The approaches to management of part-time lecturing staff in the United Kingdom's further education (FE) colleges were examined in a study that included the following research activities: review of relevant publications and Further Education Funding Council (FEFC) statistics; postal survey of 454 FE colleges in England and Wales that elicited 67 responses (response rate, 15%); visits to 8 colleges for in-depth interviews with managers and part-time teaching staff; a survey of all 508 part-time teaching staff in the 8 case study colleges; and visits to 2 agencies providing teaching staff to colleges. The study established that FE colleges cannot realistically expect part-time staff to fulfill the range of nonteaching duties typically expected of full-time staff. By the part-time staff members' own admission, their commitment to staff development, attendance at staff and team meetings, and extracurricular support for students were significantly lower than even college managers perceived. Six recommendations for improving management of part-time faculty were proposed. (Ten tables/figures and 17 references are included. Appended are the following: 28 figures summarizing the results of the part-timers and college surveys; 3 tables detailing lecturing staff mode and teacher training qualifications; overview of the FEFC cost-benefit analysis system for staff development activities; and model induction checklist.) (MN)
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This publication about the management of part-time lecturing staff in colleges is both important and timely. There has been a huge increase in the numbers and the proportion of part-time teaching staff in the sector; an increase that has been largely unplanned and unanticipated.

The key findings from the research reported here are the high proportion of part-time teachers for whom this form of working is a positive choice, and the existence of a perception gap between college management and their part-time staff. This gap manifests itself in the different views they hold over the degree of involvement in college life and the amount of support provided. Colleges largely think their part-time staff are involved in such activities as meetings, staff development and student support outside the classroom. In contrast, part-time staff complain about the lack of basic facilities with which to work, difficulties in keeping up to date with developments in the college and a general lack of involvement.

Effective management of part-time lecturers identifies important aspects of good practice in the management of part-time staff which can be grouped under the four broad headings:

- provision of general support
- application of good employment practice
- help in assuring quality
- use of effective management techniques.

The report consequently suggests some important priorities for colleges in the management of the part-time staff:

- developing a more strategic approach to human resource planning
- being more realistic in their expectations of the contributions made by part-time staff
- providing more basic facilities to support the work of part-time colleagues.

Given the substantial participation of part-time teachers in the teaching and learning process, and the inspectorate's concern about inadequate arrangements for training part-time staff, moves to improve support for and management of the part-time workforce are essential. Such moves will benefit the learner and affect their achievement. This report points a way forward.

Graham Peeke
Director, Professional and Organisational Development, FEDA
Summary

The last 15 years has seen a significant shift in the pattern of employment in further education, with the proportion of part-time staff rising from 15-20% in the mid-1980s to around 63% in 1996/97. It is a reasonable assumption that two-thirds of the FE teaching force is now working part time.

Since incorporation, the year-on-year efficiency gains which have been required of all colleges have often been the most important driver of human resource planning. However, recent and planned changes in legislation aimed at enhancing employment rights for part-time workers may not help those colleges which have increased the number of part-time staff significantly to reduce some of their fixed costs.

The findings summarised here are based on research conducted by FEDA, which included a review of the relevant reports, case-study visits to colleges, a postal survey of colleges and a postal survey of part-time teaching staff in further education.

Some colleges had analysed the relative costs and benefits of employing part-time lecturers, often comparing it with the option of using agency staff, but reasons for or against a particular course of action were at best mixed and at worst contradictory. There was no evidence of any attempts to undertake a complex financial cost-and-benefit analysis that compared the whole range of different factors which might influence the choice of strategy in human resource terms.

The context for this research arises from concerns expressed by, among others, NATFHE, the FEFC Inspectorate and the Education Select Committee. The latter encapsulated these as:

- the need for an optimum or maximum ratio of part-time to full-time staff for FE colleges
- the 'over-dependency on part-time staff', possibly leading to failures in pastoral care and to differences in the quality of provision
- colleges not offering the same development opportunities to part-time as to full-time staff
- the drawbacks identified with the use of agencies, including the lack of commitment, lower morale and the avoidance of contractual obligations.

Colleges are faced with an intractable dilemma. The concept of an ‘inclusive staff’ whereby lecturers are differentiated only by the number of hours they are contracted to work, appears to be unachievable in current circumstances. However desirable it might be, colleges cannot expect part-time staff to fulfil the range of non-teaching duties. Any requirement on their part would be met, in all probability, by claims for equal pay. The evidence in this report suggests that the level of commitment to such activities as staff development, attendance at staff and team meetings, and extracurricular support for students is, by the part-timers’ own admission, significantly lower even than the colleges perceive it to be.
The extent of this problem varies from college to college, just as the number of part-time staff varies. In the 67 colleges that responded to the survey, numbers of part-time staff employed ranged from 6 to 591. In the eight case-study colleges, the proportion of part-time staff employed ranged from 41% to 79%. It is not, however, just a question of numbers but the importance of the right balance between full- and part-time staff, balancing flexibility and stability.

Of the part-time staff surveyed, 55% worked to a single contract while 15% held three or more contracts. When asked if part-time working was their preferred pattern of employment, nearly three-quarters (73%) said that it was and the other 27% answered negatively. The reasons given fell into nine broad categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired or early retired</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family commitments</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other work commitments</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer full-time employment</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress or disenchantment with full-time employment</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility or freedom</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle or other interests</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer adult evening classes</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor conditions of service</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By reclassifying these reasons in terms of likely medium-to-long commitment to a career in FE, four groups were identified along a ‘voluntary–involuntary’ part-time working spectrum. The proportion of staff in each group was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly voluntary</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainly involuntary</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was some concern about the effect that this diversity of career intentions and longer term commitment to FE would have on strategic planning in areas such as staff development. It was also recognised that finding part-time replacements would become more difficult as the existing large pool of full-time, ex-employees (retired or redundant) is used up.

Around 90% of the colleges that responded to the survey thought their part-time staff were involved in a range of non-class contact activities, whereas the levels of part-time staff who claimed to be involved in such activities, were between 42% and 63%.

There was little disagreement between the two surveys on levels of support afforded to part-time staff in their working environment, such as the supply of storage/desk space and access to a mentoring scheme. Both put the availability of a range of support items at between 35% and 70%.

Benchmarks to assess the quality of the management of teaching had been developed in 42% of the colleges in the survey but although all measures were applied to full-time staff, only 65% of the measures were applied to part-time staff. A larger number of colleges (58%) had developed benchmarks for assessing the quality of teaching but only applied them to 36% of part-time staff.

There was no evidence to link the proportion of part-time staff employed with the average grade for programme areas in the 1994–97 FEFC inspection reports.

Effective management of part-time lecturers
Introduction

This publication reports an investigation that aimed to identify and evaluate approaches to the management of part-time lecturing staff in colleges, with particular reference to:

- the scale and nature of part-time employment
- the effect of the increased proportion of part-time teaching staff on the overall quality of provision
- differing approaches between colleges to the management of part-time staff, drawing also on distinctions made with full-time staff
- the financial costs and benefits of different employment patterns.

Setting the context

Management of part-time teaching staff has in recent years become an increasingly significant and emotive issue: significant because of the huge increase in the numbers and proportion of part-time teaching staff; emotive because of changes that have led to this becoming a ‘hot’ issue for politicians, trade unionists and college managers – not to mention the part-time lecturers themselves. This section summarises a number of important changes – political, legal, economic, social and technological – that have influenced managers in FE colleges in the past few years, and had a major impact on the way they manage their part-time staff.

In 1985, the Audit Commission published *Obtaining better value from further education*, in which it recommended as one of its ‘good practice’ parameters, that the proportion of part-time teaching staff should be 25%. At that time, this would have meant an increase in part-time staff in most colleges, as levels then averaged 15–20%.

In the intervening 15 years, and latterly very quickly, the proportion of part-time staff has actually grown to an average of two-thirds (based on statistics drawn from this research and closely confirmed for the whole sector by the FEFC, *Staffing statistics, 1996–97*). It is not unreasonable to reckon that there has been a five-fold increase in their numbers since 1985. When combined with the net loss of up to 20,000 full-time teaching posts in the sector over the same period, this amounts to a very significant shift in the pattern of employment. In the mid-1980s, the full-time staff numbers probably peaked at around 65,000 with perhaps a further 13,000 teaching part time. FEFC’s figures for 1997 show 44,000 full-time (excluding those employed in sixth-form colleges) and 80,000 part-time lecturers. These figures are brought into sharp focus by evidence given to the Education and Employment Committee for its report on *Part-time working* (see Table 1 overleaf).
Table 1 | The distribution of part-time employees by occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childcare and related occupations</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE (lecturers)</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales (checkout staff)</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering occupations</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office for National Statistics (Labour Force Survey Database)

Note: Since 1989, the number of part-time jobs as a proportion of all jobs has risen from 24% to 29%, an increase of nearly 21%. Over a similar period, the increase in part-time jobs in FE has been more than 200%.

