Organization of the United Kingdom's education system mirrors its political divisions; education is different and somewhat autonomous in each area: England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland. The Department of Education and Science, based in London, oversees the English education system. Education in the United Kingdom has a longstanding foundation of voluntary provision based on the Church and private philanthropy. In recent years, local power in English education has been based in some 100 Local Education Authorities (LEAs). This has led to some wide disparities between educational systems. The educational system is divided into primary schools, secondary schools, and higher education. The overriding feature of all three parts is that historically they have not invested much in administration. The origins of educational reform can be traced to three sources: the oil crisis of 1973-74, Labour party views, and the Conservative radicalism of Margaret Thatcher. This Conservative educational view was implemented through a series of reform laws. It is still uncertain what the long-term effect of this reform period will be. However, the role of educational administration and administrators has been changed significantly, and local educational authorities have been depleted. (JPT)
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Abstract

This paper is divided into five sections. It begins with a brief outline of the salient features of the educational systems of the United Kingdom and of the organizational cultures of its educational institutions. It then proceeds to an analysis of recent educational reform, with particular reference to organization and administration, under three broad headings: origins, implementation, outcomes.

The systems

The United Kingdom is currently composed of four elements: England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Broad population figures are England - 47.5 million; Scotland - 5 million; Wales - 3 million; Northern Ireland - 1.5 million - a total of some 57 millions, very roughly three times as large as that of Australia. The population is virtually static, the last 20 years has seen an increase of about one per cent. It is a densely populated country, but although the modern industrial and urban revolutions came first to Britain, and the vast majority of people live in towns, the ideals, images and culture of many British people are firmly rooted in the countryside.

Although urban areas tend to overlap into each other in the United Kingdom, so that places which in another country might be deemed as one city are divided up into two or three, it should be noted that, London apart, which has a declining population and has been at the centre of the recent economic downturn, there are (by international standards) no other really large cities in the United Kingdom. The country's second city, Birmingham, only has a population of one million, considerably smaller than those of Sydney or Melbourne. The contrast between the geographical sizes of the two countries could hardly be greater. The 246,050 sq kms of the UK would fit into Australia more than 30 times.
Another factor in modern British society is that of unemployment. It is difficult to obtain precise figures, but in 1992 some two and half million people in the United Kingdom are unemployed. This should be seen as part of a general Western European trend. In 1970 unemployment in Western Europe stood at 2.5 million. This rose to 7.8 million in 1978, 14 million in 1982 and 16 million in 1987. Some 40 per cent of this figure was accounted for by young people. (Unesco, 1991, 61)

It is right to talk of the educational systems of the United Kingdom, for there are differences between the separate parts. This shows at the centre, for while the Secretary of State for Education and Science oversees education in England and has broad powers in respect of higher education, the other parts of the education service are headed by the Secretaries of State for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland respectively. Thus while there is an overall uniformity in the systems historic differences still remain.

Scotland is the most independent of the three smaller areas for four reasons: it is the second largest partner; the Scottish Education Department has had a separate existence for over 100 years; Scotland has its own separate legal and religious establishment; the Scots firmly believe that their educational system is superior to those of the rest of the United Kingdom. There are tangible differences. For example Scottish university students take a four-year first degree course; students in the rest of the United Kingdom have only three years. Scottish teachers have had a General Teaching Council since 1965; those in the rest of the United Kingdom do not.

This paper will, of necessity, focus primarily upon education in England, which has a population more than four times greater than Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland together, and, in London, the seat of legislative and executive power.

