the Chairman and the Vice Chairman the Governors present shall before any other business is transacted choose one of their members (not being the Principal or a member of the staff of the College) to preside at that meeting.

Meeting of Governors

13. The Governors shall hold meetings at least three times in each year and a special meeting may at any time be summoned by any [...] Governors or by the Chairman upon [...] clear days' notice being given to the other Governors of the matters to be discussed.

Quorum and Voting

14. (i) There shall be a quorum when [...] Governors are present at a meeting and every matter shall be determined by the majority of the Governors present and voting on the question.

(ii) In the case of equality of votes the Chairman of the meeting shall have a second or casting vote.

Proceedings of Governors

15. The proceedings of the Governors shall not be invalidated by any failure to appoint or any defect in the appointment, election or qualification of any Governor.

Rescinding Resolutions

16. Any resolution of the Governors may be rescinded or varied at a subsequent meeting if due notice of the intention to rescind or vary the same has been given in writing to all the Governors.

Adjournment of Meetings

17. If at any time appointed for a meeting a sufficient number of Governors to form a quorum is not present the meeting shall stand adjourned sine die and a special meeting shall be summoned as soon as conveniently may be. Any meeting may be adjourned by resolution.

Procedure at Meetings

18. (i) Unless invited by a Resolution of the other Governors present at the meeting to remain any Governor who is a member of the staff of the College shall withdraw from that part of any meeting of the Governors or a committee of the Governors at which there is consideration of the appointment or promotion of a person to a post senior to that which is held by him, or consideration of the suspension, dismissal or retirement of a person holding such a post.

(ii) Except as provided by Clause 23 of this Scheme, such a Governor shall not take part in that part of any meeting of the Governors at which there is consideration of his suspension, dismissal or retirement.

(iii) Any such Governor to whom notice of the termination of his contract has been given by the Governors shall withdraw from that part of any such meeting as aforesaid at which there is consideration of the appointment of his successor.

II

ARTICLES OF GOVERNMENT

Conduct of College

19. (i) The College shall be maintained in buildings to be provided at or in other suitable buildings elsewhere provided as a College for the training of teachers.

(ii) The College shall be conducted in accordance with the Education Acts 1944 to 1967 as amended by any subsequent enactment

and with any regulations for the training of teachers made under them by the Secretary of State [and with the regulations of the Area Training Organisation of which the College is a member] and subject thereto the College shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of this Scheme.

College Establishment

20. (i) The Governors shall determine the total number of teaching staff and the number of lecturers in each grade.

(ii) The allocation of the members of staff and grades of lecturers to departments and subjects shall be made by the Governors on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

Appointment of Staff

21. (i) The Governors shall at a duly constituted meeting appoint suitable and duly qualified persons to be Principal, Deputy Principal, and Senior Administrative Officer of the College. The Governors shall [consult (the providing body) before appointing the Principal and shall] take suitable measures to obtain applications from qualified candidates and interview not less than three such applicants, if there be so many, as appear to them to be qualified for the post before appointing

(a) the Principal or Senior Administrative Officer

(b) as Deputy Principal a person who is not a member
of the teaching staff.

(ii) Appointments of Principal Lecturers and of Senior Lecturers in charge of departments shall be made by the Governors on the recommendation of a Selection Committee appointed from time to time

consisting of the Principal as Chairman and [....] other persons of whom half the number shall be appointed by the Governors and half shall be appointed by the Academic Board from among the members of the teaching staff.

(iii) Other appointments to, and promotion of members of, the teaching staff shall be made by the Principal on behalf of the Governors.

(iv) The procedure for other appointments shall be laid down by the Governors.

Contracts of Employment of Staff

22. All persons employed by the Governors on the teaching staff of the College and all persons employed as senior members of the non-teaching staff as defined by the Governors (hereinafter called "the senior non-teaching staff") shall serve under a written contract [of service with the Governors] [which shall appoint them to the service of (the providing body)]. In the case of teaching staff the contract shall be in conformity with any regulations made by the Secretary of State for the training of teachers and in the case of both teaching staff and senior non-teaching staff the contract shall be in conformity with the next following clauses relating to dismissal and suspension.

Dismissal of Staff

Version A

23. (i) The appointment of any member of the teaching staff and any member of the senior non-teaching staff may be terminated by a [Staff] [Disciplinary] Committee comprising not less than [.....] Governors,

either by notice in accordance with his contract or without notice for misconduct or other good and urgent cause.

(ii) A resolution of the Committee terminating the appointment of any such member shall be subject to confirmation by the Governors at a duly constituted meeting.

(iii) The member shall be entitled to appear accompanied if so desired by a friend at any meeting of the Committee and the Governors convened to consider the termination of his appointment.

Version B

23. (i) The appointment of any member of the teaching staff and any member of the senior non-teaching staff may be terminated by the Governors at a duly constituted meeting either by notice in accordance with his contract or without notice for misconduct or other good and urgent cause.

(ii) A resolution of the Governors terminating the appointment of any such member shall be subject to confirmation by the providing body.

(iii) The member shall be entitled to appear accompanied if so desired by a friend at any meeting of the Governors convened to consider the termination of his appointment.