Superimposed on these changes is the developing framework of further legislation covering the contractual position of part-time work, mentioned by many colleges in our survey. Existing recent legislation is designed to give part-time staff in general more security and promote long-term proportional contracts rather than casual working. As well as the changes already made to pensions and holiday pay:

- The Employment Relations Bill (1999) aims to ensure that 'persons in part-time employment are treated ... no less favourably than persons in full-time employment'. (18/1)
- Also out for consultation in Europe is the draft agreement on fixed-term work which once adopted must be implemented at national level. Key provisions include an emphasis on equality of treatment with permanent positions and a requirement for governments to set up systems to prevent the abuse of successive fixed-term contracts.

Alongside the changing legislative framework, government policy is the other key external factor that affects college human resource strategies. The incorporation of colleges had a number of important knock-on effects:

- it allowed colleges to manage their own staff for the first time from 1993
- it created a national framework for college funding via the FEFC, whose officers set up systems to hold colleges accountable for their performance in a way that had never been done before
- the FEFC promptly set challenging and measurable targets for growth in student numbers, which by 1999 had been supplemented by equally challenging targets for retention, achievement and widening participation.

These changes reinforced the pressure originating from government policies, but a further element was added when year-on-year 'efficiency targets' were introduced. All colleges, except those that started with a very low rate of funding, faced a reduction in unit funding (i.e. they had to enrol more students for the same money). This was easier for successful low-funded colleges where the overall income continued to increase, than for colleges that had failed to meet growth targets or whose unit of funding was being reduced because of the FEFC's policy of convergence (or both). Recent FEDA research (see *Hard-nosed decisions*, 1998) found that 'Since incorporation, the year-on-year efficiency gains which have been required of all colleges have often been the most important driver of human resource planning.'
Under the new government, since 1997, the emphasis continues to be on:

- growth in student numbers combined with 'widening participation'
  i.e. increasing the numbers of students recruited from those who
  have traditionally not participated in post-16 education
- better quality provision, reflected in increased retention and achievement rates
- promotion of 'lifelong learning'; often linked with flexible provision
  via information and communication technologies.

These three policy imperatives have combined to increase pressure on colleges to:

- improve the overall range of skills of their staff (to provide a wider
  curriculum, upskill for IT or address the specific needs of new groups)
- reduce their fixed costs (especially those associated with full-time perma-
  nent staff) by shifting some expenditure from staffing budgets to capital,
  consumables and accommodation (for new outreach centres, computer
  hardware and software) thus enabling colleges to cope with the financial
  constraints from increased 'efficiencies', described in more detail below
- develop their existing staff (to raise the quality of provision –
  many colleges are now recognised as Investors in People)
- be increasingly selective about new staff (for the same reason).

Part-time staff can bring new skills to the college curriculum, fresh industrial
experience and, often, positive attitudes to working with non-traditional students.
They can be brought in exactly as and when they are needed, and used in precisely
their specialist areas, raising levels of expertise and keeping costs down. Part-time
appointments often allow colleges to 'try out' young or inexperienced teachers before
making a full-time appointment. This is why college managers told us clearly,
'We can't manage without part-time staff.'

To many colleges, especially those facing a reduction in income through
'convergence', the increased responsibilities resulting from new legislation seemed to
present an intolerable financial burden. The solution, for some, was to cease to employ
part-time staff directly, and instead to contract with a service (for example, Education
Lecturing Services – ELS – or Nord Anglia) for their supply. Other colleges (80% in our
survey) consciously decided to take the risk of continuing to employ part-time staff in
the old way (in other words, without necessarily awarding the benefits that appear to
be required by the legislation). At the time of writing, many colleges anticipate more
changes that could result in further shifts in strategy.

Cost-cutting in colleges has largely been achieved through strategies linked to:

- restructuring and downsizing – which, incidentally, has resulted in a pool
  of 12,000 experienced teachers who return to colleges in a part-time role
- increasing productivity (which for part-time lecturers may mean raising
  expectations of additional unpaid contributions to the college)
- creating new types of post (e.g. instructors or facilitators)
  or contracts (e.g. outsourcing, as in contracts with agencies)
- the implementation of new pay policies.

Some of the colleges in our sample had analysed the relative costs and benefits of
employing part-time lecturers, usually comparing it with agency provision, but none
had attempted the complex analysis that would compare the whole range of possibilities:
full-time compared with part-time; lecturers versus facilitators, trainers and assessors,
whether in-college or outsourced; more radical alternatives such as distance learning
or franchised programmes.
Government policy aside, the whole environment in which colleges work has continued to change rapidly. There is a general perception (accepted by 83% of adults) that learning will be more important in the next millennium (Campaign for Learning, 1998). Technology provides new opportunities that lead both to new types of jobs – call centres being a recent example – which then require new learning programmes; and to new opportunities for communication and learning. Employment trends generally indicate that most people will have several changes of career during their working life. As the pool of unskilled jobs has already almost dried up, this will inevitably mean several spells of training or education – enforced lifelong learning. This may have far-reaching implications for colleges if they wish to meet the needs of this market.

Colleges are currently listed only fourth in the list of environments where adults say they learn most – after home, work and libraries! (ibid). More and more people (including many part-time lecturers) make a living through a mix of part-time or temporary jobs or contracts – Charles Handy’s ‘portfolio people’ (Handy, 1994) – but the benefits infrastructure is still tailored towards a far more traditional employment model.

It was the new Labour Government, however, prompted perhaps by the National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education (NATFHE) that brought the situation of part-time staff to the forefront of the FE agenda. NATFHE and the FEFC Inspectorate were among those who appeared before the Education Select Committee on the subject. NATFHE commented that there is value in the use of staffing agencies if we can be ‘confident of their probity, and with a national register of part-timers, a proper induction system for short-term cover ... with proper interviewing systems’.

The FEFC Inspectorate reported that quality of provision in colleges had remained consistent while the number of part-time staff had increased, although since then they have separately recorded teaching grades for full-time and part-time staff and noted that the latter are slightly lower. The Select Committee concluded:

It is the nature of the employment contract between staff and employer that is the overriding concern, not the distinction between full time and part time, agency-employer or college-employer. In each case minimum standards of employment practice must be met, and staff must be fully involved in, and committed to, the work of the college. All staff, whatever the basis of their employment, should have access to appropriate training and development ... Colleges are in the best position to understand their recruitment needs in terms of staff qualifications and experience.

Education and Employment Committee 1998: Further education. Volume 1

However, they went on to raise a number of concerns:

- the need for an ‘optimum or maximum ratio of part-time to full-time staff for FE colleges’
- over-dependency on part-time staff, possibly leading to failures in pastoral care or differences in the quality of provision
- colleges not offering the same development opportunities to part-time as to full-time staff
- drawbacks identified with the use of agencies, including lack of commitment, lower morale and the avoidance of contractual obligations.

This is the context in which the research leading to this report has been carried out.
Research methods

The research methods comprised:

- desk research
- a postal survey of 454 colleges in England and Wales
- visits to eight colleges for in-depth interviews with human resource and quality managers, senior managers, curriculum managers and part-time teaching staff
- a survey by questionnaire of all part-time teaching staff in the eight case-study colleges
- visits to two agencies providing teaching staff to colleges.

Desk research

The project team reviewed relevant publications and FEFC statistics. Findings from the desk research contributed to:

- the identification of relevant contextual facts
- the design of questionnaires and case-study visits
- the profiling of inspection grades against percentage of part-time staff.

College survey

A survey was sent to all the colleges in the sector, to enable us to build up information about the employment of part-time lecturers. The survey was returned by 67 colleges, a response rate of 15%. Data from the survey contributed to the design of a second postal survey of individual part-time teaching staff and to the identification of the scale and nature of employment issues raised in this report.

