BBC Charter Review

Seminar: Education and Learning

17th November 2004

Lord Terry Burns: Welcome to this seminar, which is the seventh in the series that we have been having. Today's seminar is about the BBC's contribution to education and learning and it is the first of five seminars with a slightly different focus to the previous seminars. We've called these crosscutting seminars as they try to focus on what the BBC really delivers in a number of areas. This morning we're doing education and learning and, as many of you are aware, the arguments and evidence that we will be hearing today are designed to inform and to shape the government's thinking as it moves towards the Green Paper in the New Year. Before I move to giving an overview of the approach and the agenda for this morning, there are just one or two housekeeping things that I have to say on each of these occasions. The first and most important is that the BBC have kindly provided the cameras in the room which are providing a live stream of footage on the Charter Review site and which provides a record for those who haven't been able to be here today and who may wish to watch this seminar. However, it is very important that if this process is not to be severely interrupted that everyone turns their mobiles and blackberries off because it interferes very badly with the sound system. So it is exactly the same arrangements that you have when being on an aeroplane. I mean you can't just turn them to silent. You actually have to turn them to off otherwise they hunt around and you will find that there is a lot of interference on the thing. So if you would please, everyone would do that. And the loos are located in the, beyond the room in which the coffee was. If you would please keep your security badges and name badges on and not wander around into the rest of DCMS I think it would be best for all concerned. There are some guides around if anyone has any questions. And during the day there will be opportunities for people to ask questions and indeed within your audience pack there are some blank cards and, if someone is very anxious to ask a question earlier on or if there is an issue raised which you don't think is being properly dealt with, I would be very grateful if you hand one of those cards to, you know write down and hand it to one of the DCMS people who are around in the room. First of all I'd like to introduce my colleague Janet Finch from the Independent Panel who is going to help to facilitate today's debate. We've also got from the Independent Panel Alan Budd and Alice Rawsthorn and we have a number of people here who I'm very delighted to welcome on the platform who are going to be the main people contributing to this seminar. Simon Fuller, recently at Channel 4, now managing Grid Learning; Catherine Bush, General Manager of City and Guilds, the UK's largest vocational awarding body; Alan Tuckett, the Director of NIACE, the National Institute of Adult Continuing Education; David Sinclair, Policy Manager for Social Inclusion at Help The Aged; Professor Andrew Pollard, Professor of Education at Cambridge University and Professor Edward Melhuish, Professor of Human Development at Birkbeck University and Executive Director of the National Evaluation of the Start Programme; David Walker – I haven't seen him – at the Guardian's Magazine for Public Service Executives and from the BBC we have Liz Cleaver, Controller of Learning and Interactive and John Willis, the Director of Factual and Learning.

This morning we have three sessions which are going to look closely at the broad spread of activity that the BBC is engaged in. The title Education and Learning covers everything from the BBC's formal educational output to informal learning, which is both targeted, such as social action campaigns and indirect, such as increased understanding and awareness stimulated by general programming. Janet will open by outlining the aims for today's session and highlighting some of the key issues that we would like to explore and I am then going to ask John to say a few brief words on this in a minute and after that we will move into our first session on what we see the purposes of the BBC's educational output. We're then going to break for coffee, after which we'll turn our attention to the question of access in audiences for the BBC's material and then we'll have another short break and we'll return for the final session, which we've called Working In Partnership. And at various points we will have the opportunity for questions. I've just got one point of disclosure to make, just simply for the record, which is that I am a non-executive director of Pearson, who of course have a

substantial education business and I wouldn't want anyone to think that I was participating in the discussion without this being noted. Janet, I'm going to hand over to you.

Professor Janet Finch: Thank you, Terry. Good morning everybody. The subject matter of education and learning covers an enormous spectrum from very formal learning at one end of it to extremely informal actional re-entered learning at the other. And during the course of the morning's debate I hope that we can try to cover that spectrum in a variety of different ways but I'm not going to introduce all those points now. I'll come back in later on. I guess that from just a purely anecdotal and personal point of view I must be very, my experience must be very common in that I think when I was first aware of the BBC as such it was probably sitting on the floor of a Victorian primary school waiting for music and movement to start, which of course you had to do in real time in those days, and it was the BBC. That I guess is something close to the formal learning end of the spectrum. Other childhood memories are sitting in front of what would now seem a very ancient television set watching Bill and Ben or, if you're slightly older, Andy Pandy, and that being sort of in a sense an early childhood introduction to what the BBC has to offer in informal learning. We do potentially encompass the whole of children's television in today's seminar, which is a very big subject in its own right. So I think that the starting point of this seminar, and we've designated this first session as focusing on the educational purposes of the BBC, raises some important questions of principle, of which I'll just use three key words at the moment, but that is not all that there is to say about education and the BBC. One is, my first word is "span". What is the proper span of learning and education which the BBC encompasses? If we take the formal end of the spectrum, it includes rather obviously the whole spectrum of schools focused education and learning and that's broadcasting on-line and publications. It includes the whole of the Open University partnership, which is one of the BBC's longest standing partnerships, and it includes a substantial amount, perhaps a growing amount, of what one might broadly call adult education – things like web proficiency, basic literacy campaigns. So that's at the sort of more formal end of the spectrum. If we move slightly along to the more informal end, at the informal end, as I've already indicated, we potentially encompass the whole of children's programmes, potentially the whole of documentary programming because one of the things that people have said in the consultation about the Charter Review that they most value is serious documentary programmes which have an educational flavour, whether that be about the planet or about history, a whole range of focuses but nonetheless documentary programmes are perceived as being part of the BBC's contribution to informal learning. And then of course on the informal end of the spectrum, as well as the publications that are associated with all of that, we have the BBC website giving on-line access to anything, the most popular website in the country. And continuing right to the further end of the spectrum – and my categorisation is not precisely the same as the BBC but this is my categorisation – at the very far end of the spectrum you get activities like what I would call collective education activities, community-based educational activities, some of them on a major scale like The Big Read. We have the open centres and buses, which are very much focused on community activity, and then a whole series of websites directed at different audiences which facilitate, which are not just about access to information but which facilitate contact between citizens of one sort or another. So BBC Connector, CBBC Clubhouse, which is for obviously older children, teenagers, and the website called I-can, which facilitates social action groups and individuals who want to get together and organise a campaign roughly speaking. So that is a huge spectrum of activities which have in some sense a connection with learning and so my first question is is that right? Should that span be narrower and, if it should, in what ways should it be narrower? Should it be broader? Are there ways in which it could be broader and, if so, how should it be? So the first key word is span. The second key word is "distinctiveness". The BBC is involved across that very broad spectrum of education and learning activities. Well the simple question is why? Why the BBC? What is it that the BBC can add that is distinctively different to the learning of the people of this country without replicating what other organisations can do? You know, why is the BBC running basic literacy campaigns when the further education sector in this country is a dedicated education sector which has expertise in that? Why is the BBC doing that? I'm not meaning to be critical here. I think it's important to ask these fundamental questions. Why is the BBC involved in social action? Why indeed is the BBC such a majority, if not a complete monopoly, provider of support for formal education? What is it that the BBC per se can do distinctively? What value is it adding distinctively? The BBC's own statement about Building Public Value focuses at its

heart on the public value test of BBC's involvement in broadcasting. Well where does the public value test lead us in relation to the educational dimension of the BBC? So the second word is distinctiveness. My third word is "values". If the BBC is such a major provider of education and learning to the people of this country, what is its role in terms of the values that are being promoted through that activity because education and learning is always in some way related to the promotion of a value set? Should the BBC be the guardian of mainstream educational values, you know, caricaturing whatever the Secretary of State for Education think the people of the country should be learning, should the BBC fall into line? Is that the role of the BBC or is the BBC's role in education and learning something a bit to the side of that and, if so, what? And very much linked to that, should the BBC always be the broadcaster of choice for government initiatives in education or does it have a responsibility, does the government have a responsibility, does the BBC have a responsibility to ensure that broadcasters and providers of on-line services and publishers of educational material should be operating within a healthy market where the BBC is one, may be a very important provider but not the only one and specifically has a responsibility to ensure that the market operates effectively. So span, distinctiveness and values are three key words which I hope we may keep coming back to in the course of the morning.

Lord Burns: Thank you very much, Janet. And now I'd like to ask John Willis to say a few words about the BBC's approach.

John Willis: Thank you. Well, to use your first word, the BBC's commitment to learning has actually spanned 80 years because this is the 80th anniversary of the beginning of broadcasting in our schools. Of course it was radio in those days. So for us learning is very deep in the bloodstream of the BBC. It's part of its DNA as it were and even now 80 years later two-thirds of teachers use BBC Schools Television and around a half use BBC Schools Radio. And of course learning sits right at the centre of our document Building Public Value, which is our contribution to the Charter Review debate which is now on-going. So learning is without a doubt one of the core values of the BBC. What's happening now is that changing technology gives us a chance to actually even more fully unlock the potential of learning for a very broad range of our adults and our children and it's an opportunity for the BBC in conjunction with partners to actually use digital technology to offer more to everyone. So in 15 months or so since Liz Cleaver, who runs learning on a day-to-day basis, and myself became responsible for this part of the BBC we've been developing a new strategy which was approved by the governors of the BBC a few months ago. And, as Janet said, one of the corner-stones is clearly formal learning, whether it's CBeebies, which the recent Barwise Report described as exemplary and a triumph, through to GCSE bitesize, which is used by two-thirds of the relevant student group. And also coming up in 2006 we will have the digital curriculum, which we hope will use new technology to enrich the experiences of learners in schools but also at home. And of course, just coming to your point about how the BBC might decide what it does on span, and the span of what we do, our formal learning activities, indeed our informal ones, are developed in consultation with the educational community. The BBC doesn't sit in, you know, an ivory tower in White City and decide what to do itself. We are part of a broader community. We have regular consultations with teachers, and regular consultation with the rest of the educational community and with our regular partners, like the Open University. Beyond formal, we have targeted informal learning. It's where we use, what is one of the key reasons why the BBC has a critical role to play here, we use a fantastic reach of BBC1, BBC2 and BBC Radio to connect with a large audience but we target learning by developing outreach, by developing interactivity and by promoting action that might follow from the natural drama or documentary qualities that our offerings for BBC1 and BBC2 have. So that might be Pompeii or The Big Read or Battlefield Britain. And of course with that it's the on-line dimension that gives a sustainable and enduring quality to what the BBC has to offer and our factual websites, science, history, so together I think it's six and a half million users every month. And then of course finally there is a whole range of general programming in the BBC which is of a – I think your word was has an educational flavour to it. So it might be inspiring a love of classic literature through, you know, last Sunday's North And South by Mrs Gaskell or it might be informed citizenship with the Power of Nightmares or The Secret Policemen or indeed the I-can website. And these programmes don't, aren't particularly targeted. They don't have lots of outreach attached to them but again they drive people towards the websites where they can make further inquiries and hopefully it leads to further