Version C

23. (i) The appointment of any member of the teaching staff and any member of the senior non-teaching staff may be terminated by the Governors at a duly constituted meeting either by notice in accordance with his contract or without notice for misconduct or other good and urgent cause.

(ii) A resolution of the Governors terminating the appointment of any such member shall be subject to confirmation by them at a duly

constituted meeting held not less than fourteen days after the meeting at which the resolution was passed and shall not be confirmed unless -

(a) the member has been notified that he may refer the question of his dismissal to ~~the~~ tribunal; and, if he so refers it,

(b) the Governors have considered any report made by ~~the~~ tribunal.

(iii) The member shall be entitled to appear accompanied if so desired by a friend at any meeting of the Governors convened to consider the termination of his appointment.

Suspension of Staff

24. (i) The Principal, the Deputy Principal and Senior Administrative Officer may be suspended from duty by the Chairman of the Governors, or in the absence of the Chairman by the Vice Chairman, for misconduct or other good and urgent cause provided that the Chairman or as the case may be the Vice Chairman shall report such suspension as soon as practicable to an ordinary or a special meeting of the Governors summoned under clause 13 of this Scheme.

(ii) Any other member of the teaching staff and any other member of the senior non-teaching staff may be suspended from duty by the Principal, or in the absence of the Principal by the Chairman of the Governors for misconduct or other good and urgent cause provided that the Principal or as the case may be the Chairman shall report such suspension as soon as practicable to an ordinary or a special meeting of the Governors summoned under clause 13 of this Scheme.

Academic Board

25. There shall be an Academic Board in the College comprising the Principal (who shall be Chairman), the Deputy Principal and other members of the academic staff appointed in accordance with arrangements made by the Governors at a duly constituted meeting. The Board shall have the powers and duties set out herein together with any further powers and duties delegated to it by the Governors. It shall also have the right to make representations to the Governors on any academic matter.

Admission, Suspension and Dismissal of Students

26. (i) The Principal in consultation with the Academic Board of the College shall regulate the admission of students to the College. He shall comply with any direction given by the Secretary of State as to the numbers and categories of students to be admitted and no student shall be refused admission to the College on other than reasonable grounds.

(ii) The Principal shall have power to suspend students for any adequate cause to be judged by him. Upon suspending any student the Principal shall at once report the facts to the Chairman of the Governors or in the absence of the Chairman to the Vice Chairman.

(iii) A student may be expelled by the Governors:-

(a) for misconduct, on the recommendation of the Principal acting with the advice of a committee appointed to advise on the discipline of the College.

(b) for unsatisfactory standard of work, on the recommendation of the Academic Board.

No student shall be expelled without being afforded an opportunity of appearing in person accompanied if so desired by a friend before a duly constituted meeting of the Governors. Any case of expulsion must at once be reported to the Secretary of State.

Representation of Students

27. The Principal shall with the approval of the Governors make arrangements for the association or other independent body representing the students to conduct and manage its own affairs and funds. The arrangements shall include provision whereby representations on matters of proper concern to the students may be made on their behalf to the Governors, the Academic Board or the Principal as may be appropriate.

Register of Students

28. The Principal shall cause to be kept a suitable register of all the students attending the College.

Religious Worship and Instruction

29. The religious worship and instruction in the College shall be in accordance with the doctrine rites and practices of the [....] but any student who claims exemption on the ground that he does not belong to [....] shall not be required as a condition of entering or continuing in the College to comply with any rules of the College as to the attendance at religious worship or observance or instruction in religious subjects.

Curriculum and Teaching

30. Subject to the provisions of this Scheme, of any regulations for the training of teachers made by the Secretary of State [and of the regulations of the Area Training Organisation of which the College is a member] :-

- (i) the Governors shall prescribe the reports to be made to them by the Principal, which shall include an annual report on the work of the Academic Board;
- (ii) the Academic Board of the College shall
 - (a) prescribe a curriculum for use in the College which shall include a systematic study of the principles and practice of teaching;
 - (b) make arrangements for the examination of the students of the College in the courses taken by them;
 - (c) make arrangements for students to obtain practice in teaching under proper supervision in schools approved for that purpose;
- (iii) the Principal shall make arrangements for College terms, vacations and occasional holidays.

Premises

31. (i) The Governors shall secure that the College premises are kept in good repair and condition and that the furnishings and equipment are suitable and adequate and that the College premises furnishings and equipment are adequately insured.

(ii) The Governors shall in consultation with the Principal make arrangements for the choice and supervision of lodgings outside the College which may be acquired for the accommodation of students.

Internal Organisation and Discipline

32. Subject to any rules prescribed by or under the authority of this Scheme and the Regulations for the Training of Teachers made by the Secretary of State the Principal shall have under his control the internal organisation and discipline of the College.

Determination of Fees

33. The Governors shall, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, fix the tuition and boarding fees payable in respect of students of the College.

Income and Expenses

34. (i) The Governors shall receive all fees payable in respect of students, all grants and loans made by the Secretary of State and all donations given to the College.

(ii) The Governors shall pay all expenses connected with the College.

Accounts, Estimates and Minutes

35. (i) The Governors shall keep true accounts of their income and expenditure in such forms as the Secretary of State may require and shall forward copies thereof to him at such times as he may direct.