The Department of Education and Science is based in London, and is headed by a Secretary of State. Though central power in education, which began in a desultory way in 1839, preceded that of local government, which dates from 1870, education in the United Kingdom has a longstanding foundation of voluntary provision based on the Church and private philanthropy which stretches back to the middle ages. Not until 1899 was a Board of Education established, only in 1944 did it become a Ministry. In 1964 it was renamed the Department of Education and Science. Traditionally politicians who headed education were of second rank, and few served for any length of time. One notable exception was Margaret Thatcher who held the post from 1970 to 1974, and was the only one to have become Prime Minister. In recent Conservative governments it has been occupied by three prominent politicians: Keith Joseph, 1981-6, Kenneth Baker, 1986-9, and Kenneth Clarke, 1990-2. Of lower status were Mark Carlisle, 1979-81, and John MacGregor, 1989-
90, and the current Secretary of State, John Patten, appointed in April 1992, following the fourth Conservative victory.

The central authority in English education has tended to exercise a supervisory, rather than an initiatory role. It is a small department and has some 2,500 employees, many of whom are engaged in the administration of teachers' pensions. It has no regional organization. Central government has not been in the business of owning or running schools or other educational institutions. Crucial to this supervision have been Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI), whose existence and prestigious title date back to 1839. Their original purpose was to inspect schools which wished to qualify for government grants. The HMI have always claimed a semi-independence from the Department, so that the chief inspector's annual report may be seen as a report to Parliament which may be critical of central government policy, for example by pointing out poor quality buildings or shortages of textbooks which may be ascribed to under-funding. Such semi-independence has always been a source of contention, not least in the last two years, when the Conservative government tried to abolish, or seriously to reduce the inspectorate and its powers.

In recent years local power in English education has been based upon some 100 Local Education Authorities (LEAs). This local authority tradition stems from 1870 when it was decided that publicly-funded schools should be organized and controlled at local rather than central level. LEAs are based upon traditional local units: counties, towns and London boroughs. The largest group are the 47 county councils. The LEAs vary considerably in size. For example the county of Hampshire has a population of 1.5 million, the borough of Kingston a mere 133,000. Even smaller are the City of London and the Scilly Isles. (Sharp and Dunford, 1990, 61)

Since 1902 LEAs, each of which has an Education Committee composed of elected councillors and co-opted members, a Chief Education Officer, and a team of inspectors or advisers, have had the duty of providing primary and secondary schooling, and a range of other educational facilities, including further education and polytechnics, in their area. Many schools with religious foundations or connections (nearly 30 per cent of the whole) are also controlled by the LEAs, or otherwise aided from public funds. Indeed LEAs have had direct responsibility for the expenditure of more than 80 per cent of all public money spent on education, even though a considerable proportion of such money has come from centrally-raised taxes rather than from local rates or (more recently) the poll tax.

Education is by far the largest single activity of local government. In the 1992-3 local authority finance settlement for England the government has set total standard spending at £41,811 million, of which Education's share is £18,730 million. (DES, 1992, 1)
Local power in education has led to considerable local diversity, not least in the matter of local finance. By the 1970s some LEAs were spending twice as much money per head per pupil as others. Although central government policies have recently reduced these discrepancies considerable variations remain. Annual spending per pupil in the counties ranges from £2,038 in Buckinghamshire to £1,621 in Cleveland; in metropolitan districts from £2,183 in Wolverhampton to £1,737 in Solihull; in London from £2,833 in Brent to £1,774 in Richmond, the borough that produced the best results in the first national tests for seven-year-olds. (Marston, 1992) Discrepancies over particular items within budgets are even higher. For example in 1989-90 some LEAs spent five times as much as others per pupil on books and educational equipment.

Differences between LEAs reflect the relative weakness of central control over education and the historical development of an impressive profession of local educational administrators. In some areas the Chief Education Officer, often by dint of long service, managed to achieve an independence from the elected authority and to promote a particular educational structure and ethos. This was the case in Leicestershire where Sir William Brockington served as Director of Education from 1903 to 1947, to be succeeded by Stewart Mason, who held the post until 1971. In Leicestershire a system of junior high schools was developed which catered for all pupils until 14. Other local administrators who had a profound influence included Henry Morris who, in Cambridgeshire from 1922 to 1954, organized the grouping of all educational and social agencies in rural areas into village colleges. In the West Riding of Yorkshire, Sir Alec Clegg, Chief Officer from 1945 to 1974, promoted informal methods in primary schools and pioneered middle schools for pupils aged nine to 13.

