

610

ce 100

Note: Spoke accordingly to DES. The circular has been issued.



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE
ELIZABETH HOUSE, YORK ROAD, LONDON SE1 7PH
TELEPHONE 01-928 9222
FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Prime Minister (2)
The Education Secretary proposes to publish this circular on Thursday. But the Environment Secretary still has doubts - see X overleaf.

Des 13/4

The Rt Hon Patrick Jenkin MP
Secretary of State for the Environment
2 Marsham Street
London SW1P 3EB

Des 10/4

10 April 1984

Dear Patrick.

I agree with the Environment Sec - but it is too late to stop the circular now

DRAFT CIRCULAR ON TEACHER TRAINING

I am writing to you about an issue which is central to our policies to improve the quality of education, and also of great urgency.

In March 1983, with the approval of colleagues, Nick Edwards and I published a White Paper (Cmd 8836) on Teaching Quality. In paragraphs 63-68 and Annex B we set out new plans for the approval of teacher training courses (for which we have a statutory responsibility) and for the introduction into the colleges of experienced school teachers to assist with the selection and training of teachers. We followed this up in the Manifesto in May by saying (page 29) "We are not satisfied with the selection or the training of our teachers. Our White Paper sets out an important programme for improving teacher training colleges."

In December Nick and I consulted the local authority associations and others on a draft circular which announced our intention to establish a Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) to advise us on the approval of teacher training courses in England and Wales. The draft also set out criteria for the approval of courses, and emphasised the need for closer links between colleges and schools. The Department's covering letter said that "it is not intended that the new arrangements should lead to any net increase in the Government's plans for public expenditure" and referred to the redeployment of resources from less important activities. The Treasury and DOE had copies of both documents and offered no comments.

In January, with the Prime Minister's approval, I referred to these plans in a speech to the North of England Education Conference at Sheffield. I added "The aim is to complete the consultation process during next month February, with a view to the announcement of final decisions in time for the accreditation council to begin work in the spring."

Nick and I are now ready to make this announcement. The Prime Minister has approved the establishment and chairman of CATE. The circular has been amended in the light of comments from

the local authority associations (who, despite some misgivings about resources, generally support these plans) and others. When it is issued I propose to make it clear, in a Written Answer, that our intention is that the teaching force - which has declined already by 30,000 or 7 per cent in England alone since 1979 - should be better as well as smaller, in the words of the recent Green Paper on Public Expenditure, Cmnd 9189. I shall go on to say "To the extent that the policies set out in the circular may require local authorities and institutions to incur additional expenditure in future years ie after 1984-85, we will expect this to be contained within the provision for those years, including the cost of employing teachers." (It would not be appropriate to include these words in a circular to local authorities since some small additional costs will also fall on universities and other institutions which are not the authorities' responsibility.)

X | The Department sent the latest draft of the circular and of this Written Answer to the Treasury and DOE on 2 April and subsequently provided them with an estimate of the cost to local authorities ie about £3 million a year, mainly for the release of teachers from school to college, by the time the plans are fully implemented in 1986-87 or even 1987-88. The covering letter explained that we hoped to issue the circular before Easter. The Treasury acquiesced in the proposals. Your Department commented 9 April "We surely cannot keep piling extra duties and powers on to local authorities and expect to get away with the line that we expect authorities to contain extra expenditure within the existing PES provision." They went on to say that they would feel bound to advise you to question the need for our proposal in substance. They added that they would expect you to be particularly concerned about the proposal to issue the circular immediately when the Rates Bill is before Parliament.

I understand this concern, particularly since you and I both objected very recently to a proposal to change the rules about the numbers permitted to be carried on school buses in such a way as to add up to £10 million to the cost of school transport. But I think there is a crucial difference. The school bus proposal would have added substantially to costs without yielding any educational benefits. Our present proposal, as I have shown, lies at the heart of our educational policies; colleagues have endorsed it more than once; yet the cost to local authorities - only a fraction of £10 million - should be contained within our spending plans for 1985-86 and beyond. The Lords have now rejected by a good majority the amendment to the Second Reading of the Rates Bill; and it is time, over a year after Cmnd 8836, for us to make progress on teacher training.

The circular is now with the printers. We would propose to issue it on Thursday, after the Second Reading of the Paving Bill but before the House adjourns for Easter, so that CATE can be set up and start work. I would answer the Question on the same day. May I please ask you to let my office know by midday tomorrow, Wednesday, if you see any difficulty about this? I shall be grateful for your help in what I believe is a most important matter.

I am copying this letter to the Prime Minister, Nick Edwards and Peter Rees.

Gordon Keir

1934
12 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11



H M Treasury

Parliament Street London SW1P 3AG

Switchboard 01-233 3000
Direct Dialling 01-233 8481

12 April 1984

J R Jameson Esq
Department of Education and Science
Elizabeth House
York Road
LONDON SE1 7PH

*Dubs
13/4*

Now Richard

DRAFT CIRCULAR ON TEACHER TRAINING

The Chief Secretary did not have the opportunity to consider your Secretary of State's letter of 10th April to Mr Jenkin before his departure for the States on official business. But I think he would have been anxious at least - given its circulation - to counter any impression it might have conveyed that the Treasury did not share the general concern of the Department of the Environment to avoid increases in the burden on local authorities which are not matched by identifiable offsets.

2. No doubt Sir Keith's letter was drafted before you received mine of 9 April. I think I can best set the record straight by copying our exchanges, with this letter, to Andrew Turnbull. Copies of this letter only go to David Timlin (Welsh Office), Robin Young (DOE), and Robert Culpin here.