College case studies

The college survey questionnaires were used to identify a sample of colleges for a case-study approach. Our case-study colleges were chosen to represent a full range of FE colleges: sixth form as well as general FE; small, medium and large institutions; urban, suburban and rural, with a wide geographical spread. All the case-study colleges had good FEFC inspection reports, as we wanted to be sure that we were examining management practices in colleges that were producing an effective end result. The proportions of part-time staff ranged from 41% to 79%.

Four out of the eight case-study colleges recruited part-time lecturers through agencies such as ELS and Nord Anglia. Members of the project team visited these two major agencies to explore their management practices.
For rigour, we designed a research instrument for use in each college, including a schedule of qualitative and quantitative questions for managers and part-time staff. Interviewees in each college included: the college human resource manager, managers with responsibility for staff development and quality (where different), heads of department and course leaders from departments making use of part-timers, and where possible the principal and/or finance director. We asked for a focus group discussion with some part-time lecturers in each college.

**Individual part-time teaching staff survey**

We followed up case-study visits with a questionnaire that colleges were asked to circulate to all part-time lecturers, for return directly to FEDA. Questionnaires were returned by 508 part-time lecturers.

**Agency visits**

The discussions held and documentation provided by the agencies contributed to the identification of relevant issues and to the profiles of part-time teaching staff (see page 12).
The main issues

The scale and nature of employment

The central issue of the scale and nature of the employment of part-time staff can be encapsulated in the following spectrum of quotes, which ranges from future aspirations to present realities:

*We are persuaded as a matter of social justice and fairness, that there can be no justification for treating an employee differently on the basis of the number of hours worked.*

Education and Employment Committee's Report on Part-time Working

*The Government agrees that the status of part-time work needs to be improved. We intend to implement the Directive in a way which will help achieve this.*

The Government in response to the Select Committee's Report

*We prefer to 'grow our own' staff. It is also very likely that forthcoming legislation and EU precedent and directives will seriously erode the advantages alleged for this type of employment. We are driving towards making the distinction between full-time and part-time staff only in the number of hours they work.*

Case-study college

*Consolidation of part-time hours (into fractional appointments) cuts administration and motivates employees – although it increases costs – but new employment rights for part-time staff mean that these costs do and will exist.*

Case-study college

*We would like to pay part-time staff more for non-teaching duties – but risk equal pay claims.*

Case-study college

The contradictions are clear. The main driving force behind the change to a largely part-time teaching staff has been the need for cost efficiencies to be made both annually and over many years. The aspirations which lie behind what one college termed an 'inclusive teaching staff', could only be achieved by increasing costs in the ways implied by the last two quotes.

The figures referred to in this chapter are based on the results of the two surveys and can be found in Appendix 1 on page 37.
Scale of employment

The 1996/97 FEFC teaching staff statistics for FE colleges (excluding staff employed in sixth-form colleges) indicate that there were approximately 44,000 full-time and 80,000 part-time lecturers employed in England in that academic year. These figures suggest that the nearly two-thirds of the teaching force are part-time lecturers. However, given the likelihood that the full-time figure contains some managers who do not have full teaching programmes and that the part-time figure does not contain an estimate of the mainly part-time agency staff, it is likely that the proportion of two-thirds had already been reached by 1997.

The number of part-time staff employed in the 67 colleges that responded to our survey ranged from six to 591. The national average proportion of part-time staff appears to be around 66%, the proportions that were found in the case-study colleges ranged from 41% to 79%. However, as a number of commentators have observed, not least the Government in *The learning age* (paragraph 5.4), it is not just a question of numbers, it is also ‘important to get the right balance between full- and part-time lecturer staff, and between flexibility and stability’.

An example of the problem that can develop in most, if not all, colleges, emerged in responses from the head of management and the director of human resources (HR) of one of the case-study colleges. The former had sufficient line managers to support the relatively limited number of part-time staff. The HR director highlighted the contrast between this situation and one of the College’s initiatives to widen the participation of less well-represented groups in the local community. Operating with a mainly part-time staff, this had run into difficulties that had been acknowledged and were being tackled by redressing the balance of part-time to full-time staffing, to permit an increase in the level of management support as well as other resources. This was by no means an isolated example.

Falling levels of administrative support and a general lack of resources showed up in the functioning of the evening classes, where difficulties in communications and organisation were most pronounced as far as the part-time teachers were concerned.

Case-study college

*I feel a sense of autonomy over my own work – I saw my line manager (only) when he gave me the class register and when he collected it at the end of the course.*

Part-time lecturer
Nature of employment
The contractual nature of the employment of part-time staff can be described briefly through an analysis of the information gathered from the 67 colleges in the survey (see Appendix 1).

Proportion of colleges using agency staff
One-quarter of the colleges surveyed said that they were making use of agency staff to fill vacancies, mainly for part-time lecturers.

Contractual arrangements
The colleges in the sample were operating contractual arrangements for part-timers in the following proportions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contract</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate lecturers on fractional contracts</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly paid staff</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency staff</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The agency is used as a contractual mechanism, not really as a means of finding new staff. For example, a high percentage of agency staff are ex-employees.

Case-study college

Types of contract
The 508 lecturers who responded to the questionnaire survey of part-time staff in the eight case-study colleges described the types of contracts held in the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Contract</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed term</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly paid staff</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency staff</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed hours</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly paid</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractional/associate</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some respondents gave more than a single description in their answer.

Numbers of contracts per lecturer and weekly hours taught
In the part-time staff survey, with a couple of small variations, the numbers of weekly hours taught by each lecturer were evenly spread throughout the range from three or less to 22 hours or more (Figure 5). The number of contracts held by individuals ranged from 55% with a single contract to the 15% who are currently working to three or more (Figure 9).

These facts and other attributes such as the age profile and range of subjects taught (below), give this sample a measure of ‘closeness of fit’ to the shape of the national population that might justify a degree of confidence in any conclusions drawn from the analysis.

The average number of hours is in the ‘10–12’ hour range, i.e. roughly half the number of hours taught by full-time members of staff. This statistic supports the earlier estimate, using FEFC statistics and the findings from the college survey, that there are now approximately two part-time lecturers for every full-time lecturer.

Rates of pay
There was little difference in the findings from the two surveys on the question of rates of pay (Figure 10). For the three main types of contract mentioned above, the rates were as follows:

- for fractional staff, the pay range was from £8.55 to £30.00 – with a mean of £14.19
- for hourly paid staff, the range was from £10.20 to £23.30 – with a mean of £16.41
- for agency staff, the range was from £14.97 to £20.00 – with a mean of £17.00.
Subjects taught
The four programme areas with the majority of student enrolments according to national statistics, are well represented in this sample. Art and design also, not surprisingly, has a larger than average number of part-time teachers (Figure 13). In fact, the proportion of part-timers teaching in each of the programme areas closely resembles the national picture of the corresponding proportions of student enrolments in the same programme areas.

Teaching qualifications held
The profile of this sample bears little relation to the corresponding FEFC statistics for 1996/97 – the number of higher level of qualifications is much greater. It is not, however, possible to tell which set of data is the more representative. (See both Appendix 1, Figure 6 and Appendix 2.)

Age profile
The frequencies of the age groups in this sample display a pattern consistent with being drawn from a normally distributed population and similar to the national distribution (Figure 1). The slight difference in the proportion of staff over the age of 50 reflects the current situation in which an unusually high number of full-time staff, having taken early retirement, are returning to do some part-time work.

Further understanding of the complex nature of part-time employment can be gained by comparing colleges’ perceptions of the situation and the corresponding views of the part-time lecturers involved.

Who are the part-time staff?
From their responses to the questionnaire survey of part-timers and from interviews with groups of staff in the case-study colleges, a picture of the differing motivations that might underpin choice of part-time employment was built up. Staff were asked whether it was their preferred choice and then to specify a reason for it. Thus:

Is part-time work your preferred pattern of employment?
This was answered in 484 of the 508 responses received: 73% said it was a positive choice and the other 27% said it was negative (Figure 7). By comparison, in the UK workforce as a whole, 90% of part-timers do not want a full-time job, the others could not find one. The reasons given, positive and negative, fell consistently into nine broad categories (Figure 8). An example of each category is set out below, together with the percentage of responses. There are examples of more detailed answers, which were given to an open question on the same theme, at the end of Chapter 4 (page 25).