The third tier of educational administration exists at school level. In 1944 the principle of a governing body for each school was established, although practice varied widely from LEA to LEA, and there was criticism that in too many cases governing bodies were dominated by political appointments.

All children must attend schools between the age of five and 16. Although, as indicated above, there is some variation between LEAs, for most children the primary stage consists of infant schooling to seven and junior schooling till 11, when all transfer to secondary schools. Although more than 90 per cent of children in state schools now attend comprehensive secondary schools, some LEAs, for example the borough of Kingston-upon-Thames, and the county of Kent, still divide children at age 11 according to ability. Some go on to grammar schools; the remainder proceed to what are referred to as comprehensives but are essentially the old secondary modern schools writ large.
About seven per cent of children in England attend independent schools - including the so-called 'public' schools, like Eton and Harrow. These fee-paying schools still exert great influence. Currently some half of all undergraduate students at Oxford and Cambridge come from fee-paying schools. Almost all members of Conservative cabinets, including Secretaries of State for Education (though not John Patten) have sent, and still send, their own children to fee-paying schools.

Organizational cultures

This section is concerned to show the extent of diversity within the traditional organizational cultures of the English educational system. It relies heavily upon the work of Charles Handy (Handy, 1984) and may be taken as a general broad-brush picture of the situation which existed before the current period of change, for the specific purpose of highlighting the effect of such changes.

a) Primary schools

Primary schools in England are heirs to two traditions. The first is the elementary school of the nineteenth century which from 1862 to 1895 was dominated by the system of 'payment by results'. This immediate and highly visible system of accountability, which meant that a school's grant from central government depended in considerable measure upon the pupils' performance in annual examinations, had a marked effect upon curricula, teaching methods, and the relationship between teachers and their inquisitors - the HMI. Essentially the role of the elementary school was to teach the basics - the 3 Rs and to send children directly to work.

During the twentieth century this tradition was modified in several ways. First, the elementary school was replaced by the primary school, which at age 11 sent children not to work but to the next stage in their schooling. The effectiveness of the new kind of accountability, the 'eleven plus' examination, which determined whether children proceeded to secondary grammar, technical or modern schools, diminished from the 1960s with the rapid introduction of comprehensive secondary schools. To many commentators the 1960s appeared to witness the victory of a progressive, child-centred philosophy which lacked direction and rigour in terms of both curricula and standards, a victory apparently epitomized by the Plowden Report of 1967, entitled Children and their Primary Schools.

Primary schools were, and have largely remained, small in size, frequently smaller indeed than the elementary schools which preceded them. Therefore the numbers of adults employed full-time in such schools - headteacher, senior teacher, other teachers, school secretary, caretaker, may be quite small - a
dozen perhaps - even fewer. Most teachers in such schools have the same essential responsibility - to be in charge of a class of children. In such circumstances, where the basic role is common to all, a 'club' culture may flourish. The purpose of the institution is clear and a general educational ethos or spirit may prevail. This club culture is like a wheel with the headteacher at the hub. Lines of communication (the spokes) are short, and all teachers (and others) can have direct access to the centre.

b) Secondary schools

Secondary schools have invariably been larger than primary schools. Though schools of 2,000 and more pupils, as in the days of the first comprehensive schools, are no longer the norm, establishments of more than 1,000 pupils are not exceptional. In such schools the club culture cannot easily operate. Instead they are run on a role culture. If the organization of the primary school resembles a wheel, that of the secondary school is shaped more like a pyramid.