action. The new strategy is to increase the distinctiveness – to use your word – of what the BBC does, to use one of the things that is really special about the BBC, which is the ability to work across all platforms. The BBC is blessed because it's strong in terrestrial and digital television. It has a range of radio stations. It also has very well-developed on-line services. And these are not just national but they penetrate locally and of course with the World Service on an international basis. And we are increasing the number of rounded holistic 360 degree action campaigns that the BBC is undertaking across a range of all platforms to try to deepen the experience of people who come to the BBC. So, for example, we have a big adult literacy campaign, literacy and numeracy, coming up in 2005. We already do a lot on our websites but we need the reach of television to help drive understanding and action in this particular area. And we're following that up with an environmental campaign about local environments. But of course we're also determined not just to reach audiences who are receptive to learning but to stretch across what now is called the learning divide and actually to embrace harder to reach audiences. And we see this as a very important part of our public service mission in this area. So it might be older people directed towards the People's War website; it might be older Asians learning IT skills in our open centre in Blackburn; or it might be the 41 schools in deprived areas of Hull, who are experiencing creativity through the opportunities that broadband television can offer. Of course being honest, the BBC hasn't got everything right. I think Liz and I feel that for a period of two or three years until our domestic violence season Hitting Home a year, in early 2003, that the BBC actually lost sight of its social action campaigns. Now they're back and they're right at the centre of what we want to do. And I think it's also true to say that the BBC as a public sector body doesn't always understand the commercial market-place and we have sometimes acted in a way that makes it feel and perhaps is that the BBC is blundering into areas where there's already commercial provision. But we're learning from these mistakes and we're determined to improve in what we do. We regard our role as being complimentary to the market, being a catalyst rather than a competitor, but that means that the BBC has got to be very open, very transparent and we also have to measure in more robust ways than ever before the learning outcomes of what we do. And it also means that the BBC can't fully unlock the potential of digital on our own. It creates a much more two-way relationship with our views and listeners and so we need partners. And whether it's the Reading Agency or the National Literacy Trust or the OU for the Big Read, or whether it's Shelter and Child Line and Refuge for our domestic violence season, we have to harness the skills, the expertise of partners on the ground to really maximise the impact of what the BBC can do, which is open up a very large window through television and radio. And it's only with partners that I think that the BBC will fully deliver the public value that our audiences have a right to expect.

Lord Burns: Thank you very much, John. Well Janet has outlined the issues – span, distinctiveness, public value – and I throw the discussion open to others and see if anyone else now wishes to comment both on Janet's points and the points that John Willis has just made.

David Sinclair: I'll come in on the issue of span. I think from our perspective, from Help The Aged, we don't think the issue should be around extended the span but actually ensuring the span is inclusive. We do have an ageing population. 10 million people are already over the age of 65 and we know from the work from NIACE that learning decreases with age. However, we've got dedicated programming aimed towards younger people and there's a perception amongst the older population that programmes are made by younger people for younger people and that MORI research highlights that. Two examples from the informal learning, which I wanted to pick up just to get us going. Again some research by NIACE has highlighted the levels of financial capability amongst the over 50s, suggesting that 30% of those experience extreme difficulty in understanding finances. However, if you watch programmes like Alvin Hall, how many people over the age of 65 or 70 have you ever seen on there? It just doesn't happen. Equally, if you look at programmes like the excellent, the Fat Nation programme that's been produced recently, I saw part of one episode which looked at sea-based exercises and yet there was nothing really targeted at anyone over the age of 75 when actually we've got almost 5 million people over the age of 75. And I think it's that sort of programming where there's a real potential for change.

Lord Burns: Well audiences, etc., I mean we have in a sense have now an agenda for the second part but I'm more than happy to register them at this point as well. Simon?

Simon Fuller: Well I've got a lot of points to make but I'll deal with the issue of span I think and distinctiveness. One of the things that strikes me about the BBC is it probably has the most potent brand of any media provider in Britain but I think by its own admission the brand is stronger in certain areas than others – clearly in terms of children, clearly in terms of I think an older population. But there is an element of the population, particularly around youth, actually for which I think if we're all honest the BBC is not a great brand. And I think one of the debates the BBC has to decide in is where it will play to its strengths and where it might not. And there is nothing in the paper which I've read which suggests this is an area where we might actually not go because others actually have a stronger brand. Now I know that John has been in discussion with colleagues at Channel 4 where for instance Channel 4 would argue that probably in terms of the 14-19, the 14-24 age group, its brand is as strong if not stronger than the BBC's and it is playing particularly to that strength now. So when the BBC talks about partnering, I have a sense from the paper that it's about to what extent do partners actually support the BBC strategy, whereas I'm saying to what extent should the BBC say "actually we have partners that have a better brand than us here. We'll support their brand. We'll play a supporting role." And I think the issue of partnership seems quite a strong one here, is is it a genuine partnership or is it actually simply about agencies coming into back what the BBC chooses to do. And if I step back from that, what I think perhaps is slightly lacking for me in the documentation I've read is a broad analysis of the education market-place as a whole because it is true, if we just take one example – the digital curriculum – and I was reminded earlier by Stephen Heppell in the audience that there's plenty of sharks out there, but it is, there is an enormous provision already in that market-place and the BBC is but one player. And I think a decision would have to be made is will it use its brand to try and push itself as the key provider or will it say our brand is best here, supporting and working with the other brands that are out there? And I have a sense that what John says is that is the strategy and that would be a strategy I would welcome. So rather than the BBC saying we have to be the dominant provider, I think the BBC should recognise it is one of a number of providers in certain areas, particularly the formal digital space, and it should settle for the provision in how it enhances learning across the whole space.

John Willis: Would you like me to answer that?

Lord Burns: By all means.

John Willis: I think Simon's absolutely right that we are trying to enter into partnerships in a different spirit and it's important that partnerships are balanced, that going into partnerships both sides fully understand what can be delivered and sometimes the BBC can't meet the expectations of partners who want, you know, 20 hours on peak-time BBC1 and you know that's not always possible to deliver because that's clearly a much broader service. So for example the digital curriculum, I think we've learned from some of the mistakes and it's clear that the BBC cannot be the entire market-place. The terms that are set out by the DCMS quite rightly and you know we absolutely support them are that the BBC will make 50% of the programmes and independent producers will make the other 50% and we're about to publish our list of preferred suppliers, which are a mixture of agencies and independent producers. And we can only make 50% of the curriculum. And we hope that the BBC's entry into the market actually stimulates the market rather than dampens it down. And in terms of youth, I think it is a difficult area for the BBC. We do have a number of activities in this area. We have a fantastic scheme called Blast which I've been involved with quite closely myself, which is encouraging young people's media skills across whole ranges of the country. And of course we have One Music and One Life on BBC1 but we've been cautious in this area partly because of exactly the reason you say, that we know that Channel 4 is already committed and we would want whatever we did to compliment what Channel 4 did. We certainly don't want to be in competition with Channel 4. And equally we also know that there's some uncertainty because the Tomlinson Report is pretty fresh off the presses, debate is still going on about it and so we are watching and waiting and seeing which way provision for 16 to 19-year olds is actually going to go but it's not our intention to muscle into the market and we certainly, whatever we would do we would do it if we could in harness with Channel 4.

Alan Tuckett: I think there's a conundrum in addressing the question and it's that nobody can be in any doubt what a rich mix of stuff we get from the BBC right across the piece in learning and whatever happens in this Review you want that to be underpinned, valued, strengthened but at the same time it does seem to me I think everybody starts from when do they begin to engage with the question. I've been working at NIACE for 15 years and if you look at the volume of evidently educationally focused programming now on mass channels as against when I started, there's been a diminution. Now why has there been? There have been pressures external in the television market and I think, certainly for adults, it seems to me that you've got the arrangements broadly right, the dialogue with the rest of the education system in relation to school provision but for adults you have the reach – Bridget Plowden's wonderful phrase about, you know, television is democratic, there are no reserve seats. You reach people who the education and training system failed, so you have an absolutely distinctive role within the education mix that I think gets lost a bit within the territory of the dialogue within the broadcast arena. Paddy Coulter, who used to run IBT, following a couple of people into, this is a Channel 4 room of course not the BBC but it's a sort of industrial worry, said he heard two blokes saying "Well you wouldn't really want to go for a drink with somebody who worked in education would you?" And you could see when ITV lost its obligation to be doing programming in dedicated main-time slots that we saw a migration to the margins of the schedules the development, very creative development of The Learning Zone but the middle of the night isn't 7 or 8 o'clock in the evening and it's terrific the way that John and Liz have recovered a dynamic for looking at the middle. But there's an issue about balance and about who you listen to in the reach and the span I think. If you measure the BBC's educational activity for adults against the life long learning debates the country is engaged in and the priorities we've identified for skilling people to a minimum of level of employability, the kind of skills people have at 16 when they leave, not so good there are you as you are around the basic skills agenda, very good in that arena. But what I feel is it's very hard to see how you measure yourself against external as well as internal dynamics in the thing and my sense down the 1990s and when digital arrived too is that the pressures within the corporation can be powerful to make it hard for you to be defended if you don't have a good enough dialogue with policy making outside. And then the risk is not that you won't make wonderful programmes but that your big bangs will be far enough apart in an area for the connective tissue to feel lost for audiences. So again, if you don't mind, when I was young you used to know what time on a Sunday morning you could watch language programmes on the box. There were slots. Now it's absolutely brilliant to do stuff right through the agenda but it's also good to be able to look for a place where you know you can be stimulated. And if encouraging people to join in is your top goal, you also need not only on the dedicated channels, and especially since the digital divide exactly parallels the learning divide and those people who have had least benefit are least likely to have confidence to follow things up on the web, you need to have stuff within the narratives of the mainstream mass channels too. And since I think in the end everybody else copies what you do, I think the more we can defend you to have visibility on those channels, the more likely we are to fulfil the public interest role of broadcasting in general as well as your distinctive role.

Lord Burns: Could you say a bit more about, when you say the amount of adult education on television has declined, what are the kind of things that were there and are no longer? I mean you mentioned language programmes on a Sunday morning.

Alan Tuckett: It's clearly deeply weasly territory because if you look at the whole of CBeebies and CBBC as formal education and clearly only some of it is, I'm not talking statistically but I think we can, we've probably got the statistics and I haven't brought them along to show where there were, what you could predict in terms of volume of provision 15 years ago because the competition had quotas in ITV and Channel 4 that were explicit quotas. Now I don't think you ought to be in that territory but I think the measurement of the volume of hours that were explicitly educational and when you were doing the Blue Planet, we did an analysis of what happened for a two or three year period around that, you were investing heavily in the web, understandably, but you only got limited budgets. The impact for people on the screen was fewer different distinctive programmes. And what I, if I can illustrate, you decided not to have on as it were the day, the time when anybody is up and watching, languages, new languages programmes for the next little while. Now I understand why you're doing that but, or at least proposing to do it. What I think I'd be looking for is how

do you keep small narratives on the go as well as the really big campaign initiatives that you concentrate resources in? If the price of concentration is not enough little bits to keep hooks going for people then I think there would be a problem.