Responses
1. Retired or retired early (including redundancy) – 12.8%
   I retired early from a full-time post in further education. Part-time work allows me to be involved in some non-paid projects within my area of interest while earning a small monthly salary for part-time work to add to my pension payments.
2. Flexibility or freedom – 8.1%
   I am a free agent; I can leave when I choose; I can take more than one job.
3. Family commitments – 24.6%
   I am working while my young children are at school, but wish to be available when they are at home.
4. Lifestyle or other interests – 5.4%
   I have worked full time in positions of responsibility, but now with my family grown up I wish to teach part time and enjoy time to pursue other interests. Also, I do not want the ‘stress’ of full-time employment.
5. Other work/professional commitments – 20.5%
   I have my own design business so it works out well in terms of personal development – academically and financially.

6. Prefer to teach adults in evening classes – 0.6%
   Adult education tends to be in unsociable hours, i.e. evenings/weekends.

7. No security, poor pay, no holiday pay, ‘scattered’ commitments – 7.2%
   Fixed-term contracts do not cover work preparation, meetings, and DD [departmental duties] time. There is no long-term security, difficult to obtain mortgages, loans, HP.

8. Would prefer to have full-time employment – 17.4%
   I require full-time employment to fulfil my financial commitments.

9. Stress or disenchantment with full-time employment – 3.5%
   Because full-time teaching for 26 hours a week is too demanding to be done well or satisfyingly.

The varied circumstances and motivations of these groups mean that they may have different support and staff development needs. This is more fully explored in Staff development and appraisal on page 20.

At a superficial level, although colleges still need to address why one-quarter of staff do not want part-time work, these responses do show why nearly three-quarters of them actually prefer this form of employment. However, as the next section clearly shows, the situation is not quite as simple as that.

**The voluntary–involuntary spectrum**

Looking in more detail at the preferences of the staff for their chosen pattern of employment may help to highlight important aspects of management relating to what a college may reasonably expect from, and provide for, the part-time lecturer. Implicit in the reasons that have been given for preferring, or not, to undertake part-time work, are indications about longer-term commitments to a career in FE. These, in turn, can be compared with commitments colleges make to their part-time staff.

In a research project carried out at Southend College by Rick Olver, three groups of part-time workers were identified:

- voluntary – people who choose part-time work to fit in with domestic arrangements
- involuntary (1) – people who would prefer to do full-time work
- involuntary (2) – people who do not wish to work part time but need the money.

Olver was concerned specifically with part-time staff working in adult education, but his approach provides a useful starting-point in this analysis.

The responses to this survey suggest that a more complex situation exists in FE which could be better classified in terms of a voluntary–involuntary spectrum, from completely voluntary to completely involuntary:

- lifestyle or other interests, hobbies and voluntary work
- flexibility/freedom to choose
- prefer to teach in adult education (evening classes)
- other work/professional commitments, often full time
- early retirement (not redundancy)
- family commitments
- prefer full-time work – career progression, security/money
- redundancy (early retirement package including part-time work)
- retired (aged over 60)
- stress from, or disenchantment with, full-time work.
Using the statistics from Figure 8, which shows the proportion of part-time staff who indicated one of the above reasons for their choice of employment pattern, it appears there are four groups of part-time staff, exhibiting differing medium to long term career patterns.

**Group one: voluntary**
This covers the first five categories which contain those part-timers who have access to income from other sources such as other salaried work, self-employment, own business, pension, etc. and who see part-time teaching as a supplementary or secondary activity. Many of those in employment elsewhere describe themselves in terms of their ‘other’ professional role. No doubt this group contains most of the ‘volunteers’ but the mixture of professional ambitions, lifestyle choices and varying degrees of independent means, suggests that its collective commitment to teaching in FE in the medium to long term might be regarded as ‘soft’.

This group represents approximately 40% of the sample.

**Group two: mainly voluntary**
This group contains all those who indicated ‘family commitments’ as their primary reason for working part time. Unlike the first group, there are no obvious clues to future career prospects, although a few of the respondents expressed a hope for a return to full-time teaching. A similar number indicated a preference for remaining part time with a view to broadening their outside interests later when the family was older. The medium to long term commitments here might best be described as uncertain – a mixture of full-time and part-time returners and a proportion of potential non-returners.

This group represents approximately 25% of the sample.

**Group three: mainly involuntary**
This group covers those who wish to gain full-time employment. ‘Volunteers’ are in a minority in this group, those who see part-time employment as a stepping-stone to a career in FE (newly qualified or mid-career move). Many more are ‘involuntary’ part-timers who wish to regain a full-time post or who have waited rather a long time to move up to a permanent contract. There is a large sub-set in this group who would settle for a substantial associate lecturer post because of the prospect it offers of greater security. Future intentions in this group are focused on medium to long term commitment to FE, with the proviso that it is in a full-time post. However, one-third of this group also expressed very negative views about the current conditions of part-time employment and this may temper their longer-term plans to remain in the sector.

This group represents approximately 25% of the sample.

**Group four: involuntary**
This group covers those who, for one reason or another, could be described as the ‘involuntary’ part-timers – redundant lecturers who see no future prospects, retired lecturers beyond the normal retiring age and lecturers for whom full-time work is too stressful or is ‘unacceptable’. There would seem to be only limited future commitments among this group.

This group represents approximately 10% of the sample.
Implications
If this small sample is in any way representative of the whole population of part-time lecturers in FE, it provides some important evidence of the extent of diversity within the workforce. As the trend towards casualisation is maintained, the number of part-time lecturers employed will continue to approach the 100,000 mark. Even now, the numbers in each of the broad groups described above will be close to 40,000, 25,000, 25,000 and 10,000 respectively.

Both within each group and between the groups, there are examples of mixed motivations, divided loyalties and varying levels of commitment to a career in FE. Since these groups together represent at least two-thirds of the current FE teaching profession, an understanding of the underlying implications is a prerequisite for any strategic planning process, local or national.

For example, what must be clear from the spread of reasons at the ‘voluntary’ end of the spectrum, including ‘family commitments’, is that for many staff involved, the college contract is only one commitment among many. Teaching on Mondays and Tuesdays cannot imply any commitment to ‘pop in’ on Wednesdays, Thursdays or Fridays to take part in course teams, staff meetings, staff development or to see students.

Despite that, the colleges’ survey indicates that approximately 90% of the colleges ‘perceive’ hourly paid part-time staff as fully or partially involved in these activities. The word ‘perceive’ was carefully chosen – as one college commented, ‘we cannot “expect” part-time staff to undertake any of these activities because, to do so, may lead us to Industrial Tribunal claims for equal pay’.

The colleges’ perceptions (Figure 14) are not matched by the corresponding judgements of the part-time staff who put the level of any significant involvement in non class-contact activities in the range 42% to 63% (Figures 11a to 11e). The part-time staff may see this level of commitment to what are essentially unremunerated activities as providing a reasonable contribution to the work of the college. The higher level of 90% would seem to be the level of commitment that the colleges would like to see rather than the one they actually see. Either way, there is a large gap between the parties on this issue.

Payment at £9 per hour is available for agreed non-teaching duties.
Case-study college

No pay even for essential meetings but I go along to keep in touch.
In one section part-timers aren’t even invited.
Part-timer

There is much less of a gap in perceptions of colleges’ support for part-time staff within the working environment. Between 40% and 70% of colleges say that they provide the different elements of support listed in Figure 15, and between 35% and 65% of the staff agree that they do indeed receive such support (Figure 12). But, given that the areas of support include storage space, communications, a mentoring scheme and involvement in deciding which classes they teach, perhaps the part-time staff would be justified in thinking that all colleges should offer these things. In the 508 responses, staff frequently complained about not having a desk/storage space, not being kept up to date with developments and, to a lesser extent, not having access to a mentoring system.

Mentoring systems (are useful), when they work well – which didn’t seem to be the case anywhere we saw.
Consultant’s report

If storage and quiet study areas are adequate for students, then part-time lecturers should also be adequately catered for. Ditto for access to IT. It seems to me that the issue of storage space is a big one – having a lockable drawer for your handbag, for instance. It may be helpful to think about part-timers’ requirements in terms of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs – cater for food, security and belongings in that order.
Consultant’s report
One idea (for the use of a college-wide intranet) was the establishment of an internal database of part-timers who were available to all departments where appropriate. Another was the idea of developing a structured resources base for each programme, so that part-timers would just drop in to a pre-existing framework (as in the Open University).

Case-study college

A very comprehensive handbook and induction for all new staff; an accessible full-time office; a supportive culture; enabled to slot into an established timetable with meetings set and working to detailed course materials.