(ii) Annual estimates shall be prepared by the Principal in consultation where appropriate with the Academic Board for the

consideration and approval of the Governors and submission by them to the Secretary of State.

(iii) The Governors shall keep a minute book.

Further Endowments

36. The Governors may receive any additional donations or endowments for the general purposes of the College and they may also receive donations or endowments for any special objects connected with the College not inconsistent with or calculated to impede the due working of the provisions of this Scheme.

Rules

37. Subject to the provisions of this Scheme the Governors shall have full power to make rules for the management of the College and for the conduct of their business including the summoning of meetings, the deposit of money at a proper bank and custody of documents.

Committees

38. Subject to the provisions of this Scheme the Governors may appoint such Committees as they consider necessary and refer or delegate any matters to them.

Clerk

39. The Senior Administrative Officer of the College shall act as Clerk of the Governors.

*

Management

40. The Governors shall manage the property of the College not occupied for the purposes thereof according to the general law

applicable to the management of property by Trustees of charitable foundations.

* Questions under Scheme

41. Any question as to the construction of this Scheme or as to the regularity or validity of any act done or about to be done here under shall be determined by the Secretary of State on such application made to him for that purpose as he thinks sufficient and such determination shall be binding on [the custodian trustees,] the Governors and all persons claiming under the trusts of the Scheme.

Interpretation

42. The Interpretation Act 1889 applies for the interpretation of this Scheme as it applies for the interpretation of an Act of Parliament.

* Date of Scheme

43. The date of this Scheme shall be the day on which it is established by an Order of the Secretary of State.

Commentary

1. The model follows that which has been used for schemes made by the Department (and previously the Ministry) for the last eight years. The opportunity has been taken to make some drafting and other minor amendments to the original model scheme, but the only amendments of substance are those giving effect to the recommendations of the Secretary of State's Study Group. A table showing the references to the corresponding paragraphs of the Study Group's Report is attached.
2. The scheme has been divided into two parts to form the Instrument of Government and the Articles of Government respectively; and each part, and the constituent provisions of each part may serve as a model for its own purpose where a scheme is inapplicable and it is possible to proceed by the amendment of an existing instrument. The asterisks against particular clauses indicate provisions which are appropriate in a scheme made under the Charities Act or in a trust deed but inappropriate in other instruments. In addition other provisions, for example the transitional clauses, may not be required in other instruments.
3. In the model a space (thus) indicates where individual Colleges should insert words or numbers appropriate to their particular circumstances. The following specific comments deal with points not covered by the Study Group's recommendations.

Clauses 2 and 3 The words in square brackets in clause 2 and the whole of clause 3 are to be omitted from schemes which do not require any provision relating to a custodian trustee.

Clause 4 (i) It is envisaged that sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) will specify, in addition to the total number of members under each sub-paragraph, the bodies responsible for making the appointments and the number for which each is responsible.

Clause 4 (v) It is necessary to specify who shall be the first Chairman in the period between the date of the scheme as established under clause 43 and the date on which a Chairman is first elected by the Governors appointed under the scheme. Where an annual election is not desired an alternative wording might be:-
"The first Chairman of the Governors shall be
..... who shall hold office for the unexpired term of his office as Governor and thereafter the Governors shall elect from among the representative and co-opted Governors a Chairman and a Vice Chairman who shall hold office for three years and shall be eligible for re-election."
Where a member of the providing body is to be Chairman ex officio the wording might be:-
" ... shall be Chairman of the Governors ex officio."

- Clause 5 This clause will require modification in the case of instruments other than schemes or trust deeds.
- Clause 14 (i) It is envisaged that the quorum shall normally be not less than one third of the total number of Governors.
- Clause 18 The number of Governors remaining when any withdrawals have taken place should constitute a quorum.
- Clause 19 (ii) It is a matter of choice whether the passage in square brackets should be retained or should be transferred to clause 30 as indicated therein.
- Clause 21 (i) The passage in square brackets is only required when there has to be consultation with the providing body before appointment of the Principal.
- Clause 22 The expressions in square brackets are alternatives, the first being appropriate where the Governing body, and the second where the providing body, is the employer. The Governors must comply with the provisions of the Contract of Employment Act.
- Clause 23 Version B is appropriate only in the case where the providing body is the employer.
- (i) Version A. The title and composition of the committee are for consideration.
- (iii) Versions B and C. These provisions do not give the member of staff the right to appear before

(in version B) the providing body and (in version C) the tribunal because the Secretary of State has no power to regulate by a scheme made under the Charities Act the conduct of any persons other than the Trustees. It is of course envisaged that these bodies will give the member of staff the right of appearing before them, but the Secretary of State cannot impose any legal obligation upon them to do so.

Clauses 23 and 24 In neither clause is reference made to the dismissal or suspension of junior members of the non-teaching staff. It is being left to be dealt with under the Governors' general powers under the scheme.

Clause 25 This does not set out the composition of the academic board in detail in order to allow scope for changes in the light of experience as academic boards develop. It would normally be appropriate to include the Librarian.

Clause 29 The form of this clause is appropriate for colleges of a particular religious denomination.

Clause 30 See note to clause 19 (ii).