*Your M
Michael*

M J C Faulkner

- will request if required.



H M Treasury

Parliament Street London SW1P 3AG

Switchboard 01-233 3000

Direct Dialling 01-233 8481

9 April 1984

J R Jameson Esq
Department of Education and Science
Elizabeth House
York Road
LONDON SE1 7PH

John R. Jameson

INITIAL TEACHER TRAINING

Thank you for your letter of 9 April - largely, indeed, as I had expected in the light of our conversation on Friday but in one important respect not.

It was my understanding at the time that the additional bill to the local authorities by the time the scheme became fully operational would only be £0.5 million. It did not register that there would be additional costs of the order of £2 million arising from use of existing school teachers in the selection of students and provisions of training in the institutions.

Hence my slight puzzlement at your Secretary of State's proposal to make a statement - a reaction which may in turn have puzzled you. A total bill of £2.5 million is still of course small in relation to total present or foreseeable provision, but enough to cause concern in present circumstances - as your Ministers were quick to point out in response to DET's recent proposals for modification of the 'three for two' rule.

You will at once say that the present case is different in that the aim is to improve the cost-effectiveness of authorities' education spending. But we have the same problem that the Government will be imposing, and be seen to be imposing, a new direct cost on local authorities (and will be providing additional ammunition for Norfolk County Council!) - with no immediately identifiable relief on other fronts. I do not imagine that you have some other impending initiative conveniently to hand that will save authorities sums of this order; nor would authorities be receptive to exhortations to try even harder than they have already been asked to to reduce spending on, say, meals and milk or to improve the efficiency of their deployment of the teaching force. It may well be, therefore, that the draft statement as it stands is the best you can do for the moment. If so, we will have to return in the Survey to the question of where the £2.5 million is to come from - on which see paragraph 3 of my letter of 6 April.

I am copying to Robin Young and David Timlin.

John R. Jameson
Michael
M. I. C. Paulman



Department of Education and Science
Elizabeth House York Road London SE1 7PH

Telegrams Aristides London SE1 Telex 23171
Telephone 01-928 9222 ext

15
2/14

M J C Faulkner Esq
HM Treasury
Parliament Street
London
SW1

Your reference

Our reference

Date

9 April 1984

Dear Michael

INITIAL TEACHER TRAINING

We had a word about your letter of 6 April.

2. Our best current estimates of the answers to the questions about costs in your para 2 - in each case not until the scheme is fully operational in 1986-87 or even 1987-88 - are:-

	£m
Local authority institutions	0.5
Voluntary colleges	0.5
Universities	2.0
Mandatory awards	1.0

X In addition there may be by then some costs to local authorities, of the order of £2m, through making school teachers available to take part in the selection of candidates for teacher training and in the training of the students within the institutions; but there are no "coded messages", to use your phrase.

3. You accepted that these figures were "modest" in relation to the Government's existing or prospective plans for local authority expenditure in 1985-86 and beyond - indeed you thought that word might be inserted in the draft Answer after "incur" - and on this basis you were content with our proposals. As I told you, the Secretary of State hopes to issue the circular and answer the Question before Parliament adjourns at the end of this week.

4. Copy to Robin Young, DOE. I hope he will take into account both this exchange with you and also the Government's collective political commitment (Cmd 8836 and Election Manifesto, page 29, last two sentences) to the improvement of teacher training.

cc. Miss Eather
1. Mr Jurgent 2. Mrs Thomas
Mr Jameson did not tell me
about the 'additional £2m' at
X - or I might have been less
forthcoming

Yours sincerely

Richard Jameson

J R JAMESON

cclb 1. Mr Sargent (+ pps) 4
Mr Harvey
Miss Rutter (+ copy of Jameson letter)



Mrs James
to see
July 9/4

PAP!

H M Treasury

Parliament Street London SW1P 3AG

Switchboard 01-233 3000
Direct Dialling 01-233 8481

6 April 1984

J R Jameson Esq
Department of Education and Science
Elizabeth House
York Road
LONDON SE1 7PH

Dear Richard

INITIAL TEACHER TRAINING: APPROVAL OF COURSES

Thank you for your letter of 2 April.

2. I would like to know rather more about your assessment of the resource implications of the new policies before coming to a firm view on the text of the proposed statement and on the desirability or otherwise of including a reference to resources in the circular itself. Clearly bringing all PGCE courses up to 36 weeks will cost something. What do you expect the direct effect to be on expenditure in local authority institutions, voluntary colleges and universities; and on mandatory awards spending? Otherwise, as I read it, the circular is asking local authorities and others to improve their teacher training courses rather than necessarily to make them any more expensive: but are there coded messages here which imply higher unit costs and, if so, what do you estimate their effects to be?

3. This all has a bearing, as you will appreciate, on the credibility of statements that any additional costs can be 'contained' within provision for future years. If the costs are going to be significant, we will need offsets to them - and in view of the difficulties of delivering savings on local authority current, we should look in the first instance to your vote-borne programmes to provide these. (You have been rightly critical of recent initiatives from other Departments which would have imposed identifiable new burdens on education authorities but given them no clear guidance as to how savings were to be made to pay for these.)

4. I have no comments on other aspects of the circular.

5. Copies of this go to Robin Young (DOE) and David Timlin (Welsh Office).

Tom
Richard

M J C Faulkner

1984