At the head of the pyramid is the headteacher or school principal. In the next tier come deputy heads or assistant principals. Heads of faculty hold sway over heads of subjects who in turn direct the work of other teachers of those subjects. The prime duty of teachers in a role culture is not to be responsible for a particular class, but for a particular subject area; although parallel to the academic hierarchy may be a pastoral tier, based on a house or year system. The role culture of the secondary school is visible, formal, and full of procedures. It is more bureaucratic than the club culture, and there is a greater need for formal meetings with agenda and minutes. Direct access to the headteacher for a junior teacher or other member of staff may be difficult. As Handy has observed, the main characteristic of a role culture is that it is 'managed rather than led'. (Handy, 1984, 12),

c) Higher education

Higher education, and particularly university education, has been organized more on a person culture. The purpose of such a culture (and person cultures also exist in the legal and medical professions among others) is to allow as much free rein as possible to the individual. Thus the leading academic was given tenure and freedom to research, to write, and to teach in a largely unfettered way. Such people were not managed or controlled. The role of the bursar in a college or university, of a chief clerk in a law firm, was of lower status. The vice-chancellorship in an ancient university, even the role of head of a department, might be a rotating job. The great purpose of academic life was not to manage, not even to lead an academic institution, but rather to make contributions to knowledge on a national or international scale.
What effect did these organizational cultures have upon those who were being educated? In the primary school the children might be seen as workers - given specific tasks to perform within a supportive environment by a teacher who knew them well.

In higher education students were clients. They chose their places and subjects of study. If dissatisfied they might transfer to another course, or to another postgraduate supervisor.

In secondary schools pupils were like products on an assembly line. They might begin the day with a period of mathematics, followed by a period of music, followed by another of French, then a double period of science. After a lunch break they might have a period of physical education and then, tired and aching, conclude the day with double geography. Each of these activities might take place in a different classroom, with different teachers, who might not even know their names. Little wonder that many pupils in such a system became confused by the whole exercise.

The overriding feature of all the three cultures, however, insofar as they were applied to education, was that they did not invest much money, time or space in administration. In consequence it could be argued that educational institutions were relatively inefficient enterprises. This problem was exacerbated by the fact that schools in the United Kingdom were trying to fulfil a wider range of purposes than those in many other countries: academic, pastoral, custodial, spiritual, moral, physical, etc. Teachers at all levels saw their key roles as being to carry out this multiplicity of purposes; managerial tasks had a much lower priority. Only in the role culture of the large secondary school did the headteacher, perforce, become a full-time manager. Indeed on occasion the headteacher, being the only person apart from the secretary or caretaker without a substantial teaching role, ended up performing a variety of low-level administrative tasks.

On the other hand it could be argued that the lack of office space, the small amount of time spent in administration per se, the desire of most teachers not to be 'promoted out of the classroom', meant that schools and other educational institutions were highly efficient places in that the central purpose of the education of children remained paramount.

Differences in organizational culture within the educational system itself, therefore, existed alongside the differences in organizational culture between LEAs.

One of the major effects of the educational reforms of recent years in England has been to diminish the differences between these organizational cultures.
The origins of educational reform

The origins of reform in education in the UK may be traced to three sources.

The first was the oil crisis of 1973-4 which finally brought home to Britain that the old imperialist days and legacies were finished and that the self-indulgences of the 1960s, the hippy culture, the flower power, the Beatles, etc., were also at an end.

The second was that this change in respect of education was grasped by some Labour politicians, and articulated by the-then Prime Minister, James Callaghan, in a speech at Ruskin College, Oxford in October 1976. The three principles which Callaghan outlined were:

- financial stringency - 'as high efficiency as possible by the skilful use of existing resources';
- back to basics and the raising of standards, pupils must be equipped - 'to do a job of work';
- consumer rights - 'teachers...must satisfy the parents and industry'.

Thus in the 1970s accountability - in terms of finance, standards and consumers - was placed on the agenda by a Labour government, but very little was actually done - instead it led to a 'Great Debate', which produced many discussions but few outcomes. This was partly because the Callaghan government was faced with more immediate problems: rampant inflation, unemployment, and a series of strikes which culminated in the 'winter of discontent' in 1978-9 which swept Margaret Thatcher to the first of her three victories: 1979, 1983 and 1987.