Clause 38 The effect of this provision is that Governors may delegate any of their functions except those which the scheme requires them to exercise at a duly constituted meeting.

REFERENCES TO STUDY GROUP REPORT

<u>Clause in Model Scheme</u>	<u>Paragraph in Report</u>
4 (i)	95-97 and 84-90
14 (i)	97 and 94
19 (ii)	19
20 (i)	32
20 (ii)	33 and 110
21 (i) and (iv)	35 and 48
21 (ii) and (iii)	36-37
23	41-43
24	39-40
25	110, 112-114
26 (i)	26, 28 and 110
26 (ii)	29
26 (iii)	29-30 and 110
27	31
30 (i)	24
30 (ii)	25 and 110
30 (iii)	26
32	26-27
35 (ii)	55

APPENDIX TWELVE

Extracts from the Weaver Study Group Paper SGG/10:
Constitution and composition of governing bodies and academic boards

Note by the Secretary dated 9th September 1965

Section B Composition of governing bodies

Present Position

7. Nature and Size. In a sample of twelve counties and county boroughs which included some of the biggest authorities, the governing bodies of their colleges of education were in ten cases sub-committees of the education committee or a joint education committee. The size of the governing body ranged in eleven cases from 11 to 18; in the other case the Further Education Sub-Committee of the Education Committee, whose size was not given in the instrument of government, acted as the governing body.
8. Representation. As was pointed out at the first meeting of the Study Group, it is easy to over-estimate the representation of authorities because of the range of categories of governors who may be appointed by the authority. There are four such categories:
 - (a) the chairman (and possibly vice-chairman) of the county or county borough council, the education committee and/or another committee, who may be ex officio members of the governing body;

(b) members of the authority;

(c) people representing the authority, but not
members of it or nominated by another body;

(d) people nominated by another body.

It seems fair to regard (a), (b) and (c) - but not (d) - as
representatives of the authority.

9. On that basis, in ten out of the twelve LEAs in the sample
the representatives of the authority are in a majority; in
the other two authorities, they are just in a minority (5
out of 12 and 7 out of 15). In the first of these two
authorities, and in most colleges of the second, there is
no provision for appointing governors to represent neigh-
bouring LEAs, so that representatives of authorities (but
not of the maintaining authority alone) are not in a majority
either.

10. Particulars follow of the representation in the sample of
interests other than the maintaining authority:

<u>Interest</u>	<u>Number of LEAs out of 12</u>
Neighbouring authorities	3 (and a minority of colleges of a fourth)
University (no doubt in many cases covering the institutes of education as well)	11 (two governors in five cases, three in one case)
Institutes of education separately	3

<u>Interest</u>	<u>Number of LEAs out of 12</u>
People with teaching experience or other relevant interests	10 (including four cases where provision is made for some co-options which are not restricted to particular categories of people. Three governors in five cases, four in two and five in one case)
Members of academic staff	2 (one in one case, three in the other. It is expressly forbidden by eight of the LEAs that members of the staff should be governors)
11. It is laid down by three out of the twelve authorities that a minimum number (two or three) of the governors, or of the representative governors, should be women.	
12. <u>Co-option</u> . Provision is made for co-option in six out of the twelve cases. In four of these, the type of person to be co-opted is laid down for some at least of the places. The co-options are made by the governors in all cases except one where the first co-options are made by the authority, and another where one co-opted governor is nominated by the university. In one case the co-options are subject to the approval of the education committee.	
13. <u>Chairman and Vice-Chairman</u> . In only two out of the twelve cases is there any restriction on the governing body's choice from among its own members: in one either the chairman or the vice-chairman has to be a member of the education committee or of the county council; the other is where the Further Education Sub-Committee forms the governing body, and the Chairman and	

Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee act in the same capacities for the governing body. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman serve for one year, usually the municipal year, and are eligible for re-appointment.

14. Eligibility. The prohibition in a number of cases of members of the staff being governors has already been mentioned.

It is provided by one authority that nobody employed "for the purposes of any college of education" shall be a governor; and in another that, apart from (i) members of the academic staff of the college and (ii) any teacher employed by the authority who is co-opted, no person employed in any capacity by the authority can be a governor, nor can a relative of a member of the staff of the college, nor (with certain exceptions) an "ex officer or ex-employee" of the authority who was formerly employed at the college.

15. There is a standard paragraph in most instruments of government under the heading "Governors not to be financially interested in the college". In one case this is replaced by a paragraph headed "Disability of members of the Governing Body from voting on account of interest in contracts, etc."

16. It is provided by one authority in this sample that "a member of the LEA who ceases to be a member of the Authority shall thereupon cease to be a representative governor, provided that he shall be re-eligible for re-appointment as a governor upon the nomination of either of the bodies empowered by the Instrument to make an appointment ..."