Prof. Janet Finch: Terry, can I just ask Alan to say, you've spoken only about television…

Alan Tuckett: Yes.

Prof. Janet Finch: Does the media have a role here?

Alan Tuckett: Well it used to have but I was reflecting on the train coming down. I don't know – and I mean that's probably because I can't, clearly things like Money Box or You and Yours have a consumer education impact and the, you know Your Own Correspondent picks up on the business that most of us get our political education from the BBC and a lot of it from the Today programme I suppose really. But in an explicit educational way I thought that you used to be able to tell because the Beeb would itself analyse what it was doing, what its strategy was for different programmes on radio and it may do that but it isn't part of what you discussed with us publicly. And I don't know and if I don't and it's my job to worry about what adults are getting, I guess quite a lot of other people don't quite know where to look as well.

Lord Burns: Andrew?

Prof. Andrew Pollard: Well I wanted to, you were talking about educational purposes, this focus here, and it seems to me we've already had an illustration of the range and diversity of what the BBC has to offer, which I think many of us, certainly myself included, think is fantastic and we're very warmly disposed towards it. But in reading the documents, I was, I mean of course there's a lot there and I wanted to see some statements of the kind of underlying principles perhaps that might drive this. And were we to have on the Panel a philosopher of education, they would undoubtedly go for that type of level. So I'm not a philosopher but let me tell you the sort of things they might I think say when thinking about educational aims and purposes. They might say it's got something to do with the economy. It's something to do with training and supporting people to contribute to our wealth generation and so forth. So skills are an important aspect of any educational activity. They'd say it's got something to do with culture. It's got something to do with identity, both individually and as a society, and of course in the contemporary world that's got something to do with diversity and complexity and understanding. They'd say it has something to do with individuals, with personal fulfilment, with agency, with creativity, with enjoyment and imagination, all those sorts of things. And they'd also say I think that it's got something to do with political activity, with polity, with citizenship, with opportunity, with democracy. And I think that, well when I read the Chapter 5 of one of your documents here, the Impact Statement, it talks about educational value and it says that the BBC will help to build a society strong in knowledge and skills and then it stops and I regretted the fact that it stopped because I think the BBC is doing much more than that and I think it's right that it should. I think some of those, attention to some of those kind of aims and values at a more analytic level might be helpful in thinking about the specifics of what you're doing. So that's my first point of that sort. And the second one, where I was looking for a clearer statement of an underlying principle, was to do with how you view learning itself. I mean how do you think learning happens because in all the documentation there is a kind of implicit sort of theory or in fact a number of theories swishing around and I'm not quite sure that it's clear. In some instances it appears that learning is viewed as something which is delivered to people. In other cases it appears it's something that happens by engaging people – engaging their activity, engaging them through social organisations and so forth. And of course there are many views of learning and that's right and proper and different learners, different ages and different things need different approaches. But I do think it seems to me that one was sort of stumbling across this rather than coming at it with a kind of active intent. And there is a lot of understanding about learning out there in the world which could be I think very helpful in thinking through what exactly you're doing and why.

Prof. Edward Melhuish: I just want to just expand on what Andrew was saying. One way of looking at learning is it's a way of bringing about change in people's ideas and people's behaviour. And if you have a general definition of learning in that sense, almost the whole of television is potentially a learning platform. And the notion of span, where you have these neat categories of formal learning objectives, informal learning objectives and then entertainment, is really in some ways a very false division. You see people who are clearly influenced by everyday mainstream TV like East Enders very clearly in the way that they behave and so on. You also see people who are fundamentally altered in their life direction by both entertainment and also informal learning objectives, for example you know things like the number of people who apply for veterinary courses you know when the vet programmes….I've forgotten their names…came on the TV. And there are instances of that kind. You know you see patterns in teenagers' behaviour affected by the new genre of reality TV. People are affected…to some extent entertainment takes this into account in that there's an unwritten rule which seems to be applied often – you shall not see somebody commit evil and get away with it. But on the other hand relatively little take on the other side of that argument. Maybe we should, you know, positively promote positive behaviour because it's noticeable about some of the very popular TV programmes there is actually hardly a character on them sometimes who could be regarded as a positive role model. So you know the mention is very wide and very diverse and if you're into having a maximum impact in terms of affecting people's learning in its widest sense, then you have to realise that the home is you know the most dominant form of learning environment. You know many of us have done studies on the effects of pre-school, school, university and so on on people's achievements and certainly all those types of learning does affect people's achievements but what does affect their achievements more than anything else is their home environments and we need to pay attention to that. And it's something which is starting to take place in the CBeebies initiative where you are getting learning activities in the home taking place in that they expanded. I think this issue of span is one that needs to be continuously monitored, the balance between the formal, the informal and learning in the entertainment sphere. I almost hesitate to say it but I think at the moment the BBC has got it about right.

John Willis: Don't hesitate.

Prof. Edward Melhuish: Although I'm not certain it's always going to be right because of the ever-changing needs of society, the changing things that happen around us all, you know we'd like things to be constantly monitored. So I just wanted to, you know, to put things in a bit of a wider perspective there.

Lord Burns: I think that's very, very helpful.

Catherine Bush: I mean could I just pick up on that, a couple of points to make. First it is to do with the span. I mean I think it is a very rich and impressive and persuasive list and I wouldn't have any sort of argument with the span that's being claimed. However, I do think that when you are looking at the, perhaps the more informal end of it, I think those things which actually are learning objectives or learning outcomes, learning intent, perhaps they need to be more explicitly identified and I think there is, as has been said, there is an argument that sort of any kind of television may have some kind of learning outcome. I have to say reading the papers I thought some of the claims were slightly exaggerated in terms of, you know, what we would see as learning. The other thing I just wanted to say a couple of words about was actually more at the formal end of learning and the products of activities have been identified there. And I think within that it is sort of the relative allocation of resources that goes on within that. I was struck by, about the emphasis very much on the school sector, either the, you know very young people or the GCSE area. And although Tomlinson has already been mentioned and yes, it is true that we don't quite know what's going to happen with that, the vocational and skills area for the 16-25 year olds has long been identified as something which this country cannot be proud of. The clichéd academic vocational divide has been with us for quite a long time and the government has in the past put in a lot of effort into things like NVQs, MAs and modern apprenticeships and so on and I think that's one area that, if we're looking at formal learning, does need to be considered in terms of how the BBC might look to support those sort of government DVS programmes.

Prof. Janet Finch: Terry, can I just come in and reflect on a couple of things that have been said, the really very interesting contributions? On the one hand we've just had a sort of position articulated by Catherine, which is I think shared by a lot of people, that if the BBC is to be involved in formal education then it should have explicit objectives that monitor whether it's achieved those objectives and so on. That's one way of looking at it. A completely different way of looking at it is the contribution, the two previous contributions from Ted and from Andrew, which were about learning as an activity and how learning actually takes place and the BBC's understanding of, the extent to which the BBC understands that, deliberately wants to understand it, wants to sort of harness its understanding in a very much broader context. So you know I could sharpen this up and say is it actually the role of the BBC to have formal learning objectives and deliver them and monitor them as if it were another type of educational institution or is it the role of the BBC to stand quite a few paces back from that and say "Well that's the role of educational institutions. If they want us to help them we will help them but we are not going to be tied by specific objectives of that sort because our role is actually to facilitate learning in a different sort of sense, in a much broader sense and in a way which actually perhaps cannot and should not be measured. Now I put these two positions in extreme forms in order to bring out the debate and would be interested to hear what other people have to say about that.

Liz Cleaver: Can I just touch on a few points that have been made because I think it is important to differentiate and it touches on what you're saying and it refers to how we make some selection. I think in terms of the breadth of the content that the BBC has, television in terms of broadening horizons and stimulating curiosity works extremely well and there we look to have a mix right across the piste that includes all sorts of television programmes. We are not seeking there through those television core programmes to deliver anything formal or with objectives against them. No learning objectives are set against those sort of programmes. When you come to the informal area, we absolutely do set objectives. We set objectives about what we're trying to achieve on television and if you like the big changes there have been over the last five or six years, I think none of us can deny the impact that interactivity has had on how more effective we can be in terms of how we engage our audiences because television has always done a brilliant job at opening those windows to the world. But in terms of real, genuine learning, television doesn't do that by itself. Interactive media, if you like what we all refer to as lean forward, as soon as you come to the informal areas where we are looking to get more learning value out of that content, interactivity is a very important way that we do that. The third area I think where you get genuine in the formal area, I think formal, if you look at our schools output, there very much is guided by objectives of what is going on in the classroom and what is going on with students. And I think absolutely we should see….

(TANNOY)

Liz Cleaver: So I think, so I think you must see the way that we operate. If you go into the third area, which we term outreach, when you have a learner with a teacher or whatever, we absolutely see there, we can't deliver the whole learning agenda all by ourselves. I don't think, in answer to your question, we're set up to do that and I don't think it's appropriate that we should. But when you look at the, if you like the funnel of the level of engagement, I think those top two with general broad and then the informal area is somewhere where we have a great deal to offer. So I think yes, we should, we do, we didn't represent it in the document and I think that's an absolutely fair comment. If you look at, we absolutely do look at those three levels of engagement. We do look at the market-place to see where there's areas of need. I think that attaches onto the area of formal when you question the spend difference in those areas. I think with the formal area, if you are looking at the market-place, if you are trying to ensure that you're only being complimentary to the market-place and not providing a totally comprehensive area, provision, then I think you don't need the same level of funding as you do say to populate BBC1 primetime. Remember too where resources are used in the classroom. There's a great deal of repeatability. I mean programmes are still being used from 10, 15 years ago quite happily with every new cohort coming through the classroom. And I think the value too contained in that 30 million is on-line spend. I think it's extraordinary what you can achieve in terms of a learning experience through on-line. It doesn't require the same level of funding as say television. It's a different level of funding that's engaged. Touching on

Alan's point because I think there has been a big change in television and the market-place that we all inhabit. If I take you back to On The Move, many people remember that series. It was a Sunday afternoon on BBC1 and 18 million people watched that programme. There were 3 channels. It was a very different market-place. It was very different what people came to and what people responded to. I think in the Cohen's climate, I think it's fair to say, as John said in his opening remarks, over the last 5 or 6 years the BBC has absolutely got behind big passion campaigns. What it does brilliantly well around is sort of history or science or whatever. I think it's proved more challenging around the skills agenda to find appropriate programming that works in prime-time BBC1 that targets that audience. And, as you said, we recognise that we do, I think when you ask you know what can we bring say to a literacy agenda, I think the fact that you can have a storyline in East Ender or the fact you do have something on prime-time BBC1 where you have tremendous reach, where you try to engage people in the whole notion of literacy but in a soft way, that's the role that we can play. And if you go back to that funnel notion, we can start working with partners, we can start being the process in that funnel. And I'll just give you a couple of quotes to give you an illustration of what I mean. On the buses there's a wonderful interview with somebody from the Lancashire Council who says that if we had a bus with Lancashire County Council on the side, we wouldn't get anybody through it to come and use the sort of material that we have in this bus because they'd just think oh dear. So we're really happy. The BBC, people think ah BBC, I'll go through that door. The minute they go through that door and the minute they start using the resources on that bus, the resources are everybody's resources. It's the BBC included with other provision but it's the LCC that provide the tutor, it's somebody else who provides the provision. And I'd also just give a second example. When I was in Cambridge about 6 months ago and a man there running a small business. He needed to retrain his over 50s and he needed to run some training exercise. He said it is fantastic to use the BBC brand again to get them through the door. It's like the unsuspecting, that they go in and the BBC brand brings them in. But everything that we're then providing and the seriousness and depth of what happens, absolutely I think that's something that we do in partnership with others.