Open University

Wide use of e-mail addresses, key staff-room access and video conferencing.

Case-study college

Staff responses in four colleges compared

The part-time staff from four of the group of eight colleges chosen for the case studies returned their completed questionnaires in significant numbers (411 of the 508 used in the main sample above), a large enough number to form statistically viable subsets. This allowed the earlier questions about preference for part-time work and the main reason for that choice to be re-analysed here on an individual college basis, as follows:

Table 2 | Is part-time work the preferred pattern of employment of staff in four colleges?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>College (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 | The reasons for choosing part-time employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>College (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired or retired early (including redundancy)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility or freedom to do other activities</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family commitments</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle or other interests</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other work/professional commitments</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor conditions, pay, insecurity, etc.</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would prefer full-time appointment</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress/disenchantment with full-time work</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The category of staff who prefer to teach adults in evening classes has been excluded here because the frequencies were too low. The totals do not always add up to 100 because a few respondents did not answer every question fully.
Analysis of this section of the survey suggests three recommendations.

**Recommendation 1** | In planning for future investment in, and development of, part-time staff, colleges should take particular note of the diversity of personal objectives identified in the 'voluntary – involuntary' spectrum.

**Recommendation 2** | Linked to this issue is the related one of commitment to the work of the college beyond the classroom. In their planning processes, colleges need to consider what strategies should be developed to narrow the ‘perception gap’ between what colleges would wish the level to be and what part-timers feel is reasonable within the terms of their contracts.

**Recommendation 3** | Colleges should review the levels of support that they are currently providing, to ensure that items such as those highlighted in this survey are regarded as normal features of the working environment available to all part-time staff.

### Quality

Many of the issues covered earlier also have a direct bearing on quality.

**Involvement in the work of the college**

Evidence of involvement by part-time staff in the work of the college outside the classroom demonstrated a gap between the colleges’ perceptions of what takes place and the lecturers’ own estimations. Although most colleges believed that their part-time staff were fully or partially involved in staff and course development and meetings, and in extracurricular support for students, part-timers paint a different picture. They declare that they never, or only rarely, get involved in staff meetings (58%), staff development (54%), course development (38%) and team meetings (37%). Perhaps most worryingly, and remembering that two-thirds of the workforce are now part-time, 48% declared that they did not get (or rarely get) involved with any extracurricular support for students.

It is not possible to estimate what effect these levels of non-involvement of the teaching staff might have on quality. However, if the views expressed by the staff in the sample are an accurate reflection of two-thirds of the workforce, then average levels of non-involvement of nearly 50% must surely be a matter of some concern.

> [We need to] develop more systems for getting feedback from part-timers – people make a lot of assumptions about their perceptions. Then deal with the issues that have been uncovered.

Case-study college

The table overleaf compares staff perceptions of involvement in four of the case-study colleges.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>College (%)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/course development</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team meetings</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff meetings</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular support for students</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question of levels of staff involvement is less about individual choice and more about the interplay of the college’s invitation (and support) and the individual’s willingness to take part. Although it would be wrong to draw firm conclusions about any particular difference on the basis of a sample of this size, some of the patterns might not have occurred by chance but as a result of different organisational policies. For example, 28% of part-time teachers in colleges B and C will not, on average, take part in curriculum development whereas, in A and D, 47% will not be involved. In the same two pairs of colleges, students will get some level of extra-curricular support from 64% of part-time staff in B and C, whereas only 48% will get in support in A and D.
The working environment

There is evidence of only modest levels of support for the part-timers' working environment in areas such as the provision of storage space, access to a mentoring scheme and other items set out in Figure 15.

Table 5 illustrates the following findings from the four case-study colleges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of working environment</th>
<th>College (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take part in college induction programmes</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided with adequate desk/storage space</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated with college wide new developments in own specialism</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to college newsletter</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to a mentoring scheme</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A feeling of autonomy over own work</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A say in deciding which classes you teach</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support in difficult teaching situations</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel easily dispensable ('hired and fired')</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff in the different colleges share some aspects of the working environment but not all. It is unlikely that any formal mentoring schemes are in operation; unlikely that there is much desk and/or storage space available; but likely that staff feel autonomy over their own work and have a say in which classes they will teach. Opinion is divided on the other aspects but both colleges and part-time staff agree that there is a significant gap between the ideal of the inclusive staff and the differential levels of support afforded to the part-time section of it.

Is one of the problems simply the lack of administrative support, pushing even more on to the first layer of managers?
Consultant's report

Benchmarking

Another gap in the treatment of part-time staff was revealed by the information that was collected on the incidence of the benchmarking being used to assess the quality of management of the teaching staff and of teaching. In the 42% of colleges that have developed benchmarks to assess the quality of the management of teaching staff, all measures are applied to the full-time staff but only 65% are applied to the part-time staff. Benchmarks for the quality of teaching, are applied to only 36% of part-time staff, although 58% of colleges had developed them.

The partial attention to part-time staff indicated by these figures sits uneasily with FEFC statistics showing the overall level of teaching qualifications and the Assessment Committee's comment about the quality of teaching. In both cases, there is cause for concern. Also, evidence from the surveys demonstrates the wide range of personal motivations and career intentions that exist within the population of part-timers. These require different strategies in the management of teaching. A simple matrix, which links levels of staff motivation and competence with consequential actions that might be taken by managers, may illustrate the point.
For example, responsibility can be delegated to a highly motivated and competent practising professional artist; while a strategy of providing suitable staff development opportunities might need to be devised for the less well-qualified but motivated teacher.

**Recommendation 4** | There should be consistent approaches to benchmarking for management of both full-time and part-time teaching staff, and for the quality of teaching of both full-time and part-time teaching staff.

## Staff development and appraisal

### Staff development

Only 10% of the 67 colleges in the survey ‘perceived’ that their hourly paid staff did not get involved in staff development programmes, although 54% of the part-time staff surveyed described their own involvement as ‘never’ or ‘rarely’. However, the one characteristic of the sample that varied significantly from the corresponding national statistic, was the general level of teaching qualifications held. Staff in the case-study colleges had a much larger proportion of higher level qualifications and therefore may have regarded further involvement as unnecessary.

There was no evidence in the case-study colleges of any lack of encouragement for all staff, including part-time staff, to undertake further education and training, teaching qualifications and professional updating.

The colleges’ undoubted encouragement, linked to their belief that most part-timers are involved (which appears to be at variance with the lack of any very positive action by many part-timers) is probably caused by factors already discussed in relation to other issues. However, apart from those on fractional appointments, most part-timers are likely to attend courses in their own time and without payment (but with fees often covered). Also, ‘own time’ may not mean time free of other commitments, given that nearly half of the part-time staff have two or more contracts and a quarter have family commitments.

From the colleges’ point of view, ‘encouragement’ has to be tempered with caution in avoiding any ‘requirement’ to play a full role outside the classroom because this could lead to equal pay claims.
This is particularly an issue for part-time teachers involved with students studying at foundation and entry level. These teachers are sometimes not well equipped to deal with students who have a wide range of backgrounds and abilities.

College managers need to ensure that staff development programmes provide teachers with the skills they need to do their job effectively.

Report of the FEFC Quality Assessment Committee for 1996/97

Very good staff development policies with training available even for part-time staff who teach for only a few hours (almost at the 'visiting lecturer' level for whom a special 'teaching survival kit', based on the C&G course, has been devised).

Case-study college

In 1997/98, inspectors concluded that the overall quality of lessons delivered by teachers on part-time and fractional contracts was slightly worse than that of their full-time colleagues. More should be done to ensure that they are included in activities designed to assess and improve teaching, such as professional appraisal, curriculum management and staff development initiatives.

Report of the FEFC Quality Assessment Committee for 1997-98

**Appraisal**

Evidence from the information on benchmarking (on page 19), indicated that 58% of colleges used benchmarking to assess the quality of teaching, but that only 30% of them used appraisal as one of the measures. This statistic mirrors the situation in the case studies, where the inclusion of part-time staff in schemes of appraisal was a developing feature, part of extending existing practice to more staff. Unsurprisingly, inadequate resources and the large numbers of staff involved in some cases were seen as limiting the speed of any implementation.

> There is continuity at the moment because so many agency staff are ex-employee. Maybe this will be OK for the next two or three years, then it will affect students.