17. Period of office. In the sample the period of office is given in eight cases out of the twelve: in six it is three years, in two it is one year.
18. Quorum. In only six cases is the size of a quorum stated. In two it is 'three'; in one it is 'four'; in one it is "not less than one-third of the whole number of governors"; in two it is "not less than three, or one-third of the whole number of governors, whichever is the greater" (i.e. the size prescribed for meetings of the managers and governors of county and voluntary schools in paragraph 1 of the Fourth Schedule to the Education Act, 1944).
19. Vacancies. The general practice is for these to be filled as soon as possible by new appointments and nominations. Governors appointed to fill casual vacancies hold office only for the unexpired term of office of the governor in whose place they are appointed.
20. Minutes and proceedings. The provisions in instruments normally deal with such matters as summoning meetings, keeping and signing minutes, voting and rescinding resolutions. They do not show very much variation except in two respects - the notice required for meetings and the number of meetings to be held in a year. The notice required ranges from two to seven days and the number of meetings from once a term to (in one case) one per month. In one case it is specified that at least two meetings a year have to take place at the college.

APPENDIX THIRTEEN

First Report of the Committee on Non-Teaching Staff
in Maintained Colleges of Education

Appendix A: Duties of the Senior Administrative Officer

I. Administration of college

1. Staff

Administrative work in connection with appointment, promotion, retirement, etc., of all staff.

Advice to principal and/or governing body on appointment, promotion, suspension, dismissal and retirement of non-teaching staff.

Organisation and oversight of non-teaching staff.

2. Supplies

*Arranging contracts for supplies.

Ordering supplies.

Receipt and distribution of supplies.

Stock control, including maintenance of records.

3. Services

Routine maintenance of buildings and grounds.

Maintenance of furniture and equipment.

Maintenance of caretaking, catering, cleaning, clerical and secretarial, heating, lighting, portering, transport and other services.

4. *Building work

Preparation of schedules of accommodation and of furniture and equipment.

Liaison with architects and contractors.

5. Student registration

Preparation and issue of prospectus.

Advertising.

Administrative arrangements for interview, admission, examination, etc.

Maintenance of student records.

Statistical returns.

6. Miscellaneous

Administrative arrangements for:-

Receipt and distribution of mail.

Security and fire precautions.

Hiring lodgings for students.

Letting of college premises during vacations.

II. Finance

Preparation of annual estimates of income and expenditure.

Control of expenditure within approved estimates.

*Assessment and payment of salaries and wages.

*Payment of bills, staff and student expenses, etc.

Collection of fees and other income.

Custody of cash.

Maintenance of accounts.

Costing exercises.

Preparation of annual accounts of income and
expenditure.

III. Clerk to the governing body

Preparation of agenda, reports and minutes.

Conveyance or execution of resolutions.

Correspondence, including that with LEA, Institute
of Education and the Department.

Liaison with CEO and other chief officers.

- * Will vary according to extent of delegation by the local
education authority.

Bibliography

(Place of publication of printed material
unless otherwise stated: London)

1. Primary Sources

A.T.C.D.E. Archives: preserved until recently at the A.T.C.D.E. Headquarters in London, and now deposited in the Modern Records Centre of the University of Warwick. Papers consulted include:

Minutes of the Executive Committee, 1943-73.

Minutes of the Principals' Panel, 1943-73.

Minutes of the Lecturers' Panel, 1958-73.

Minutes of the Finance and General Purposes Committee 1943-73.

Minutes of the Education Policy Committee, 1960-73.

Minutes of Council, 1958-73.

Minutes of the Committee on the Government of Training Colleges 1956-60.

Working Papers of the C.I.D./A.T.C.D.E. Working Party on the Government of Training Colleges.

C.I.D./C.H.U.D.E./A.T.C.D.E. Liaison Committee Minutes, 1959-65.

Ministry of Education/D.E.S. Letters to Training Colleges/ Colleges of Education 1945-70: available on prior request at the D.E.S. Library, Elizabeth House, London. The letters are not catalogued in the library.

Minutes, Working Papers and Proceedings of the Weaver Study Group: private collection of a member of the Weaver Study Group.

Records and papers of the Council of the Church Training Colleges and the Standing Conference of the Church Training Colleges available for consultation at Church House, London.

Archives of the College of St. Hild and St. Bede, University of Durham. The papers include minutes and proceedings of the governing bodies and academic boards of St. Hild's College and the College of the Venerable Bede; correspondence with the Ministry/D.E.S.; documents relating to the Council of the Church Training Colleges. Material is in the process of being classified.

Minutes of the A.E.C. Executive Committee printed in Education.

Minutes of the C.C.A. Executive Council printed in County Councils Gazette.

2. Government Publications (All published by H.M.S.O.)

a) Education Acts

<u>Education Act, 1902</u>	2 Edw. 7, c. 42. 18th December, 1902.
<u>Education Act, 1921</u>	11 and 12 Geo. 5, c. 51. 19th August, 1921.
<u>Education Act, 1944</u>	7 and 8 Geo. 6, c. 31. 3rd August, 1944.
<u>Education Act, 1946</u>	9 and 10 Geo. 6, c. 50. 22nd May, 1946.
<u>Education (No. 2) Act, 1968</u>	1968 c. 37. 3rd July, 1968.

b) Parliamentary Debates (Hansard) Fifth Series

i. House of Lords

Vol. CCXXIII,	Session 1959-60, April 26-May 26, 1960.
Vol. CCLV,	Session 1963-64, Feb. 4-Feb. 27, 1964.
Vol. CCLXIII,	Session 1964-65, Feb. 9-Mar. 4, 1965.
Vol. CCLXX,	Session 1965-66, Nov. 9-Dec. 2, 1965.
Vol. CCLXXXVI,	Session 1967-68, Oct. 31-Nov. 23, 1967.
Vol. CCLXXXVII,	Session 1967-68, Nov. 28-Dec. 20, 1967.