Alan Tuckett: Can I come back on that thing about the bus?

Lord Burns: Yes.

Alan Tuckett: It did strike me reading the papers that this touches on partnership I'm afraid as well but it is about span. There's no doubt the things you do in the centres and the buses, they're wonderful, but I think the distinction you made between when people can use your brand and when you do things yourself is one worth thinking about but you can't replicate what you do with the buses you've got everywhere, so what leads you to make choices to do it where you do it? How do you construct partnerships to say this is where we should be focusing resource? I can see the value in doing it in some places to feed your other programming decisions but how far that needs to be things you directly manage and run because frankly from outside it often feels as though once the BBC's developed an enthusiasm to do it, it will do it and everyone else will fit round it and I think that's characteristically how people feel on those occasions when they are not with you in partnership as it were. And in that case I can't see that you're adding something distinctive by the doing of it but I can see huge value in doing it alongside other people and bringing that brand, that kind of quality of materials and the thoughtfulness you have. And I think you just have to say well what are you not doing in order to do what you're doing there, the kind of level of community education engagement that you had a decade ago that's not there in the same volume. And that's a trade-off and I'm not sure that that's a trade-off that actually works to adult learners of benefit enough.

Lord Burns: Could I take up an issue which has cropped up in a lot of our seminars and I think Liz touched on it, which is that the broadcasting world is changing very rapidly? We now have many more channels and a move to multi-channel homes, which is changing viewing habits a great deal and of course the impact of on-line. And what has often been said at these seminars is that broadcasting in general is going to have to respond to this and some of the things that the BBC does or does not do is going to have to respond to this. And I would like to put to you in terms of a question is what are the major ways in which you think the whole educational effort should change in relation to this? I mean you mention the point that there

were three channels. Now on a Sunday afternoon you've got to compete with movies and all sorts of things. Now your ability to have a captive audience is a great deal less than it was, more as you say though can move into the on-line world. I mean how far does this change the offering that the BBC should be engaged in? Does it change the balance of those three, you know the types of categories that you were talking about between engagement and delivery, etc. and what's it all going to look like in another 5 or 10 years' time when many of these trends that we have seen are presumably going to be even more pronounced?

Prof. Edward Melhuish: Surely there's a temptation in that kind of changing environment for more and more of the education content to be channelled into the less watched channels in one way or another and I think that's a potential danger. I think it's inevitable that a large proportion of the educational, either formal or informal, is directed to the less-watched channels because you have greater flexibility in what you can programme there and so on. But in that environment there has still to be maintained and educational presence on the main channels and in particular a way in which the main, the experience on the main channels can direct you to the other more substantial areas of content on the subsidiary channels and on the web.

Prof. Andrew Pollard: I agree with that. I also think, going back to this bus example, that that kind of illustrates the way in which learning is very effective if it's embedded in people's actual lives. If you can get close to the action and the way they actually interact together in their communities and if you have more platforms, more channels, I think you can get a more differentiated form of output - and that's another educational word of course – and I think that should be all to the good, particularly if you are following this interactive strategy, using the technology to get people in an active kind of relationship with the medium which is followed through through social interaction with other people in their communities. And I think that is likely to be the most long-lasting and sustained form of learning that might come through. There's an awful lot of educational research that would support that basic line. And of course I'm aware that some of the representations in the review for instance come from LSDA, LSC, seeking a higher emphasis on skills and implicitly I think talking about the delivery of courses to enable that. It seems to me that there's a danger that that will become a kind of music and movement, you know, for skills learning. And as somebody who both experienced music movement and talked using it, I am aware…I am aware of its advantages and disadvantages as a delivery mechanism. Now we've had a lot of delivery in our national education system in recent years and I'm delighted that the DfES strategy, the 5-year strategy, is a significant turn in the approach. We've got more emphasis on personalised learning, more emphasis on motivation, more emphasis on engagement and that to me represents an important change and a recognition of a more sophisticated view of learning. And I think that you need to be a bit careful not to go down the line of trying to use a big medium like television to try to deliver things. It won't work. People will just turn it off.

Lord Burns: Right.

Prof. Andrew Pollard: In a school context they generally don't walk out of the door, although of course a number don't come, and that is, I mean it is a major issue. Attendance is a major issue in schools and engagement has been a significant problem. But I think that you can't be expected to solve the skills problems of the education system coming in late in the life of course, if you like, and sorting out a problem which a lot of people have had a crack at. So I think you've got to be a bit careful about how you respond to these pressures and make sure you do it in a principled way.

Lord Burns: Okay. Could I bring David Walker, I'd just ask to bring David Walker in because he hasn't had a word yet.

David Walker: First of all my apologies for being late. I'll perhaps to the dichotomist distinction that Janet made. I mean we should leave pedagogy to pedagogs and leave programme making to programme makers. The first priority of the BBC is to make watchable listenable programmes. If they happen to have educational result that's good but I was very struck I have to say in preparation for this seminar, reading the documentation, I mean we live in a world of targets and quantified objectives - there is none of that. You don't pretend to try

and put numbers on the BBC's educational ambitions because they are perhaps necessarily rather vague and fuzzy. And I think one should sort of capture that and look to the ways in which all programme makers might as they are thinking about what they do, think about the consequences of their action. And as I came in, Edward Melhuish was talking about informal learning and I'd very briefly make the point, just looking at Newsnight last night, knowing I was going to be here this morning, what do we learn from Jeremy Paxman's rudeness and arrogance to a government minister? We must learn something, perhaps about the BBC, perhaps about Paxman, perhaps about the BBC news culture or perhaps about his participation in a general journalistic culture, which is destructive of our confidence in elected politicians but clearly there is a learning output from BBC news, just as there's a learning output from really Radio 3, BBC3. There's education in all of that but it's education of a kind which can be quantified, is fuzzy and perhaps as a result shouldn't be emblazoned on the objectives of BBC post Charter renewal as a principal objective. We're talking about education small "e" in future as one of many programme outputs rather than educational ambition and I for one I think wouldn't be unhappy if the BBC gave up the pretension of being a pedagogical institution in any shape or form.

John Willis: Can I answer a couple of those points? Just to reassure you about BBC1, BBC2 and digital channels. Obviously there are lots of programmes with learning outcomes. On BBC3 we've had a cancer season in particular aimed at young men and young women and we do a large number of parenting programmes because that's the target age range. But basically we feel very strongly that we have to use the channels with maximum reach to deliver the objectives and so I see absolutely no sign of any decline in that. And I think going forward in a multi-channel environment, to pick up one of Lord Burns' points, is that actually this is one of the areas that gives the BBC a distinctiveness. It's one of the ways the BBC can stand out in the multi-channel crowd. And just to follow that up in just a little bit more detail, I think in that multi-channel world we have to be more inventive. It's a challenge for us. It's actually a good challenge because it makes us more creative. It makes us think okay there are lots and lots of channels here. We don't have a captive audience of 18 million people who watch a literacy programme. How do we make a programme about adult literacy that is going to connect with that audience that needs it? Now we are going to put a storyline in East Enders and actually we're going to put a storyline in Neighbours as well and that's a very good starting point. And equally we have to experiment with the ways that the younger generation, who are very multi-channel literate, actually receive, want to receive media. They want to receive it when they want it not when the schedule of the BBC1 or BBC2 decides it's appropriate. They want to perhaps have it in a portable way on the move and so we are working very hard in finding ways of delivering GCSE Bitesize for example on people's mobile telephones because that's what young people do. So it's a challenge to our inventiveness and it's one thing the BBC you know for all its occasional faults is actually quite good at being inventive and rising to those particular challenges. And I'd just, to pick up your point, I think we absolutely agree and it's why we, for all the points that Alan made, why we think that community activity is part of the tiering system for BBC learning is that it is a place where people can learn in their own environments, where they can work with their peers, their friends and it comes much more easily. And although we're not trying to replace what people do in schools and we're not for one second believing that the community activity is going to be transformational to massive numbers of people, we do think in certain key sectors and certain key parts of the country it is important. So we chose Hull because they have a very sophisticated broadband system there through Kingston Communications. It was the obvious place to try a spark of creativity in a rather deprived part of Britain that happens by chance to have broadband technology. We're also looking at (INAUDIBLE) one. So for example I think our next bus and open centre is in Gloucester. That is not funded by the BBC. The BBC, we'll use the BBC, we'll use the skills of some of our partners. In fact it's the community who have said to the BBC "We've seen how these work. We think we need one in this part of the country." And so we're just acting as a pump primer in lots of ways and that's one of the things that should happen in community projects, that we should start it off but the BBC shouldn't be there to finish it. We should let other people take it on.

Lord Burns: Alan, do you want….

Alan Tuckett: Well it was the skills point really. I don't think anybody wanted to be doing narrative kind of heavy-duty programmes on how you develop skills. I think we do recognise that motivation is part of the curriculum for adults. I mean children, agreed some of them manage to avoid doing it but they are supposed to be there, so you don't tend to think about the curriculum as starting when they arrive. With adults they don't join in and surely that's the key issue. We've taught people really well education and training aren't for them and then we've changed the economy so they need it. They need to see themselves as agents, active, capable of joining in and learning and you are brilliant at doing that. The potter's wheel I grew up with, you know when you couldn't think of any other programmes to make, when there was only one channel, and it was wonderful. The point about it is my sons are far more articulate about advertising, adverts on the box than he is about whole programmes, speed, focus. So what you did with website-wise, what you did with second chances, of using those spaces between your main programmes to stimulate images of I could do this seem to me not your big campaigns but absolutely something you could do covering the wide diversity of things people are curious to learn and you can help the skills image-building that this is something normal. And for the likes of you and me, you could do something for supervisors who have got Polish building workers about learning a bit of Polish. You know 30-second jobs change culture I think and you can do it. You know how to do it.