Case-study college manager

All the evidence for this report about transition from a mainly full-time to a mainly part-time workforce confirms the fears of this manager. The large ‘pool’ of early retired or redundant full-time staff cannot be ‘fished’ again so easily. Nor is there an easy short-term way to fill the pool again in the wake of the exodus of staff over the age of 50 who were eligible for early retirement and took advantage of arrangements no longer in place. The quality of the students’ experience could be affected by a much greater reliance on inexperienced part-time staff; there would be a loss of continuity and a lack of knowledge about college systems.

**Recommendation 5** | Colleges must urgently consider planning strategies to accommodate succession from full time to part time (e.g. early retirement), part-time conversion to full-time and subject conversions (e.g. staff development opportunities).
Financial costs and benefits

The responses to the questionnaire survey of colleges revealed some apparent contradictions in answers to the perceived advantages or disadvantages of particular HR policies. For example:

What do you perceive as being the advantages and disadvantages of the present contractual arrangements?

The top four reasons, for and against the current arrangements, were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial relations</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial relations</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the college uses agency staff, what are the main benefits?
If not, are there any particular reasons for this decision?

There was a set of even more mixed messages on the questions about the benefits of the arrangements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main benefits</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of staff</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal reasons</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of response</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for not using agencies</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment/ownership</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reasons</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of staff</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal reasons</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These apparent contradictions were also evident in the college case studies, where continuing pressure to make short-term cost savings seemed inimical to use of a cost-benefit analysis which might provide improvements in the medium term. Two publications recently addressed this question in the context of FE colleges.

The Joseph Rowntree Foundation/University of Warwick research study into 'flexibility' in different sectors of the workforce produced a template of costs and benefits of flexible employment that could be applied in further education (set out in Table 6 on page 24). This template contains many of the ingredients that were evident in the case studies and elsewhere in the survey material but there are still other potential 'benefits and costs' that could be added. The FEFC's Professional development in further education, 1998/99 (1999, see Appendix 3) reproduces the outline of a system currently being used in one college as part of its planning for future staff development programmes.

Question marks (?) in the Table 6 template alongside several of the individual factors indicate that these may contribute to both costs and benefits. For example, better child-care facilities may be seen as a cost and also as a benefit that allows part-time staff to play a larger role in the work of the college and perhaps reduce the need for additional staff.

The evidence set out below indicates a need for a more detailed framework analysing costs and benefits, which could then be offered to colleges as a model.
According to national statistics, which were reflected in the survey findings, at least two-thirds of average college expenditure is committed to salaries and at least two-thirds of the teaching is now in the hands of part-time staff.

The survey of part-timers revealed a number of teachers who have a mixture of motivations within their longer-term career intentions that should be taken into account in any strategic planning. There was strong circumstantial evidence to suggest that the sample was reasonably representative of the population as a whole.

Colleges demonstrated rather contradictory messages when describing their reasons for choosing a particular contractual arrangement, including whether or not to use the services of an employment agency.

The establishment of the Further Education National Training Organisation (FENTO) and moves to develop a framework of teaching qualifications that would allow the introduction of a version of qualified teacher status in further education mean that pressure is likely to increase to ensure that all teachers, including part-time staff, are properly qualified.

The level of investment in programmes of staff development to achieve that is going to be high. One of the concerns expressed by the Education and Employment Committee was about the increased cost of training in relation to high levels of part-time working. With part-timers outnumbering full-time lecturers in a ratio of 2:1 and with average periods of tenure, according to evidence given to the Committee, estimated to be 60% of that of a full-time colleague, a cost-benefit analysis needs to be applied to the medium-term effects of these factors.

It is unlikely that anyone could have forecast ten years ago the scale and precise nature of the growth in part-time working. It simply grew, unplanned, from 15–20% to 65–70% of the teaching workforce, transforming the nature of employment in its wake. As the evidence also shows, the growth was not uniform. Numbers of part-time staff in the sample of colleges varied from 6 to 591. Even in colleges with below average numbers of part-time staff, there can be pockets of high levels of part-time staffing in particular curriculum areas.

**Recommendation 6** Any framework developed should take into account the aspirations of the Select Committee for Education and Employment and the similarly stated aim of a number of colleges in this survey, to develop an 'inclusive' work force. To contribute to an efficient and effective and strategic approach to human resource planning, a model framework should be developed for the analysis of financial costs and benefits. This framework can then be incorporated into the processes of strategic planning in human resources.
### Table 6 | Benefits and costs for employers and employees

**EMPLOYER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting demands of a tighter budget</td>
<td>Lack of continuity of hourly paid staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less unproductive time</td>
<td>Lower core teaching staff commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending the daily/weekly/annual provision, so widening access</td>
<td>Lower commitment of hourly paid staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening client base (e.g. distance learning, franchising activities)</td>
<td>Demarcation disputes between teaching and learning support staff (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resourcing to meet labour needs over day, week and year</td>
<td>Climate of distrust in industrial relations (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More efficient use of resources</td>
<td>Rules-driven culture discourages employee involvement (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing labour costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing division of labour between different categories (and prices) of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing employee individualism, which may weaken collectivism (?) – improving industrial relations (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closer auditing of employee performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to ‘try out’ staff as casuals prior to offering more secure contracts (so fewer recruitment mistakes) (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EMPLOYEE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job creation of casual jobs that can lead to better career opportunities</td>
<td>Staff morale reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job opportunities over extended day/week/spatially, provide opportunities for staff unable to work weekday hours</td>
<td>Increase in the workload of core staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility for employees and family-friendly policies, and employee development, remain part of the culture</td>
<td>Peripheral staff often isolated and not given full support facilities/omitted from meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Arts and Performance professionals to supplement earnings by teaching and for practitioners to balance teaching and practice</td>
<td>Insecurity of employment, especially for hourly-paid teaching staff and others teaching ‘minority demand’ courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio careers for scarce-skilled experts (?)</td>
<td>‘Climate of accountability’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for administration and technical staff to extend skills and enrich jobs (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearer specification of rights and obligations for all employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward for effort and productivity and the elimination of ‘passengers’ (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Joseph Rowntree Foundation/University of Warwick
Part-timers' preferred choices

In the survey of part-timers, as well as asking for the reasons why part-time work is, or is not, the preferred pattern of employment, an open question was provided. This requested a description of any other aspects of the working environment that were felt to be relevant in the context of the questionnaire.

Of the 508 completed returns, 215 respondents chose to answer this question, and did so within the following broad categories:

Table 7 | Part-timers' impression of the working environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impressions of the working environment</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive views</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More positive than negative</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance of positive and negative</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More negative than positive</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative views</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To give some impression of the spectrum of views expressed, six representative responses are reproduced below. The selection happens to come from staff at different colleges, by reference to the recorded postmarks, but the same range of views could have been drawn from staff at the same college.

This may be unexceptional but it emphasises that there is a complicated interplay between the staff with a diverse set of personal objectives and the organisation of different sections within each college, which may, or may not, be complementary.

Good access to IT with e-mail facilities. I have always managed to take advantage of staff development courses concerned with personal skills as well as teaching programmes. I have opportunities to keep up with administrative programmes through attending regular staff meetings.

Part-time lecturing staff appear to provide a large percentage of the staffing within the department.

Part-time teachers provide valuable support and ideas for course development; however an 'open invitation' to contribute more would be appreciated.

Desk or shelf space would be very welcome – none is provided.

Part-time staff carry heavy file loads daily. All files have to be kept at home.

A small financial contribution (possibly a one-off payment) per annum towards the considerable time spent marking work would be much appreciated.

Part-time staff attend many meetings and no financial provision is made – a small contribution would be appreciated.

A curriculum meeting specifically for part-time staff, say twice a year, would be helpful, headed by the Curriculum Manager. This would help to bridge the 'divide' between part-time and full-time staff in large departments.

Despite the above, the working conditions are excellent – staff friendly, kind and supportive. The college standards are high and therefore I take a pride in my job. Excellent level of support for teachers/students is always available.
I enjoy the freedom which leaving full-time teaching has given me. I have less pressure, fewer commitments and feel that the teaching I am asked to do is greatly valued. In fact, I feel more valued than I did when in a full-time post with responsibility points! I have a greater sense of autonomy in many areas.

My reason for stating [earlier] that I feel dispensable is that working at an evening centre and in the Home Tuition Service, I am required when there are pupils either wanting my course or teachers who are ill. Hence, I could, potentially, have no work at all.