ii. House of Commons

- Vol. 632 Session 1960-61, Dec. 12-Dec. 21, 1960.
Vol. 634 Session 1960-61, Feb. 6-Feb. 17, 1961.
Vol. 688 Session 1963-64, Jan. 27-Feb. 7, 1964.
Vol. 703 Session 1964-65, Nov. 30-Dec. 11, 1964.
Vol. 709 Session 1964-65, Mar. 22-April 2, 1965.
Vol. 735 Session 1966-67, Oct. 31-Nov. 11, 1966.
Vol. 750 Session 1966-67, Jul. 10-Jul. 21, 1967.
Vol. 758 Session 1967-68, Feb. 5-Feb. 16, 1968.
Vol. 766 Session 1967-68, June 11-June 21, 1968.

iii. House of Commons Standing Committees 1967-68

Vol. IX, Standing Committee G, Education Bill (Lords).

c) White Papers

Board of Education, Educational Reconstruction Command
6458, 1943.

Board of Education, Principles of Government in Maintained
Secondary Schools Command 6523, 1944.

d) Teacher Training Regulations

Regulations for the Training of Teachers, 1941. S.R.O.
1941, No. 738.

Training of Teachers Grant Regulations, 1946. S.R.O.
1946, No. 630.

Training of Teachers Grant Regulations, 1950. S.I. 1950,
No. 1203.

Training of Teachers Grant Regulations, 1955. S.I. 1955,
No. 1907.

Training of Teachers (Local Education Authorities)
Regulations, 1959, S.I. 1959, No. 395.

Training of Teachers (Grant) Regulations, 1959. S.I. 1959,
No. 396.

Training of Teachers Regulations, 1967. S.I. 1967, No.
792.

e) Local Authority Regulations

The Education (Local Education Authorities) Grant Regulations, 1946. S.R.O. 1946, No. 1215.

The Education (Local Education Authorities) Grant Regulations, 1950. S.I. 1952, No. 1331.

General Grants (Pooling Arrangements) Regulations, 1959. S.I. 1959, No. 447.

f) Administrative Memoranda and Circulars

Board of Education, Circular 1377, Revision of the Regulations for the Training of Teachers: 1926, 4th June, 1926.

Ministry of Education, Administrative Memorandum No. 520, Training of Teachers Grant Regulations, 1955, 29th December, 1955.

Ministry of Education, Circular 354, The Training of Teachers (Local Education Authorities) Regulations 1959 and the Training of Teachers (Grant) Regulations, 1959, 24th March, 1959.

Ministry of Education, Administrative Memorandum 11/59, Arrangements for Pooling Educational Expenditure, 13th August, 1959.

D.E.S., Circular 2/67 The Government of Colleges of Education, 7th February, 1967.

D.E.S., Administrative Memorandum 8/67, Polytechnics, 5th April, 1967.

D.E.S., Circular 4/67, The Training of Teachers Regulations, 1967, 5th June, 1967.

D.E.S., Circular 22/68, The Education (No. 2) Act, 1968, 9th October, 1968.

D.E.S., Circular 8/69, The Education (No. 2) Act, 1968: Colleges of Education, 10th April, 1969.

g) Reports

Board of Education, Teachers and Youth Leaders, 1944.

Report of the Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education to consider the Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders.

- | | |
|---|--|
| Committee on Higher Education, | <u>Higher Education</u> , Command 2154, 1963.
Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins 1961-63.
Report; Evidence - Part One, Vols. A-F; and Appendix Four. |
| Department of Education and Science, | Report of the Study Group on <u>The Government of Colleges of Education</u> , 1966. |
| Department of Education and Science, | <u>First Report of the Committee on Non-Teaching Staff in Maintained Colleges of Education</u> , 1967. |
| Select Committee on Education and Science, | Session 1969-70, <u>Teacher Training</u> , 1970. Evidence and Appendices, vols. I-V. |
| Department of Education and Science, | <u>Teacher Education and Training</u> , 1972.
Report by a Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme. |
| Ministry of Education/
D.E.S., | <u>Annual Reports</u> 1945 onwards. |
| National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers, | Reports I-IX, 1951-65. |

3. Secondary Sources

a) Books

- Alexander, Sir William P., Towards a new Education Act (Councils and Education Press Ltd., 1969).
- Baron, George and Taylor, W. (eds.), Educational Administration and the Social Sciences (Athlone Press, 1969).
- Baron, George and Howell, D.A., The Government and Management of Schools (Athlone Press, 1974).
- Bartle, G.F., History of Borough Road College (1976).

Becker, T. and Kogan, M., Process and Structure in Higher Education (Heinemann, 1980).

Berdahl, Robert O., British Universities and the State (Cambridge University Press, 1959).

Birley, D., The Education Officer and his World (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970).

Bradbury, John L., Chester College and the Training of Teachers (Governors of Chester College, 1975).