Lord Burns: Simon first, then…

Simon Fuller: I just wanted to reiterate what John said because I thought it was incredibly important. While we're talking about multi-channel world, we're also talking about a multiple media world. And the most ubiquitous piece of technology is the mobile phone and I think frankly if the BBC is going to reach all learners, I am sure it will be innovative in exploring those technologies. And it as an institution is probably best placed to take those risks because it's not bounded by the same commercial pressures and actually explore those technologies and technologies yet to be invented for how we can reach learners because I think if one is realistic, with 100 channels about to be unleashed on most homes, it is a dead, you know there's no argument. You're just not going to reach a lot of people. But the idea of being able to text people to use mobile telephony and other medium is incredibly important and I think that is a real piece of innovation you can go for. The other thing I just wanted to mention was, it was referred to earlier about whether the BBC should be the voice of the DfES and its various distinctiveness, I want to just come back to that point. It's worth reminding ourselves that the DfES have just invested £60 million of public money in launching its own television service called Teacher TV and I think it's very important that the BBC is not working hand in glove either with a government department or with the government as a whole. You have to be ahead of the government in its thinking. Governments on the whole tend to work quite slowly; they're quite conservative; they have various pressures on them. One way the DfES can be innovative is to be ahead of the government's thinking, listening to the people that you're talking to and creating programmes and ideas that lead and don't follow government initiatives. I just wanted to make that point about innovation and where the BBC can go.

Lord Burns: Can I, I'd like to come back to that issue about in a sense the relationship with the DfES in Session 3 about working in partnership because I think there are some quite important issues there. I think we need to have a break, so we have a number of people from the world of education who are in the audience. Can I just say is anybody bursting to say something that has upset them terribly that has been said this morning or there has been something in this whole area of span and distinctiveness that they feel that we have missed because after the break I want to move on in a little bit more detail to the issue of access audiences and to see that in a little more detail? But before we go for coffee I just want to make sure that there is nobody sitting there seething that…. No? Excellent. I like nothing more than a contented audience. We'll have a break and we'll come back at 10.30. Thanks very much.

(COFFE BREAK)

Lord Burns: Thank you all for coming back. I'm afraid I've got to give you this repeat message about telephones and blackberries and quite clearly most people listened to my plea in the first session but there was somebody's machine that was running around at various stages this morning which is, you can hear it on the, every time you hear that kind of crackle on the mic, on the speakers that means that somebody hasn't turned off their electronic device. And whilst I don't wish to adopt a Home Office approach to this particular issue I would plea for your co-operation. The second session, which we have labelled access and audience, we now want to move on and look at some of these issues in a little more detail and I'll hand over to Janet again to introduce more questions.

Prof. Janet Finch: Thanks very much, Terry. I am going to just draw a few threads together from the previous discussion because we'd like to be able to sort of roll things forward before I go into the access and audiences directly. It was an extraordinarily interesting session I think the first hour and a quarter. It really did bring out a number of very important points. It certainly didn't resolve them but it brought them to the surface in a very important way. Rather than repeat points that people have made, perhaps I could come at it from a slightly different angle and say that I think some of the, quite a few of the points that were made in the first session could be organised around the question what is the meaning of educate in the Reithian definition of the BBC's purposes as to educate, inform and entertain? What does that mean, those three words which we keep coming back to, which have stood the test of time, what the BBC is about? And quite a lot of what we talked about in the first session was really about the interpretation of the educate bit of that. So let me just try this for a different way of thinking about these issues, which is that there are three different ways in which the BBC perhaps does, maybe doesn't, perhaps should interpret what education means within that spectrum. One is that they are three separate objectives and that the objective to, the Reithian objective to educate is a specific separate activity from other BBC activities and leads the BBC into being – and I caricature to make the point again – into being a kind of very, very big school or university or FE college indeed, an educational institution that works with other educational institutions to deliver pedagogic purposes. Now in the first session I think that there was, a fair number of people spoke against that view, the BBC should not be a pedagogic institution but that wasn't probably a consensus view. So that's the first way of looking at it, that to education is a sort of separate specific requirement on the BBC and leads it down that particular route. The second way of interpreting the way education fits in that spectrum of educate, inform and entertain is that the BBC's educational remit is to facilitate learning through the other things – through information and entertainment. And that particular point of view was articulated as well in the first session, so that everything the BBC does in fact is fulfilling its educational remit for somebody. And it may or may not do it particularly well for different groups and so on but in fact the whole educational remit of the BBC is an integral part of everything else. And you might have some parts of it that are label more education specific than others but that when the BBC thinks about its educational role, it should be thinking across the full spectrum of everything that it does. And the third way of interpreting educate, inform and entertain is that education must take place in an entertaining way so that the distinctiveness of the BBC's educational remit is that it can educate people without their feeling patronised to put it bluntly, and that this is the argument that says that really one of the most important things you do is to put the right sort of storylines in East Enders and so on to get into people's minds without their realising that it's really an educational activity. Now these three of course are not mutually exclusive and I guess that some combination of them is what the BBC actually does but it's perhaps a slightly different way of thinking about you know where the educational remit actually sits within that spectrum of educate, inform and entertain. And how we interpret that of course has to be mindful of two particularly important contexts within which the BBC's educational remit is fulfilled. One is the broadcasting environment and the whole, the real importance of the multi-channel environment that is here and is going to accelerate and how that changes the way in which the BBC can deliver its educational remit. And the second thing, the second important context is the understanding of what learning actually is and how it happens in people's lives. And here I think it became very clear in the first session that the BBC currently has not sort of thought in those terms. You know an understanding of how learning operates, specifically articulated and followed through in the way in which the educational remit is fulfilled isn't the way the BBC has thought in the past and perhaps could helpfully be brought into BBC thinking. So I think those important contexts for understanding the educational remit and then

of course there's the whole question of how we judge the effectiveness of education and here I think there is a split in the Panel very clearly between those who think there should be some sort of targets of specific learning outcomes and those who think there should not and I guess that we may return to that later in the morning. So those I think are the sorts of thoughts that we might take forward into this session and the following one, focusing, shifting the focus now a bit to the question of access and audiences, that's to say is the BBC in its educational remit equally serving all citizens or are there sections of the population that are under-served? By definition I guess there would be then others that were over-served by the BBC's current education strategy. How does the BBC cater not only through its television programmes but also radio and online for the full range of groups that we would expect it to cater for as the recipient of the licence fee and how does it manage for those who don't access on-line material for example? You know what's the BBC's thinking about that? In focusing our thoughts here can I suggest that we would, as well as other things in this session, very much like to hear more about the BBC's role in terms of children's broadcasting specifically for children and the extent to which it reaches children of all sorts. You know are there groups of children who are less well-reached than others? And I guess Edward Melhuish will be able to help us there. And I haven't told him he'd have to say that. He may or may not be able to. And then an equivalent question if you like in terms of the older audience, in mindful of the fact that over the next Charter period, if it lasts 10 years from 2006 to 2016, the population aging will continue apace and we will have an ever-older population during that new Charter period. So how is the BBC, how is that being taken into the BBC's thinking and how is the BBC both in the present and the future catering for the needs of older citizens in its educational remit? So I'll stop there.

Lord Burns: Thank you very much, Janet. That's very helpful. Who would like to? Edward?

Prof. Andrew Pollard: I'd better pick up on the first review if I may. Somewhere in the documentation it talks about a learning revolution and I wasn't quite sure what that meant but I think that some of the points you're making there, Janet, do touch on this notion of a learning society, which again is a powerful idea. I think a way of thinking about the role of the BBC might be in terms of creating the conditions for a learning society to emerge. I think you could argue that the BBC, except in particular instances, should not be the main provider of education. It's not a school system certainly. It's not a training system. But in terms of creating the conditions in the culture where learning is valued by individuals of every age and every circumstance, it is immensely valuable and probably our most influential institution in the country. And I think that thinking creatively about how a climate can be created where people do value learning and improving, self-improvement and developing with others and all those things, it could be really, really powerful. I mean I think if you think about our school system, we know we've got relative improvements in performance in primary years. Now I know they've levelled off a little bit but nevertheless there's been quite a significant development there. When we hit secondary, we've got all sorts of cultural problems sweep in because peer group culture and youth culture doesn't always support the learning process. And I think that affects particular groups in specific ways. But we are into there the way people think about their lives and about thinking about taking control of them and whether they think about learning as a positive thing that they can get engaged in or whether they think it's something that's done for somebody else by somebody to them and so forth. This is about culture and the BBC could have a tremendous role in that, whether or not it's actually making provision or whether it's standing back and letting others make specific training provision.

Alan Budd: Can I, it's just a little reminiscence which I often use. I am associated with something called the United Kingdom Maths Trust, which is very concerned with encouraging school children to do maths and it puts out these gold stars and silver stars, which your kids no doubt do. And I often quote the following example of a programme I was watching with my children, and it was some time ago, so it would have been something like Tiswas, which I know is not a BBC programme but it was that sort of programme, and this is the sort of very typical programme in which there is a studio, a lot going on and some child, it's the high point of their lives, comes into the studio and because they've done so well they're going to have a telephone conversation with a pop star of their choice, right. And so this is how the conversation goes. And the pop star says "Hello, Annie, how are you?" "Fine." Pop star: "How are you getting on at school? Annie: "Fine." "What's your favourite lesson? What's

your favourite subject, Annie?" Annie: "Maths." Pop star: "Ugh!" Now at that stage I think bang goes another million potential mathematicians. This is just an illustration of this whole business of an environment conducive to certain sorts of education really is very imminent and the power of broadcasting to change people's attitudes to this is immense.

Liz Cleaver: Just to answer one of your questions, the learning revolution that we were referring to is really the arrival of interactive because, as we touched on earlier, I think interactive completely changes the way that we can aid people and help them to learn. And I think we should be careful, broadcasting absolutely plays, as you pointed out, a vital role but I think when you – picking up on something you said – I think to say within the formal arena that we don't spend a long time considering what learning is, both having expertise inside the BBC and importantly who we consult with on the outside of the BBC, we spend a lot of time thinking about this because it's incredibly vital in the way that we deliver for example the thought going behind the DC. If you look at how you will change the relationship you have with your audience, broadcasting and using television programmes as a recorded means in a classroom, as a teacher moderated activity, interactivity and the DC will be learned centred. It was your point about you know the importance of personalisation, and you then begin to break down barriers. You are no longer just talking about schools and institutional use, you're talking about home use and you're talking about use on the move, which again is terribly, terribly important. So I think that to us is the revolution that will absolutely change the way that you deliver formal education.

Alan Tuckett: Is one of the questions for you then how that skills, which is there clearly in the formal programmes, because normative enough in general programmes for David not to want to write it out the script altogether because I thought the remark David offered us earlier about this stuff just gets in the way of making great programmes or risks getting in the way of making great programmes, feels to me much more normative across broadcasting and for you to be pushing an uphill boulder as it were to really achieve what you're proposing in your paper about how much educative programming there is in the general.