Despite the fact I am very much happier to be out of full-time teaching, I recognise the loss of experience and expertise which the profession has suffered in my departure and, no doubt, from many others like me who have simply ‘had enough’? Nevertheless, I am pleased still to be able to use my skills at a reduced level and in a way that suits me.

Working as part of the college in the community, I have to carry all stationery requirements, work-sheets, craft materials, books, reference books, etc., with me. I have to have storage space at home for all this and go into college for whatever purpose – handing in forms, collecting materials, etc., in my own time.

My working environment is whatever room a school or community centre has available. This varies from a well-equipped, good-sized room to draughty school halls with the lingering smell of school dinners in the atmosphere.

Phone calls about work to college staff, teachers, other tutors are made (from home) at my own expense. These can sometimes be lengthy, and therefore costly.

Having a permanent fractional part-time contract seems to mean all the duties and responsibilities of a full-time member of staff – the only difference being the reduced class contact. I feel that at 0.6 I should only be doing 0.6 of the administration, training, etc.

Over recent years I was employed as a part-time lecturer on a college contract. As such I did attend course meetings and was fully engaged on course development. From September 1998, the college, in the interest of cutting costs, would only employ me through an agency, at a much-reduced salary and without any provision for me to undertake either attendance at course meetings or course development work. What was a vocation has become just a job!

The working environment has become almost intolerable.
Common features of good practice

There was a wide range of practice among and within the colleges. The two staffing agencies were different again, both from each other and from the colleges. The best practice, however, offered part-time staff the following elements, which have been grouped into support, employment matters, quality and management issues.

Support (administrative, working environment, management)

- an induction programme and/or start-up information
- access to advice from the Personnel section
- information updates, such as a regular, personal copy of the college newsletter
- a pigeon-hole and/or access to a message service
- a safe place in which to keep teaching materials and personal possessions
- a place to work when not teaching
- sufficient line-management support
- access to a mentoring scheme
- recognition and/or praise for work well done
- an invitation to attend course team or other relevant meetings
- feedback on student achievement
- information about internal job vacancies and how to progress to fractional or full-time work.

Employment matters

- some security of employment
- employment practices that ensure equal opportunities
- information about pay and conditions of employment, including holiday pay, pensions, compassionate leave, entitlement to benefits, etc.
- recruitment practices that are transparent and fair
- payment (maybe at a lower rate) for attendance at meetings.

Quality

- access to the college’s system of staff review and appraisal
- access to staff development, including initial teacher training
- access to teaching and learning resources, including IT
- benchmarking procedures applied equally to part-time staff
- a system for monitoring the quality of part-time staff.

Management issues

- a manageable timetable (i.e. not too many separate hours and days)
- an appropriate balance of full-time to part-time staff
- other staff, including managers, having clear, shared ideas on what it is reasonable to expect part-timers to do
- managers who are aware that different part-timers have different needs
- recognition from staff, and managers, that part-timers have a useful role
- sufficient time for managers to manage the part-time staff
- planning strategies to accommodate succession from full to part time (e.g. early retirement) and part-time conversion to full-time (e.g. staff development opportunities).
The relationship between FEFC inspection grades and the proportion of part-time staff

A separate investigation was carried out to determine if there was any correlation between FE colleges' inspection grades for programmes and the proportion of part-time lecturers employed.

Method

A sample of 324 colleges was used, consisting of:

- 280 FE and tertiary colleges
- 29 agricultural colleges
- 15 art and design and specialist designated.

The 'inspection grades' were represented by the mean of the individual colleges' range of curriculum programme area grades (1–5) and paired with the 'proportion of the part-time staff' employed, as represented by the percentage of full-time equivalent (FTE) part-time lecturers.

The information was collated from the first round of FEFC college inspection reports, 1994/95 to 1997/98 and the resulting scatter graph of the variables (see Figure 3, page 31) was produced.

Statistics

The mean of the colleges' average inspection grades in each group was:

- 2.32 for FE colleges
- 2.22 for agricultural colleges
- 1.94 for art and design/designated colleges

The range of average grades was 1.00–3.22.

The mean of the colleges' percentage of part-time, full-time equivalent (FTE) staffing in each group was:

- 27% for FE colleges
- 18% for agricultural colleges
- 45% for art and design/designated colleges

The range of average FTE percentages was 5% to 64%.
Findings

The scatter diagram did not reveal any discernible correlation between the variables and did not justify any further, more sophisticated statistical analysis. The range of different percentages of part-time staff provides good differentiation, using the inspection grades 1 (excellent) to 5 (poor) with a predominance of 2s and 3s which produced many clusters around averages of between 2 and 3. Evidence from the colleges’ survey shows that there are variations in the numbers of part-time staff employed in colleges with similar FTE ratios, suggesting that the FTE count provides only a rough guide to population density.

However, in the context of this research, it may be worth noting that of the 15 art and design/designated colleges, which, as a group, had easily the highest average proportion of part-time staff at 45%, 14 had an average FEFC grade that was better than the combined FE colleges’ average grade.
Figure 3 | Variables from the first round of FEFC college inspections

The relationship between FEFC inspection grades and the proportion of part-time staff.

- General FE and agricultural colleges  □ Art and specialist colleges
The specific recommendations arising from this research and discussed in some detail in Chapter 4 are repeated below:

**Recommendation 1**
In planning for future investment in, and development of, part-time staff, colleges should take particular note of the diversity of personal objectives identified in the four groups of staff in the ‘voluntary – involuntary’ spectrum.

**Recommendation 2**
Linked to this issue is the related one of the immediate levels of commitment to the work of the college beyond the classroom. In their planning processes, colleges need to consider what strategies should be developed to narrow the ‘perception gap’ between what colleges would wish the level to be and what part-timers feel is reasonable within the terms of their contracts.

**Recommendation 3**
Colleges should review the levels of support that they currently provide to ensure that the items such as those highlighted in this survey, are regarded as normal features of the working environment and are available for all part-time staff.

**Recommendation 4**
There should be consistent approaches to benchmarking of management of both full-time and part-time teaching staff, and of the quality of teaching of both full-time and part-time teaching staff.

**Recommendation 5**
Colleges must urgently consider strategies to accommodate succession from full time to part time (e.g. early retirement), part-time conversion to full-time and subject conversions (e.g. staff development opportunities).

**Recommendation 6**
Any framework should take into account the aspirations of the Select Committee for Education and Employment and the similar aim of some colleges in this survey to develop an ‘inclusive’ work force. To contribute to an efficient and effective and strategic approach to human resource planning, a model framework should be developed for the analysis of financial costs and benefits. This framework can then be incorporated into the processes of strategic planning in human resources.
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Part-timers' survey – main results

Figure 1 | Age profile compared with the national statistics, 1996/97

![Bar chart showing age profile comparison](chart)

Figure 2 | Gender balance

![Pie chart showing gender balance](chart)

Figure 3 | Ethnicity
33% of the part-timers are from ethnic minority groups compared with 6.8% nationally.

Figure 4 | Disability
1% of part-timers are registered disabled compared with 1.6% nationally.
Figure 5 | Average number of contract hours per week per lecturer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 to 21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6 | Teaching qualifications held compared with national statistics, 1996/97

Key to qualifications:
1. Graduate (BA/BSc/BEd)
2. Certificate of Education
3. PGCE
4. C&G 730 series
5. TDLB
6. Other
7. None
8. Not known
Figure 7 | Is part-time work your preferred pattern of employment?

Key to reasons given:
A. Retired or early retired (including redundancy)
B. Flexibility or freedom
C. Family commitments
D. Lifestyle or other interests
E. Other work/professional commitments
F. Prefer to teach adults in evening classes
G. No security, poor pay, no holiday pay, 'scattered' commitments
H. Would prefer to have full-time employment
I. Stress or disenchantment with full-time employment
Figure 9 | The number of contracts held per lecturer

Figure 10 | Hourly rates of pay
The following five figures cover questions about the part-timers’ involvement in the work of the college.