Browne, Joan D., Teachers of Teachers, A history of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education (Hodder and Stoughton, 1979).

Burgess, Tyrrell, Dear Lord James (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1971).

Burgess, Tyrrell, A Guide to English Schools (Harmondsworth, Pelican, Third Edition, 1973).

Chester, D.N., Central and Local Government (Macmillan, 1951).

Coates, R.D., Teachers' Unions and Interest Group Politics, a study in the behaviour of organised teachers in England and Wales (Cambridge University Press, 1972).

Dent, H.C., The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975 (Hodder and Stoughton, 1978).

Dance, H.E., The Management of Higher and Further Education (College of Preceptors, 1965).

Gosden, P.H.J.H., The Evolution of a Profession (Blackwell, 1972).

Gosden, P.H.J.H. and Sharp, P.R., The Development of an Education Service: The West Riding, 1889-1974 (Robertson, 1978).

Griffith, J.A.G., Central Departments and Local Authorities (Allen and Unwin, 1966).

Hencke, David, Colleges in Crisis (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1978).

Hewett, Stanley (ed.), The Training of Teachers: A Factual Survey (University of London Press Ltd., 1971).

Humphreys, D.W., The relationships between the training colleges and the universities before McNair (Lyndale House Papers, University of Bristol Institute of Education).

Jackson, W. Eric, Local Government in England and Wales (Harmondsworth, Pelican, 1949).

Jeffreys, M.V.C., Revolution in Teacher Training (Pitman, 1961).

Jennings, Robert E., Education and Politics: policymaking in local education authorities (Batsford, 1977).

Jones, Lance, The Training of Teachers (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923).

Kogan, Maurice, The Politics of Education, Edward Boyle and Anthony Crosland in conversation with Maurice Kogan (Harmondsworth, Penguin Education Special, 1971).

Kogan, Maurice with Eyken, Willem van der, County Hall L.E.A. The Role of the Chief Education Officer, Maurice Kogan and Willem van der Eyken, in conversation with Dan Cook, Claire Pratt and George Taylor (Harmondsworth, Penguin Education Special, 1973).

Kogan, Maurice and Packwood, T., Advisory Committees and Councils in Education (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974).

Kogan, Maurice, Educational Policy-Making, A Study of Interest Groups and Parliament (Allen and Unwin, 1975).

Kogan, Maurice, The Politics of Educational Change (Glasgow, Fontana, 1978).

Lawrence, Bernard, The Administration of Education in Britain (Batsford, 1972).

Layard, Richard, King, J. and Moser, C., The impact of Robbins (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1969).

Lester Smith, W.O., Government of Education (Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1971).

Lomax, D.E. (ed.), The Education of Teachers in Britain (Wiley, 1973).

Maclure, J. Stuart, Learning beyond our means? (Councils and Education Press, 1968).

Maclure, J. Stuart, Educational Documents, England and Wales 1816-1967 (Methuen, Second Edition, 1968).

Manzer, Ronald A., Teachers and Politics: the role of the National Union of Teachers in the making of national educational policy in England and Wales since 1944 (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1970).

Moodie, Graeme C., and Eustace, R., Power and Authority in British Universities (Allen and Unwin, 1974).

Niblett, W.R., Humphreys, D.W. and Fairhurst, J.R., The University Connection (N.F.E.R., 1975).

N.U.T., The Training of Teachers and Grants to Intending Teachers (N.U.T., 1939).

Parry, J.P., The Provision of Education in England and Wales (Allen and Unwin, 1971).

Parry, J.P., Lord James Tricycle (Allen and Unwin, 1972).

Perkins, Harold, Key Profession: The history of the Association of University Teachers (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970).

Pile, Sir William D., The Department of Education and Science (Allen and Unwin, 1979).

Pratt, John, Burgess T., Allemano, R. and Locke, M., Your Local Education (Harmondsworth, Pelican, 1973).

Regan, D.E., Local Government and Education (Allen and Unwin, 1977).

Rich, R.W., The Training of Teachers in England and Wales during the Nineteenth Century (Cambridge University Press, 1933).

Robbins, Lord, Higher Education Revisited (Macmillan, 1980).

Robinson, Eric, The New Polytechnics (Harmondsworth, Penguin Education Special, 1968).

Sandiford, Peter, The Training of Teachers in England and Wales (New York, 1910).

Selby-Bigge, Sir L.A., The Board of Education (Putnam, Second Edition, 1934).

Stacey, F., The Government of Modern Britain (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968).

Taylor, George and Saunders, J.B., The New Law of Education, Seventh Edition (Butterworths, 1971).

Taylor, William, Society and the Education of Teachers (Faber and Faber Ltd., 1969).

Taylor, William (ed.), Towards a Policy for the Education of Teachers, Colston Papers No. 20 (Butterworths, 1969).

Tibble, J.W. (ed.), The Future of Teacher Education (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971).

Tropp, Asher, The School Teachers (Heinemann, 1957).

Vaizey, John, The Control of Education (Faber and Faber, 1963).

Weaver, Sir Toby, Higher Education and the Polytechnics (College of Preceptors, 1973).

Willey, F.T. and Maddison, R.E., An Enquiry into Teacher Training (University of London Press, 1971).