Liz Cleaver: I think you should just bear in mind I wouldn't begin to want to or seek that every form of educative programme on the BBC would come laden with learning objectives because I think there is a role for the sit back, enjoy, absorb. That's fine. That's a perfectly fine thing to do with a television programme. When you come to our definitions of formal and informal learning, I think there it's important that we do target learning objectives and you can do it subtly on television and raise awareness of things. If you're running a social action campaign, what a brilliant way to do it. Again you use your reach and share in how you heighten the awareness of something. The learning is I think, as we talked about earlier, delivered more on then what you can do on interactive programme and out in the community through out-reach. So I think it does have a place but we wouldn't be able to fulfil ever in a very meaningful way if we attempted to do with every sort of programme that we made.

David Sinclair: I've got a couple of issues from the perspective of older people. One, we appear to have mentioned digital and the Internet more than we've mentioned television this morning and yet actually we've got only about 17% of older people who have ever accessed the Internet. It's inevitable that more and more educational content will move towards the digital and interactive route. There's an assumption that it is a cohort effect and that this will gradually change but of course the O & S stats have been increasing by 1 or 2 percent over the last 5 or 6 years about take up of over-65s of the Internet. And of course when only two people had the telephone it wasn't particularly useful. When we get up to a situation when 90, 95% of the general population have access to the Internet but still 2 million older people don't, does the move towards more interactive services run the risk that those most excluded, those most in need of the education actually will lose access to it. You mentioned earlier the link between the digital divide and learning divide. If you push more and more people towards the interactive learning and they don't have access then clearly there are dangers there.

Lord Burns: Does the same go for multi-channel programmes?

David Sinclair: At the moment the over-75s are the one group of the population who haven't taken up digital TV and of course that will be addressed hopefully by the Ofcom Consumer Panel, which will report in December in terms of the move to a digital switchover. And I think we see digital switchover as being a real opportunity for digital technology into the homes of the most excluded and we are worried that the government isn't particularly interested, that it's actually more interested in putting the cheapest boxes they can find into the homes of the older people, rather than putting the boxes which will be of most educative and learning benefit. The other thing I wanted to talk about was linking to the point earlier. We did some work with the ITC back in 2002 and 70% of viewers thought that over-65s were ignored by programme makers and it was actually a higher figure for over-75s, although viewers of all ages said they'd like to see more older people on TV. And of course – rather a cheeky remark – of course one of the reasons for this is of course the BBC still has a retirement age of 60, so of course you don't have trainees, you don't have young programme makers actually within the BBC anyway so.

Lord Burns: But can I press a bit further on, the issue of the extent at which you think the older groups are served? I mean to what extent is it in a sense that they don't appear on the programmes that they're on part of it and to what extent is it because you're worried that the issues that they are concerned about in this education space are not being addressed? You know is it in a sense something to do with methods of delivery and style of delivery and you know or is it to do with what it is that is being done and the extent to which it is attractive to them in terms of watching and listening?

David Sinclair: I think actually in terms of the second point, the sort of programmes and sort of issues, I really think, linking back to my point earlier, an Alvin Hall programme which looked at the issues of someone on a fixed income and how you manage your money would actually make amazing television. It could look at things like equity release; it could look at things like are you claiming the right benefits; are you spending your money effectively and it would also be extremely valuable educationally but we don't see that sort of programming on mainstream programmes.

Lord Burns: Okay. So that's an issue about dealing with the issues, which are of more concern to the older age group than to the younger age groups?

David Sinclair: And in terms of the methods of delivery, clearly actually like we said, as we've said earlier, actually amongst the young and the old population, actually there's quite a lot of people who are very warm towards the BBC and actually, you know I've got an older volunteer who works with me who absolutely loves BBC3 for the educational and information content he gets out of that. But actually you know I think my worry and the worry from our perspective is what will happen over the next 5 to 10 years as we move towards more, a different way of delivering when actually there isn't a lot of thought about how you give older people access to whether it be the expensive set top boxes, whether it be the Internet at home, for example. And in fact even the government's given up on it by cutting funding to the 6,000 UK on-line centres, so.

Alan Tuckett: There's a dilemma in this because older people watch programmes in a huge amount but they watch very cheaply made programmes don't they and, if you look at the kind of price per hour watch and you're older and you're stuck at home during the day because you're not so mobile, what's the message we're telling them? Look at American television where you have kind of the main presenter of the day is an older person and contrast it with the UK and there's a kind of hidden curriculum which it's quite hard to get at culturally about how you value in an aging society people of all ages, which I think does need, that is something about your first question. For the second, I mean interactivity, helping people to be active while they watch a lot of television is a really big challenge to avoid morbidity in older people and there's a real good economic case for the country in encouraging that kind of you know do something or you lose it.

Lord Burns: Can we stick to the question of, I mean maybe we should go through this session by working our way down the age population.

John Willis I'm not quite sure whether you're starting with me and working your way down or starting with me and you're working your way up the older population. The stars of the BBC – David Attenborough, nearly 80 - and there's a fantastic role model. He travels the world, hugely inquisitive, inspires different generations. Bill Oddy –you know well into his 60s and now incredibly popular. So we do have presenters who are fantastic role models in that age group and in many ways the heartland particularly of BBC2 but also BBC1 in terms of viewers of the older population and we see it as one of our jobs, and it's part of I think what you called the learning society, which is exactly where I think the BBC is and should be placed, not as a big school where we're all prefects but is the learning society that we're aiming at. One of our jobs is to drive digital and that includes driving digital and encouraging the older age groups to actually engage with new technology because they can get so much out of it. When you see an older person who suddenly discovers the Internet and realise that what they can do is communicate with their sister in Australian via email, you know they think they've found heaven and that's one of the things that we can do. And so the BBC, through things like Webwise, is encouraging people, through projects like the People's War, which got older people to tell their stories. Some of them could put them straight into a computer but actually they could go into the local library – and we had 400 partners in the project – and they could tell their story to someone who would then sit with a computer and try to encourage someone to use the computer. And the People's War has collected, probably for the last time for that age group, all the memories, a fantastic oral history that will be there for, you know for years and years to come of the war. And then in the community groups, obviously we are interested in connecting younger people with the BBC but also you know older people too. And as I think I mentioned right at the beginning, if you go into the Open Centre in Blackburn, it's populated almost entirely by people from the Asian community, of an older age group who are grappling with IT skills. So I'm not saying we're perfect in this area of course we're not but we're really, you know we are really conscious that the BBC is paid for by everyone. You know it's the people's broadcaster, to use a cliché, and the older population is really part of that.

Lord Burns: Any other comments about the older age group?

David Sinclair: Just that I completely agree, that actually most, the evidence is that most people, when they do interact with the technology, love it and it's getting people in there in the first place and it's actually I think a question of scale and perhaps it's not law for the BBC anyway in terms of in some ways. The other thing around of course the older presenters, there aren't very many presenters over the age of 75. And in fact if you look at quotes from people like Kate Adie a year or so ago who said they want women with cute faces, cute bottoms and nothing in between, talking about how the BBC acted towards older presenters. And it does highlight there may well be an issue there.

Prof. Janet Finch: Just a quick thought, I think the point about the potential social exclusion of the older population, if you have not learnt to access the Internet is a very, very important one actually and one where the BBC could make things worse or better. And I recall that I think about a year ago, thinking about storylines in soaps, the Archers ran a storyline where there was an Internet access class run in the pub and they had the characters who were successfully engaged by that with the sort of older farm workers on the show. So there are opportunities here actually for that to happen as well.

Lord Burns: Well what about the next sort of age group, Janet? How wide does this reach?

Prof. Janet Finch: I'd like to go right to the other end and find out about, find out about children, yes.

Prof. Edward Melhuish: Okay, well maybe I should say something about children's TV. Children's TV is a very big commercial market and this is an area where I think the BBC plays a very good role as complementary to the commercial section of the market. I've worked to some extent with commercial operators in this market and it's interesting in seeing how those commercial makers make their programmes that they're torn between, you know, commercial drives and more humanitarian education, if you like, drives in the making of educational TV…of children's TV rather. And it was very apparent to me that the presence of the BBC as a very substantial operator in this market kept the commercial companies to some extent on

the straight and narrow, which I don't think would have happened if the BBC hadn't, wasn't a big operator in this area.

Lord Burns: Could you just expand a bit on that? What do you mean by keeping on the straight and narrow? How were they tempted to…?

Prof. Edward Melhuish: They were tempted to go for….

Lord Burns: For an office role?

Prof. Edward Melhuish: You know the thing which would lead to them get the most immediate reaction from the children in terms of emotional explosion as it were and also in terms of being driven in ways which their sponsors found attractive, the sponsors being the, you know, toy makers and other people like that. Now children's TV is something I feel rather ambivalent about. I feel ambivalent about it because when we look at young children we see that amongst their most valuable learning experiences take place in interaction with other people, particularly their parents and so on. And unfortunately children's TV is often used as a kind of sedative both by parents, by day-care settings and sometimes even by pre-school settings as well. Almost every day-care, pre-school and home in this country will use children's TV at some time or other during the week to just occupy the kids.

Lord Burns: And that's why it's done on a Saturday and Sunday morning.

Prof. Edward Melhuish: Well and in some ways it has to, you know…it's fine but if it takes place all the time, you know, it actually prevents the children doing other active things which might be more valuable and that's why it can act as a kind of sedative. So there needs to be a bit of a balance. So I think there's a great opportunity there for children's TV to actually provide a learning experience for children and I think possibly the BBC is too conservative. Commercial operators have gone, some of them at least have gone the route of providing a single source digital channel specifically for children's TV. Should the BBC be considering this? The commercial operators are also much more heavily into animation techniques than the BBC is with great success. I think the use of these techniques, particularly in a digital age, gives a great opportunity for expanding the minds of children in ways which have some educational function and which will require greater inventiveness than is currently being shown. Having said that, however, I must say that the CBeebies for example is a tremendously successful enterprise and I applaud it and wish it further expansion.