The third element was the Conservative radicalism of Margaret Thatcher, who had previously been Secretary of State for Education, 1970-4, a position in which she had felt herself unable to exercise much control. She was also, as Prime Minister, to be hurt by the refusal of her old university, Oxford, to grant her a Prime Minister's customary accolade of an honorary degree.

Margaret Thatcher is a grocer's daughter. She, like John Major, identifies with the small business person, having to make his or her own way in the world, living above the family shop, striving to survive in a fiercely competitive environment. She was totally opposed to featherbedding, to restrictive practices, and to overpowerful trade unions and professions, whether like the miners who had brought down the Heath government in 1974, or the lawyers, doctors or teachers whom she suspected of providing inefficient and overpriced services.
She was against state monopolies and state socialism, against what she regarded as a spurious and ineffective compassion which provided jobs for unproductive functionaries at central and local levels, which led to the politics of envy and the economics of inaction, and which lowered the living standards of all in the pursuit of a spurious equality. In her view the way to improve the quality of life within the United Kingdom, and to make the country great again, was to throw off the corporate, collectivist structures which had developed since 1945 and to follow instead the examples of such competitive economies as Japan and Singapore.

Though her chief targets were on the political left Margaret Thatcher also had little time for the fudgers and moderates, the 'wets', within her own party, particularly for those who themselves came from the traditional ruling classes. By 1990 she had ousted all really independent thinking from her Cabinet and was acting in a presidential, some would say even, a royal, style. It was for this reason that eventually, in November 1990, she was overthrown, not by the electorate but by her own party.

Nevertheless though Margaret Thatcher was unseated, and may complain about some of the actions of her successor, the Conservative victory of April 1992 confirmed the sea change which had taken place, and its acceptance by the electorate.

Martin Jacques (Jacques, 1992) summed up the situation admirably: 'The 1980s marked an historic transition from a society of mass production, class-based identity and collectivism to a more individualised culture where identities are more numerous and more fluid, and society is a more mobile affair. The great achievement of Mrs Thatcher was to recognise that change and seek to cast it in her own image.'

This happened in education, as in many other areas. The three principles enunciated by Callaghan in 1976 - financial stringency, raising of standards, and consumer rights - were taken over and reshaped in a Conservative mould.

Financial stringency now meant more accountability at all levels, and the pruning of certain types of expenses: bureaucrats, student grants, school meals and milk.

Raising standards was seen to depend upon the establishment of national scales of measurement so that, for example, the attainments of pupils and schools could be made public. This would promote competition between pupils, between schools, and between different types of schools. Comprehensive secondary schools would not have the monopoly. Independent schools would be aided, existing grammar schools preserved, and new types of school - the city technology colleges - created. Good schools would flourish; bad schools would be driven out of existence.
Consumer rights necessitated a reduction in the powers of the producers. LEA bureaucracy and bureaucratic control would be reduced: in 1989 LEAs in England and Wales employed 944,000 persons, only 537,000 of whom were teachers and lecturers. (Statham and Mackinnon, 1991, 94) LEA representation on school governing bodies would be drastically cut: to be replaced by parents, and representatives of local employers. The influence of powerful teacher unions, particularly the left-wing National Union of Teachers, would be reduced. The tenure of university teachers would be abolished.

Implementation

Implementation of Conservative policy in education was achieved by a substantial programme of legislation, the main features of which are outlined in this section.

In 1979 the requirement for LEAs to reorganize secondary schooling on comprehensive lines was withdrawn. Eleven plus selection and grammar schools thus continued in some areas.

In 1980 the right of parents (and teachers) to be represented on governing bodies was secured. Parents were also allowed to express preferences for schools. LEA duties in respect of the provision of nursery places and school meals were replaced by powers. Assisted places at independent secondary schools were provided for able children from state schools. In 1991-2 there are some 30,000 such places in 300 independent schools. More than one third of these pupils have free places. Some parental contributions, based on income, are required for the others.

In 1981 new procedures were introduced for the identification and assessment of children with special educational needs, who, where possible, should be educated in general schools.