**Figure 11a | Involvement in staff development**

- **Never**: 35%
- **Rarely**: 19%
- **Sometimes**: 35%
- **Always**: 11%

**Figure 11b | Involvement in course development**

- **Never**: 23%
- **Rarely**: 15%
- **Sometimes**: 37%
- **Always**: 25%

**Figure 11c | Involvement in staff meetings**

- **Never**: 29%
- **Rarely**: 20%
- **Sometimes**: 31%
- **Always**: 20%
Figure 11d | Involvement in team meetings

Never: 21%
Rarely: 16%
Sometimes: 33%
Always: 30%

Figure 11e | Involvement in extracurricular support

Never: 40%
Rarely: 18%
Sometimes: 30%
Always: 12%
Figure 12 | Aspects of the working environment that apply to part-time staff

Key:  
A. Take part in college induction programmes
B. Provided with adequate desk/storage space
C. Updated with new college-wide developments
D. Updated with developments in own specialism
E. Access to college newspaper
F. Have access to mentoring scheme
G. Have feeling of autonomy over own work
H. Have a say in deciding which classes you teach
I. Support in difficult teaching situations
J. Feel easily dispensable ('hired and fired')
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Figure 13 | Subjects taught

Programme areas

Maths/Science  Agriculture  Construction  Engineering  Business  Leisure  Health  Art  Humanities  Basic Education
Appendix 1b

Colleges' survey – main results

The next set of figures has been constructed from the information taken from the survey of colleges, which was carried out at the start of the research project. In particular, Figures 14 and 15 relate directly to the views expressed by the part-time staff in Figures 11a to 11e and Figure 12 above.

Figure 14 | College perceptions of involvement of staff in non-teaching activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of commitment</th>
<th>Fully</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
A. In the induction programme  
B. In curriculum and course development  
C. In programmes of professional development  
D. In course team meetings  
E. In departmental meetings  
F. In staff meetings  
G. In extracurricular support for individual students
Figure 15 | Does the college provide support for hourly paid staff?

![Bar chart showing types of support](image)

Types of support

- **A.** Issue an up-to-date staff handbook
- **B.** Provide storage space
- **C.** Keep up to date with new college-wide developments
- **D.** Keep up to date with new developments in their own specialism
- **E.** Provide a copy of the college newsletter
- **F.** Provide a mentoring scheme
- **G.** Involve staff in deciding which classes they should teach
- **H.** Make them feel a sense of autonomy over their own work
- **I.** Support available in difficult teaching situations

Figure 16 | Existence of a written policy statement covering part-time employment

![Pie chart showing existence of policy](image)

- **Developing one** 15%
- **Yes** 29%
- **No** 56%
Figure 17 | Proportion of colleges in the survey making use of agency staff

Yes 25%

No 75%

Figure 18 | Contractual arrangements currently in operation with part-time staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of contract</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fractional</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 19 | Changes in the level of resources devoted to the support of part-time staff over the past four years

- Increase: 56%
- Same: 36%
- Decrease: 8%

Figure 20 | Do colleges have benchmarks to assess the quality of management?

- Yes: 42%
- No: 58%

Figure 20a | Proportion of benchmarks used with different types of contract

- Full-time: 150
- Fractional: 100
- Hourly paid: 50

Types of contract

Effective management of part-time lecturers
Figure 21 | Do colleges use benchmarks to assess the quality of teaching?

- No: 42%
- Yes: 58%

Figure 21a | Proportion of benchmarks used with different types of contracts

- Full-time
- Fractional
- Hourly paid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of contract</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractional</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hourly paid</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 22: Types of benchmarks in use

- Observation
- Self-assessment
- Appraisal
- Inspection

Frequency %

Observation: 70%
Self-assessment: 60%
Appraisal: 40%
Inspection: 20%
## Lecturing staff by mode and teacher training qualification

### 1994/95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>F/T</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>P/T</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEd/BA/BSc</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. of Ed.</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;G 730</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDLB</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1995/96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>F/T</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>P/T</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEd/BA/BSc</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. of Ed</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;G 730</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDLB</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1996/97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>F/T</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>P/T</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEd/BA/BSc</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cert. of Ed</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;G 730</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCE</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDLB</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>130.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Cost-benefit Analysis System for Staff Development Activities

1 A general further education college in the North West region carries out an annual cost-benefit analysis of its staff development programme. The college employs about 400 permanent staff and 100 hourly paid staff. A typical annual staff development and training programme will comprise 800 staff development activities involving about 2,000 participants. The annual programme evaluation report provides a complete statistical analysis of quantitative data including costs, types of activities, events, venues and providers. The training programme is grouped into generic areas of training and subjective judgements are stated for each about the effectiveness of needs identification, processes, outcomes, dissemination and benefit to the college. These judgements are based on a summary of the evaluations of each activity made by individual staff and their line managers. The annual programme evaluation report links the judgements to the college’s strategic objectives and concludes with recommendations for future action.

2 While subjective judgements are a valuable contribution to the assessment of quality and effectiveness, the college decided to further develop the system to generate information throughout the year on the costs and the benefits of the activities in the training programme. During 1997-98, it developed a system of analysis for this information.

Cost-benefit Analysis System

3 Each staff development activity is analysed in three categories:
   a. the quality of the process;
   b. the benefit to the individual participant;
   c. the benefit to the college.

4 Each category is graded on a four-point scale of 1 (poor), 2 (fair), 3 (good), 4 (excellent). Categories a) and b) are graded by the individual participant; category c) is graded by the line manager after consultation with the individual. Grading criteria are set for each category. Each staff development activity then produces three scores. The scores are weighted to reflect the relative importance of each category. The category a) score is multiplied by one, b) by two and c) by three. The weighted scores are added together to produce a staff development benefit score for each activity. The higher the score, the higher the benefit. By dividing the staff development benefit score by the total costs of the activity including salaries, a cost-benefit score is obtained. The higher this score, the higher the quality of the event and the lower the cost to the college.

5 As individual scores, these are not very meaningful but when used for comparative analysis, they become powerful tools. The college is able to make comparative judgements about different types of events and providers. High quality at high or low cost or low quality at high or low cost can be identified. The analysis also enables the college to identify the effectiveness of staff development outcomes and their relationship to college strategic objectives.

Category a) criteria include pre-event organisation, environment, speakers, resources, content, and methodology; category b) criteria include knowledge, understanding, relevance of new skills, possible improvements to role and performance, and anticipated changes to existing practice; category c) criteria include use of new knowledge and skills, dissemination, resulting changes to existing practice, and improved services or performance.
## Model induction checklist

### Welcome to the college

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You had an induction session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know the name of your head of department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know the name of your line manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You are aware of your duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know your position in the faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are aware of your timetable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff rooms were pointed out to you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class rooms/work locations were pointed out to you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You were shown how to complete registers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are aware of the tutorial system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know your course manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know about the timekeeping procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know when you can take breaks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been advised about quality assurance activities in your area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been advised about locking doors and returning registers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You have been issued with your contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You understand the terms and conditions of employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been advised on pay claims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know your entitlement for holidays and other leave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Ticked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You know your administrative support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been advised about absence procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been advised of the procedure for student visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been advised about the procedure for guest speakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been advised of the procedure for hospitality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been advised of the procedure for using the mini-bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been advised about travel claims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have been informed about procedures for reporting repair needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Health and safety
- You have been given a copy of the fire regulations
- You have been advised about your responsibilities in relation to these
- You understand the college health and safety procedures
- You have been advised about the location of the first aid cabinets
- You know about contacting the first aider/duty officer
- You have been advised about reporting accidents
- You have the necessary protective clothing
- You are aware of security

### Resources
- You have been advised about curriculum/delivery resources
- You know about procedures for booking resources
- You know about stationery/photocopying facilities
- You have been advised about procedures for ordering materials

### Professional matters
- You have been given a copy of the rules of conduct
- You have been given a copy of the relevant syllabus
- You have been advised of the need to submit schemes of work
- You have been advised about the procedures for keeping a work mark register
- You have been advised about procedures for monitoring progress
- You know the name of a member of staff who will be available to assist
- You know about the student support systems
- You know about the importance of making inputs to team/course meetings
- You know about the importance of reporting to parents and employers
- You have been advised about staff development activities/opportunities

### Staff training and development needs
Please comment on any initial staff training and development needs

---

When completed, please return this form to the staff development unit.
Over the last ten years, there has been a huge increase in the numbers of part-time lecturers in the post-16 sector. What effect has this had on colleges? And what are its implications for the future of the sector?

According to the research reported in this book, a high proportion of part-time lecturers perceives this form of working as a positive choice. However, the researchers discovered a gap between the colleges' and part-time lecturers' perception of their roles outside the classroom. They also found that part-time staff consistently felt they lacked basic facilities with which to work.

This report suggests priorities and good practice for colleges in the management of part-time staff; moves that will also benefit learners and affect their achievement.
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