Prof. Janet Finch: Okay. Could I just say something? To put it mildly, I'm not an expert on children's television but I have read a report which the DCMS commissioned relatively recently from Maire Messenger Davis on children's television in the context of the digital review. This was very supportive of BBC children's programmes but I think raises for me – and this is my interpretation, not hers – some of the questions that we more generally in this Charter Review are looking at. So one of the issues that it raises is should the distinctive role of the BBC in the spectrum of providers of children's television be to be the standard setter and the innovator? That's one of the issues that has come to us in a number of these seminars and is that what the BBC should be doing? Should it be using its uniquely privileged position with this very secure source of income to be doing things that other programme makers, other channels can't do because it's too much of a risk or because they can't invest as much in the development of programmes as the BBC can? So that's one question really. Is that a proper role for children's television and, you know, how does it then relate to learning objectives if that's where we're going. The second issue, which again bears on a more general question that we've been looking at in this review is the relationship to the market, as Edward's just indicated. We have been told in other seminars, and I've no idea whether this applies to children's television, that when the BBC decided to do something it has the effect of cutting out a lot of other competitors because it is such a big organisation, it's so powerful, it's got lots of money and if it decides it's going into a bit of the market then it does and other people can't survive or don't enter it. Now I'm not saying that that is happening in children's television but I do know that the report, the review by Maire Messenger Davis does think that it's very important that a spectrum of providers should be maintained in children's television. She mentions Disney Playtime and Nickelodeon, neither of

which I know anything about, as being particularly good and it's important I think therefore that in this arena, as in all other arenas, the BBC thinks about the competition. And John made a comment about that at the very beginning about the way in which you work and don't work with the competition but I think the responsibility of having the licence of fee – both of these points come down to the responsibility of having the licence fee – is should there be a distinctive responsibility to be innovative and standard setting and should there be a responsibility to make sure that what the BBC decided to do in children's television really doesn't damage other providers in the market who are doing a good job as well.

John Willis: I think that one of the, I absolutely agree with you. I think one of the BBC's roles is to be a standard setter. We are a public broadcaster and we have to set standards, we have to innovate and hopefully - to pick up someone else's point from earlier on – by innovating and bringing in fresh ideas we'll simulate creative competition within this particular arena. And one of the areas where I think the BBC is distinctive and sets itself apart from the market is in domestic UK production. 91% of CBeebies is domestic indigenous production. It's one of the great differences between us and other channels. They obviously make an amount of domestic production. It's one of the unique things about the BBC and it comes back to the point that someone made earlier about the BBC's relationship with wider culture and I think British production is part of that. I think in terms of the market, that same piecework by Maire Messenger Davis and Professor Barwise indicated that the impact on the market of the BBC children's digital channels was actually pretty minimal or negligible. I think £2 million was the figure that's in there. And clearly it's absolutely right, coming back to the question of creative competition, that the BBC is only one provider in this arena. You know Disney and Nickelodeon are probably almost richer than the BBC. In a way they can look after themselves but we don't want, we'd like creative competition but we don't want to dominate the market. We want to be part of the market and we want to do things in a distinctive way.

Alan Tuckett: Is there a difference between children's television for those questions, Janet, and educational programming for children?

Prof. Janet Finch: Well I think one of the questions that it would be useful to explore is whether all children's television is educational by definition, if you take the concept of learning. And I think there are two aspects to this. One is that sort of philosophical approach that says anything can be learning and you don't divide it as a separate set of activities. The other issue is that the BBC currently I think when it presents its contribution to education does in fact include all of children's television.

Alan Tuckett: I was thinking of Liz's answer earlier to the issue about how clear the informal learning goals are right across children's TV and I would have thought that it would be hard right across CBeebies to see the learning outcomes implicit in all of the programming from my own children's experience of watching them.

Liz Cleaver: If you just look at the way that we divided it within the report, I think with CBeebies we decided in the end that 60% of the output of CBeebies had actual learning outcomes attached to it and 40% didn't. And on a spend of 7.9, we made a judgement that said okay, let's call the whole of CBeebies a learning source because, as we all know, with that younger age group, the play, the entertainment, the education is far more attached. With the CBBC, we don't lay claim in the document that all of CBBC actually is education. We say that about I think it's 45 of the 70+ million. Again we were trying to attach the notion that there are some form of learning objective that can be gained from that programme. So I guess that about 60/70% of it is but not 30%. And obviously these things are, they're a judgement call but that's sort of our best interpretation of what we were trying to do.

Alan Tuckett: One question you haven't asked us, those of you on the proper Panel, this morning is how much is enough for the BBC? And I think this business about what gets counted in really does highlight an issue of just how much of its overall programming budget the BBC commits to learning within this pretty broad spectrum that's being represented to us. And it's a very, very, very, very small percentage isn't it?

John Willis: If you look at the cost per viewer for BBC1 and BBC2 and then for our formal learning, it's about the same. It's you now 5.5 for BBC1, 4.5 for BBC2 and 5 to reach a pupil in the classroom. And bearing in mind that what you're doing is creating an asset base for 10 or 15 years to come every time you make a programme, either for schools or for children's television, can be repeated pretty endlessly. We're still on Andy Pandy and Postman Pat. You know they're still alive and well and living somewhere in the BBC. So you're making an investment in the future and the economics of that is very, very different from BBC1 where programmes come, they may occasionally get repeated but mostly they don't get repeated again. And I think we feel, as the people responsible for learning, that the formal side of learning, we're pretty comfortable with our budget. It's debated and approved every year by the governors. We feel that that's enough money to deliver a really good service. We'll not say it's perfect or that we haven't got room for improvement but we actually think it's a pretty good sum. And what it does is act as a trigger or a catalyst for other resources. It may be money and resources in terms of people or places from partners but it can be a commercial partner too. It can be Kingston Communications in Hull or our science and history programmes pull in you know $20m or $30m a year from US co-producers, which enhance the experiences of BBC1 and BBC2 and for the learning outcomes that follow. So we feel, you know we feel reasonably comfortable with it and, you know just to be absolutely clear about it, the amount of money the BBC is spending on learning is going up. It's not going down. It is going up. It is partly because of the digital curriculum, which is a significant new investment, but it's on the rise both in terms of how much we're spending on targeted learning within the education system and also in terms of the informal learning. So it's not going down, it is most clearly going up and probably going up pretty steadily.

Catherine Bush Could you just….

Lord Burns: Catherine's been waiting for some time to have a say.

Catherine Bush: Okay, thank you. I should declare, I'm certainly not an expert on children's television and not even having children of my own I very rarely come in contact with it. But just on a few observations. I mean it struck me that the three separate ways of looking at education that was outlined at the beginning of this session in terms of educate, facilitate, learning through information and then education taking place in a sort of entertaining, engaging way, if you're looking at other sort of age groups it's probably relatively easy to kind of categorise different types of programmes into those categories. I don't think they're mutually exclusive and I think the way in which the BBC takes forward those may be different for different areas. But it does strike me that within children's programming the blurring between those different categories is probably more distinct or more, you know, more pronounced than it is in other areas of programming. And that's why I do think it's very important that there is clarity about – to use a word that I think has perhaps been slightly maligned – round objectives, aims, outcomes from each of those things is given some clarity and some thought.

Lord Burns: Simon?

Simon Fuller: Well I think quite a lot has been said about the potential distinctive role of the BBC with regard to children's television and I just want to say that if you look at the commissioning strategy of a lot of the commercial companies, learning and education occur very rarely in their briefings. They look heavily for animation because animation travels. What they're really looking for is material that will work across a European and a worldwide situation. But if you look at Fox Kids in Britain, you're seeing Fox Kids in Spain and in Spanish, etc. etc. So one distinction of the BBC is that it may, and perhaps it should have, something distinctive about the fact that it's British children who are watching or are we looking at children who we want to be global in their thinking so should it have a global perspective? So I think that's one interesting element, the distinctiveness in terms of what the content is in relation to all of these other providers. Another point I think John mentioned is another important one about it generating work in the domestic industry. Is it part of the BBC's role – and I think I would argue it is – that it should be generating work for companies in the UK to develop their skills in providing programmes and other resources? The other thing I think is important is that there are examples, like Sesame Street, of extremely successful

programmes which both include animation, fun, entertainment and have clearly a learning underpinning. And those of us who have worked with children's television workshop know the enormous research that went into producing those kind of programmes. So I think the BBC is uniquely placed actually to continue with that tradition and its own of providing a range of programming which has education embedded within it but which nonetheless is of the same standard and the same value for those children who are watching it and I think that is a very unique role that it has to play and which will distinguish it from other providers.

Lord Burns: Alice?

Alice Rawsthorn: I would be interested in hearing from John and/or Liz on future measurement of what might be called the formal learning provision of the BBC. You made an allusion in your opening remarks, John, to perhaps a need for more robust measurement in future and I wondered which types of programmes you feel that should be given to. Ofsted was fairly trenchant in its criticism of the BBC's measurement methods in its submission to DCMS. It said that simply measuring the audience in quantitative terms wasn't satisfactory. That was like saying children were simply sitting in the classroom. It didn't measure whether or not they paid any attention to the lesson. So how are you planning to address this in future and will the proliferation of new media in BBC education such as texting to mobile phones, greater interactive use of the Internet, will that actually make the introduction of qualitative measurement easier or harder?

Liz Cleaver: I think anybody….

Alan Budd: Is this another question of BBC challenge because I thought Edward made a very interesting point, made a very profound point when he referred to the sedative role of children's television and if one is concerned with educating and developing children, the last thing you would want them to be doing was watching television. I mean maybe not the last, I can think of worse, but it is not a good activity for children at that stage of their lives. Now, and how did the BBC and others meet that challenge of encouraging children not to watch television? Now they do in fact do it. They sit there and say "Don't just sit there."

John Willis: Yes, there's a programme called Don't Just Sit There.

Alan Budd: We're sitting here and saying this is what we would most want children to do. It is not what we would most want children to do. They have other ways of learning and developing other than sitting and watching television.

Lord Burns: I would assume though that the position of this was that whatever you do children are going to watch television, particularly early in the morning, and therefore it is better that they should watch something that is of a (INAUDIBLE) than something that isn't and you know this is an acceptance of the realities of life.

Woman: Well I think there's a long tradition of trying to plan programming. I mean I think TeleTubbies is a fantastic example where the educational thinking behind TeleTubbies was extraordinary. And the work done there to ensure that the programme was about stimulating and activity beyond just what you were seeing on the screen was really worked at. I think again I would bring in the whole notion of interactivity. Television is changing and even television itself, particularly for the younger audiences, the way you use interactivity. Now a huge number of CBeebies audience along with their parents interactively play games and you're already then beginning to see a sort of a stat change in the way that television is being used. So I think there's a lot that we can do as programme makers. I would say at the end of the day anything that any of us do, children or not, that they do 24 hours a day is probably not good for anybody and in the end I don't think we can monitor exactly how much children watch. And I think other people have to be called in to maybe make some of those judgements. I think on the issue, I mean measurement, any of us in this room who work in a learning capacity know how hard it is to measure learning outcomes and real learning. I think there isn't a problem with a broadcaster like the BBC in the way that we measure online or the way that we measure television. They are set measurement standards and that's very clear. One thing we've struggled with over the last you know 5, 10 years is how do you measure the

beyond the broadcast and now beyond the interactive experience because that immediately becomes far more complex. And what we've tried to set up now, as I outlined at the beginning, in looking at different stages of learning, whether it's that sit back, watch television or the engagement with interactivity or the beyond in terms of how it stimulates learning, it's that third piece of the jigsaw puzzle that we want to get stronger in how we measure it. And one of the key ways I think we're going to be able to get better at that is the new learning strategy looks far more in the informal context to say learning doesn't work in the broadcast model. To broadcast a series for 8-10 weeks is a start but it won't change anything. If you, for example Fat Nation. You know it's not going to make the nation thin in 10 weeks. If you want to help with literacy, you're not going to make everybody literate in a series of 5 weeks. Learning takes time. So we as an organisation are behind our big campaigns are saying right, we're going to commit ourselves now for a longer period of time, so Fat Nation is a 2-year campaign. That immediately allows you to start measuring more. So you might measure the awareness and the changes after, during the programme as a dipstick measurement. You'd come back in 6 months, a year or two years and make a measurement. I think still in those areas it is difficult. I think in other areas, like for example People's War, a clear objective set for that project was to get people to tell their story and therefore it's much more straightforward because you can measure the number of stories you have on the website. So we know we have 32,000 stories, so that begins to give you an indication. I think in the formal arena and the informal it's also about how we partner with where, once you're in a school environment, once you're working with others. What happens beyond the moments when the BBC directly is not involved? And I think looking at learning outcomes, the DC for us will be an incredibly interesting experience in terms of getting a more robust measurement of actually measuring those learning outcomes over a longer period of time. But I think, I think all of you would agree – and we're always interested to have people, to work with people on this because I think there's an awful lot of work going on from government to individual organisations – about how we all get better at that deeper measurement of deeper learning.