In 1983 full cost fees for overseas students were introduced in further and higher education.

In 1983 an Audit Commission was established under the Local Government Finance Act of 1982. Of its first 14 reports between February 1984 and March 1986 three were concerned with education. In 1986 the Commission published a handbook on Performance Review in Local Government which covered seven areas of local authority services, including education. This report suggested, amongst other things, that there was too much overcapacity in the school system and that LEAs should delegate as much responsibility as possible to heads and governing bodies, together with the authority to discharge it.' (Sharp and Dunford, 1990, 39) Between 1985 and 1990 345,000 surplus places were removed from secondary schools and 180,000 from primary schools. (DES, 1992, 18)
In 1986 the composition and powers of school governing bodies were set down in detail. The government had originally intended that half of the places on governing bodies should be taken by parents, but this proposal found little favour, even amongst parental groups. Essentially it was to be a four-way split: between parents, LEA representatives, teachers and local community members. There were to be annual parents' meetings and schools, like other businesses, were to publish an annual report. Other issues dealt with in this catch-all Act included control of the school curriculum, sex education, the length of terms and holidays, the disciplining of pupils, the appointment and dismissal of staff and the freedom of speech in higher education. Many of these points arose from specific confrontations affecting the education service, which saw widespread teachers' strikes in the period 1984-6.

From May 1986 the mood changed. In that month the hugely-confident Kenneth Baker became Secretary of State, in place of the sensitive, agonising Sir Keith Joseph, who had held the post since 1981. In 1987 when the Conservatives were returned for a third term, education, at last, became top of the political agenda.

In 1987 the existing mechanism for deciding teachers' pay (established in 1919) was scrapped. Teachers were deprived of all negotiating rights. Minimum hours of work were determined by statute. Teachers' pay negotiating rights were never to be restored: instead in 1991 a Pay Review Body (broadly welcomed, but opposed by the National Union of Teachers) was set up.

The 1987 legislation may be seen as both the final element in the piecemeal approach and the first indication of central government's determination to redistribute power within the education service.

The Education Reform Act of 1988 Act (the Baker Act) not only held out radical solutions but also covered virtually all aspects of the education service.

A national curriculum of ten subjects (three core - English, Mathematics and Science: seven foundation - History, Geography, Technology, Music, Art, Physical Education and (at the secondary level) a foreign language) was to be followed by all pupils in state schools (but not independent schools). This was the old subject-based, grammar-school curriculum of 1904 which was now to be applied throughout the years of compulsory schooling;

National testing of all pupils in state schools would take place at the ages of seven, 11, 14 and 16, and the results would be published. Both national curriculum and national testing were to be under the direct control of the Secretary of State, a complete reversal of recent practice, and in sharp
contrast to the principles of market forces and consumer-orientation;

Open enrolment would be enforced so that schools could recruit pupils up to the maximum of their capacity, to prevent LEAs from distributing pupils between schools and from fixing artificial limits;

The Inner London Education Authority, the largest and only single-purpose LEA in the country, was abolished, even though a poll amongst its parents showed that 93 per cent wished it to continue. Its powers were transferred to 13 local boroughs and to the City of London;

Local management of schools was established. Governing bodies would receive the school budget, based on a weighted per capita formula, and would be responsible for spending it. Certain items would remain with the LEAs, for example capital expenditure, debt charges, central administration, local inspectors/advisers, and home-school transport. LEAs were given some discretion in respect of other areas, for example school meals and educational psychology, but these were not to be more than seven per cent of the budget;

Grant-maintained schools were introduced. Schools could, if the parents voted to do so, opt out of LEA control altogether. Such schools would receive all their budget directly via central government who would recoup the appropriate local authority contribution. Grant-maintained schools would be like independent schools, though financed with public money. The government believed that thousands of schools would wish to follow this route, but as yet few have chosen to do so. There are well over 20,000 schools in England alone. Of these, by January 1992, only nine primary and 134 secondary schools had opted out. Some schools, however, were clearly waiting to see the result of the election of April 1992, for the Labour party had pledged to return grant-maintained schools to the LEAs. Conservative victory in that election may well mean that the numbers will now rapidly increase;

City technology colleges were confirmed by the Act. These were to give special prominence to science and technology, and financial support from the business community was sought. This has not been forthcoming, in spite of considerable financial support from central government.