Wingate, M., Purposes in Teacher Training (S.C.M. Press, 1959).

Wiseman, V., Local Government at Work (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967).

b) Articles

Baird, K., 'The Status of the Teacher', in Aspects of Education 3, Journal of Hull University, Institute of Education, December, 1965, pp. 55-64.

Baron, George, 'The Training of Teachers in England and Wales', in G.Z.F. Bereday and J.A. Lauwerys (eds.), The Year Book of Education 1963, The Education and Training of Teachers (Evans, 1963), pp. 137-157.

Browne, Joan D., Malloch, E.G., Baird, K.A., Heyden, R., 'Training Colleges and Universities', in Education for Teaching, No. 55, May 1961, pp. 44-56.

Burgess, Tyrrell, 'Teacher training within higher education', in Robert Bell, Gerald Fowler and Ken Little (eds.), Education in Great Britain and Ireland (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973), pp. 267-271.

Burgess, Tyrrell, 'Polytechnics', in Robert Bell, Gerald Fowler and Ken Little (eds.), Education in Great Britain and Ireland (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973), pp. 250-266.

Dobson, J.L., 'The Training Colleges and their Successors 1920-1970', in T.G. Cook (ed.), Education and the Professions, History of Education Society (Methuen, 1973), pp. 49-68.

Elvin, H.L., 'The Robbins Committee Report', in Education for Teaching, No. 62, Nov. 1963, pp. 6-16.

Goldman, Ronald, 'No way to run a college', in Robert Bell, Gerald Fowler and Ken Little (eds.), Education in Great Britain and Ireland (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973), pp. 272-273.

Hebden, Ralph E., 'Colleges of Education - Local Colleges', in Education for Teaching, No. 69, Feb. 1966, pp. 68-70.

Hicks, David, 'The National Advisory Council on the Training and Supply of Teachers 1949-65', in British Journal of Education Studies, Volume XXII, No. 3, October, 1974, pp. 249-259.

Jeffreys, M.V.C., 'Institutes of Education from McNair to ... Robbins?', in Aspects of Education 3, Journal of Hull University, Institute of Education, December 1965, pp. 65-74.

Locke, Michael, 'Government of Polytechnics', in Lance Dobson, Tony Gear and Adam Westoby, Management in Education 2 (Ward Lock Educational, 1975), pp. 118-140.

Marshall, E.F., 'Area Training Organisations', in Robert K. Hall, N. Hans and J.A. Lauwerys, (eds.), The Year Book of Education 1953, (Evans, 1953), pp. 136-142.

Oliver, R.A.C., 'Institutes of Education', in Universities Quarterly, Vol. 5, No. 4, August 1951, pp. 359-65 and Vol. 6, No. 1, November 1951, pp. 48-53.

Parry, J.P., 'The Idea of a College of Education', in Education for Teaching, No. 72, February 1967, pp. 2-19.

Tibble, J.W., 'To whom do Colleges belong?', in Education for Teaching, No. 49, May 1959, pp. 6-12.

Tibble, J.W., 'Universities and Training Colleges', in Education for Teaching, No. 54, February 1961, pp. 8-18.

Trow, Martin, 'Binary dilemmas - an American View', in Robert Bell, Gerald Fowler and Ken Little (eds.), Education in Great Britain and Ireland (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973), pp. 241-249.

c) T.C.A. and A.T.C.D.E. Publications

T.C.A., Memorandum on the Training of Teachers (University of London Press, 1939).

A.T.C.D.E., Macintyre, R. (ed.), Colleges of Education for Teaching (Chiswick Press, 1960).

A.T.C.D.E., Memorandum prepared by the A.T.C.D.E. for submission to the Committee for Higher Education (A.T.C.D.E., 1961).

A.T.C.D.E., Government of Colleges, a further memorandum prepared by the A.T.C.D.E. for submission to the Committee for Higher Education (A.T.C.D.E., 1962).

A.T.C.D.E., News Sheet, 1953-71.

A.T.C.D.E., Year Books, 1944-64.

A.T.C.D.E., Conference Reports, 1964-73.

Dobson, J.L. (ed.), Handbook for Principals of Colleges of Education (1973).

Evans, A.A., The Government of Colleges of Education (A.T.C.D.E.).

d) Bibliographies

Baron, George, A Bibliographical Guide to the English Educational System (Athlone Press, Third Edition, 1965).

Berry, Michael, Teacher Training Institutions in England and Wales: A bibliographical guide (Society for Research in Higher Education, 1973).

Gosden, P.H.J.H., Educational Administration in England and Wales: A Bibliographical Guide (Leeds, University of Leeds, Institute of Education, 1967).

Howell, D.A., A Bibliography of Educational Administration in the United Kingdom (N.F.E.R., 1978).

Richmond, W. Kenneth, The Literature of Education: A Critical Bibliography 1945-70 (Methuen, 1972).

Vaughan, J.E. and Argles, M., British Government Publications Concerning Education: An Introductory Guide (Liverpool, School of Education, University of Liverpool, 1969).

e) Journals and Periodicals etc.

Education 1944-70.

Times Educational Supplement 1944-70.

Education for Teaching 1952-70.

Times.

The Teacher.

The Guardian.