Polytechnics and other colleges were removed from LEA control. These now came under the control of a new funding body, the Polytechnics and Colleges Funding Council (PCFC). A new Universities Funding Council (UFC) replaced the old Universities Grants Committee. Appointment to both was in the hands of the Secretary of State. Academic tenure for university teachers was to be abolished.
From 1988 much of the government's time and energy was taken up in implementing the Act. There were some minor retreats along the way, but the central thrust of making schools publicly accountable through the results of their pupils continued. The first assessments of seven year olds in 1991 showed the following results.

**National Curriculum assessment results, 1991 - Key Stage I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 2 is the attainment expected of seven year olds. Level 1 is below, Level 3 above. The last column includes pupils who failed to reach Level 1 or who were not assessed. (DES, 1992, 8)

Further reforms emerged, especially with the advent of the ebullient Kenneth Clarke, who came to Education from Health where he had introduced massive changes into the National Health Service. The full rigour (or dementia) of the new educational programme was interrupted temporarily by the resistance of the House of Lords and the election of April 1992.

Those elements which remain include:

The removal of sixth form colleges and further education colleges (for 16-year-olds and above) from LEA control. From April 1993 these will be funded by a new Further Education Funding Council (FEFC).

The ending of the distinction between polytechnics and universities. In future all polytechnics will become universities and all will be funded by one body on a broadly competitive basis.

Superior funding for grant-maintained schools, so that some 2,000 secondary schools are now considering opting out of LEA control.

**Outcomes**

It is not easy to predict the eventual outcome of the educational reforms of the period 1979-1992. Some, like the national curriculum and national testing, have already been modified; their size and complexity have been shown to be counter-productive. But though there may be modifications of
detail the broad strategy will no doubt continue for the next five years at least.

How will these affect educational administrators and administration at central, local and institutional levels?

a) **Central government**

At central government level there has been no large increase in the numbers of civil servants, nor is any intended.

**DES employees (excluding casual staff)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>2,606</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td>(est.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(DES, 1992, p. 43)

Indeed these figures take no account of the intended substantial reduction in the numbers of HMI.

Nor has the new policy-making power at the centre as yet enhanced the role and status of central educational administrators; rather has it increased the power of politicians over those administrators. Two examples may be given. The first is the reduction in the numbers of HMI to which reference has already been made. The government believes that HMI have presided over a decline in school standards. Accordingly it proposes that schools should be inspected by private teams which would include a strong representation of 'consumer' interests.

Teacher training provides the second example. In January 1992 Kenneth Clarke decided that institutions which trained teachers were too concerned with promoting egalitarian ideology, and insufficiently focused upon the practicalities of classroom teaching. He, therefore, decided that in future at least 80 percent of teacher training should take place in schools, and that school teachers, rather than teacher trainers, should be in the lead in all aspects of initial training. Two leading civil servants responsible for teacher training within the DES were deemed to be insufficiently enthusiastic in this cause, and suffered in consequence.

b) **Local government**

At local level a great reduction in the numbers of LEA administrators is taking place. Only a rump of their former services, finances and powers remains with the LEAs. The virtual elimination of bureaucracy - non-teaching posts - within the education system is the government's priority. This process
may indeed, over the next five years, lead to the complete abolition of LEAs.

Such abolition has been justified upon historical grounds. Between 1839 and 1870 an educational system was built up in England which provided schooling for virtually all the children in the country, without any recourse to local educational boards. The basic principle of that system was that schools were under voluntary control and relied upon three sources of funds: fees paid by parents; charitable donations; grants from central government given according to the principle of payment by results. Success, rather than need, was the basic criterion for state aid.

Locally-elected school boards and their schools, established from 1870, were originally intended simply to 'fill up the gaps', in areas where local charity and the extreme poverty of parents made for particular difficulty. Instead, however, by the first decade of the twentieth century state schools became the norm rather than the exception.

It has generally been argued that this was because state schools were superior to voluntary schools. Contemporary Conservative ideology rather emphasizes the inefficiency of state schools. Now that polytechnics, colleges and further education institutions have been removed from LEA control, if, during the next four years, sufficient schools (influenced perhaps by financial inducements) can be persuaded to become grant-maintained schools, then LEAs may be eliminated. The small geographical size of England, the break down of local allegiances with the frequent redrawing of local boundaries (even the abolition of historic counties) renders this more likely than in many other countries.

c) Educational institutions

In educational institutions two cultures - those of the club and the person - are rapidly disappearing. The role culture of the secondary school, together with its curriculum, is fast supplanting the club culture of the primary school. Tasks arising from local management of schools, from the need to compete for pupils and from the national curriculum and national assessment, mean that all teachers have, perforce, become administrators as well. A recent survey showed that school teachers work for an average of 52 hours per week, and that the majority of that time is not spent in actual teaching.

Higher education institutions are also rapidly moving away from the person culture. Academic audits of research and teaching, competitive tendering for students, total quality management, the projected doubling of staff-student ratios, the need still further to reduce unit costs, which in the 1980s were cut by 37 per cent in universities and 21 per cent in polytechnics and colleges, means that, in the interests of sheer survival,
higher education institutions are appointing experienced administrators, often from outside education, rather than eminent scholars at their head.

d) Conclusion

In conclusion, therefore, in the 1990s as regards England, and the United Kingdom more broadly, educational administration and administrators are being subjected to considerable change. This change may be interpreted in different ways. For example at one level it stems essentially from the fact that education, in common with many other aspects of British life and culture, is being recast in a market-oriented, competitive and cost-effective mould (although it should be noted that central government rather than the consumers has determined the curriculum). The next step, indeed, may be a return to payment by results.

At another level, however, these changes reflect the desire of the Conservative party (given their record of four electoral victories) to place as much control of education as possible into the hands of central, as opposed to local, government.

Of those educational administrators employed by central government some (including more than half the HMI) may be made redundant, while for those who remain there will be increased work loads, often in administering educational policies with which they have little sympathy.

For those employed by LEAs the future is bleak indeed. The re-election of a Conservative government in 1992 has ensured that LEA jurisdiction over polytechnics, colleges, and now all institutions of further education has ended. Local management of schools will continue and numbers of grant-maintained schools will rapidly increase. The very future of LEAs and of all their employees is in doubt.

Headteachers and other senior staff in schools are undergoing drastic changes in role, changes for which they may have had very little training or experience. Their former control over what should be taught in schools has virtually disappeared. Instead, in common with teachers in further and higher education, they are being called upon to exercise much greater financial and entrepreneurial skills. Classroom teachers are struggling with the formalities of national assessment.

Whether such massive changes of structure and role will in the longer term be beneficial is not yet clear. There is a danger that the culture of bureaucracy will simply be transferred to schools and other educational institutions. Professional leadership may, of necessity, give way to mere management. As Cornbleth has suggested in respect of the USA, 'Preoccupation with management and accountability techniques is accompanied by a neglect of purpose, substance and value', while Macpherson
has commented on educational reform in New Zealand that 'Debureaucratism, the converse of bureaucracy, reflects the limits of bureaucratic thought. The concern to encourage responsiveness and to localise responsibility appears to have given less priority to learning how to articulate what is best and significant in education.' (Schools Council, 1990, 140)

Such arguments, however, are not likely to deter Conservative governments of the radical Right in the United Kingdom which, since 1988, have set out to do nothing less than to reverse the course of educational history: principally by weakening, and eventually eliminating, those local educational authorities upon which, since 1870, the very existence and progress of a national system of education has been thought to depend.
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