Prof. Andrew Pollard: Could I comment on the learning outcomes issue because I'm involved in a research programme that's focused on trying to enhance learning outcomes and so it's a problem we struggle with all the time. I've also I should say been issued with my tape measure for Fat Nation and it's very encouraging because it's so long that it's sort of inherently…. Anyway so that's a good start but it does have some hard measures around it as well. I think the whole business of how to get some measures, how to get some indicators is very, very tricky and I think Ofsted are right to highlight that. But one of the most difficult things is to try and find a measure of things which are important generally. I mean this is a gross generalisation but in general it's relatively easy to measure some things in education and they're often not the most significant things. And that then can have a very significant distorting effect. So it's an issue where we have to be quite careful. I think as a sort of point of strategy, there then becomes in my mind anyway a question of how specific one gets. I mean there's been some discussion about measuring outcomes in relation to particular programmes. I'm not sure whether that's going to be technically very easy to do. Apart from anything else you've got cause and effect problems, which are horrendously difficult to get a handle on. And I just wonder whether, if you saw the primary objective in a global holistic sense as being trying to contribute to the conditions culturally that enable a learning society to emerge, some of the more traditional methods which I think you already use, you know large-scale latitudinal surveys, repeated panel discussions, you would get indicators from those of a relative clear type I think where you could monitor patterns. And I certainly think that would be part of the repertoire that you might use for this sort of thing. It all comes back of course to clarity about the primary objectives because any form of assessment is always very, very powerful and you have to be very careful it doesn't distort what you then do. And so getting valid indicators is critical and I would urge you not just to go for the things which are simple to measure. It must be things which are important.

David Walker: Yes, I mean to just follow up from that, I felt bubbling underneath this discussion, particularly the second session, has been a question of values. I mean we've in a sense taken for granted a purpose which is providing educational programming children as if maybe there is an unquestioned consensus on that. But I think when one addresses a particular question – I was struck by Alan Budd's question – what's the value base of the BBC such as it would be motivated to stop that pop star asking clearly a destructive question about

maths in schools? That would require a specific value commitment. Now that's a rather difficult one for the BBC because in that example there is extant public policy now being developed by Charles Clarke at DfES and that maybe introduces what we'll talk about in terms of future partnerships but I think, you know, getting clear whether the BBC is committed to general government objectives for education would have to do with raising productivity, with maximising family individual income over a life course or is the BBC concerned with a collective group objective such as civilising Britain? I think we do need at some point to get slightly clearer what the values the BBC is meant to be carrying into its educational formal, educational informal activity for the BBC's sort of own sake and not just take for granted that there is natural good as it were in educational intent.

Lord Burns: Maybe pick up, could we maybe pick up some of those issues in the third session which is about working in partnerships because you've mentioned some possible partners. Are there, before we close this part of it I'd really like to ask whether there are, we've talked about the old, we've talked about the young but are there any other social groups or audiences who we think are under-served by television, which may not be to do with age of course because I think we should try and make sure that we have touched on it all?

Alan Tuckett: We're a rather white audience and Britain isn't a white country anymore and I think one of the question that lies behind how much is enough is how many different communities feel that they're perspectives on the learning and where learning fits with their aspirations get well reflected in the media. And it's a kind of both sensitivity to a particular audience and their needs but also how we reflect for all of us on the kind of changing environment that we live on, whether we grow up in kind of white rural Britain or in urban multi-racial Britain, but it seems to be extraordinary if we move beyond this session without saying that must be a continuing real challenge to you to get inclusive enough, diverse enough, engaged enough response. I noticed in your papers the commitment to the indigenous languages of the United Kingdom and thought, well you know when you look at your responsibilities as it were to family learning in relation to Punjabi communities or Gujarati communities or whatever, there will be a set of challenges for you that I didn't see very well reflected in your papers about the educational roles we've got. Catherine?

Catherine Bush: Yes, there were two areas that I'd just like to pick up on. The first section is picking up Alan's point around sort of non-indigenous communities – a very specific point actually in the literacy and numeracy. It does specifically refer to literacy and there are big language needs for second language learners which I think need to be picked up in the strategy as that goes forward. And the second is really in sort of the working population and the skills needs of those. I don't think we're suggesting we have programmes that teach people how to be plumbers but I think there are things around people extending their working skills or skills which are transferable in the workplace. Again statistics about people have 10 jobs during their working lives. They need generic skills to cope with those sorts. And also it's about, you know, quality of life as much as anything. It's not just a productivity issue. So I think sort of the working, people throughout their working lives.

Lord Burns: Is there anyone in the audience who would like to raise any issues or are there any, you know, in this general area of groups which may be under-served or indeed over-served by the BBC in relation to education and learning?

Nick Brunker: Hi. Nicky Brunker, the Learning and Skills Council. If you want to talk about people in schools, which is very encouraging (INAUDIBLE)…lead into adulthood – I hope you could hear that, otherwise I'll repeat. The bit that you haven't touched on though is young people, say as in 16-24 year olds, and specifically around employers who ultimately employ the majority of people and subsequently train a lot of them and spend millions of pounds of their own money training people in the workplace. Is that learning leading to the type of learning that's, you know, appropriate to the skills agenda as a whole and what is the role of the BBC in helping to facilitate some of those discussions so that that money can be spent appropriately?

Lord Burns: Okay. Well I'll put that in category 2 I think of working in partnership.

Naomi Sargent: I'm not sure whether we would come back to interactivity but it was touched on quite heavily by Liz Cleaver and I'd really like to make a point that we are still at a really very early stage of interactivity. It's much talked about and quite over-hyped and very much under-researched. The question about what sort of people will benefit from what sorts of interactivity for what sorts of content and at what cost remains. Since the point at which I chaired the task group about new technologies for life-long learning under David Blunkett remains an extremely under-researched area and it's in the bridging between the here and now of terrestrial and where we're moving to. The comments that were made about older people and the boxes, the point at the moment is that the only box that is capable of a lot of interactivity is Sky Plus. The other cleverer boxes are not yet even on the market, and so I just really argue for much more serious work to go on in this area and not to be moving away from what we know reaches a people universally at home before we are much more understanding of where we want to go to and the track that we map out to get there.

Lord Burns: Yes.

David Sinclair: Can I just come back on that issue of the box? There is actually a commercially available box now produced by a company called Nepgem which allows audio transcription for example, which can provide access to television for people who currently aren't even using it – the blind and so on. There's also, that box also allows for Internet access and a fairly accessible red button. So there is some technology but I think my main concern is that I think that when switchover comes, if government happens to be forced to provide some boxes for some certain segments of the population, they will be choosing the cheapest boxes rather than the one which will provide the most learning benefit.

Lord Burns: Maybe when switchover comes of course these boxes will be easier to operate as well, as I watch an enormous people, people with Freeview boxes struggling to actually navigate their way, you know, because there is also the terrestrial offering their…to the conclusion but..

Floella Benjamin: Thank you very much. As someone who worked in children's programmes for nearly 30 years I can tell you if you do it well, which the BBC has done for many, many years, it's remembered because people still remember a lot of the things that we taught them 30 years ago in programmes like Play School. And I am pleased to see that the BBC has made that commitment to continue that. But one thing I'd like to say is that if you noticed in the room this morning, I'm the only black person here. On your committee there, on your Panel, there's no representation. And I think that's something that really needs to be addressed at the BBC, to make sure that people feel included, especially young black men who have no kind of connection with television at the moment. They don't feel as if their voice is being heard, they don't feel as if they're being included. And what the BBC and other television organisations need to do is to try and have historical accuracy, not just ghettoise programmes where you have, you know, a bit of something happening during October when it's black history month but all through the year, so that people feel included. There was a wonderful programme last night called Who Do You Think You Are with Moira Stewart. That was one of the first programmes for a long, long time where whether you're a black person or a white person you felt as if you were included and black people suddenly felt my story being told as well. And I think that's what's needed right across the BBC, whether it's in children's programmes, and there's no point just having black presenters on the shows. You need to have people who are telling the stories, you know, behind the camera as well. That's so important because that's when you get a true reflection of our country, whether it's for children or for adults. In a few years' time I'll be getting my pension and I want to make sure that, you know, the programmes out there are suited for me, the BBC is catering for me as well as my mum, who's going to be a great great grandmother. So that's something the BBC has got to reflect on – making sure that the whole of society feels as if they're part of it. Because I notice only one person on the Panel, when he did bring up about cultural diversity, nobody else spoke up about it. We need to start making sure that when you're taking people along and you're going to be included, everyone comes along with you.

Lord Burns: Okay. And there's another one over here.

Frances Balfour: I'd just like to second that really, particularly with regard to Muslims. I happen to have made friends with a Muslim student. I mean the student in the office collapsed exhausted on the spare desk opposite me saying "I am so tired" because he'd been working in a filing cupboard. That's why he ended on the spare desk opposite me. And so I've been hearing about all his concerns and how threatened the Muslim community feel and how angered by all the things that are going on and I don't know that this is being incorporated and reflected and understood in mainstream television and that somebody should work on it.

Lord Burns: Okay. Well I think there is, I mean there is a general issue about obviously these issues across the whole range of television. I think what we have to, you know, to concentrate on this morning is the extent to which that is a problem in terms of the education and learning environment and I think both powerful points have been made. I think, you know, for myself the reason I didn't respond to it when Alan raised it, I think it was Alan, everyone I think by and large agreed that this was something which does require special attention and where it is very easy to find people who don't necessarily respond in the same way in a sense to the general attempt to attract people to this type of programming. But do you want to, I want to finish this session now. Do either of you want to..Liz or John?

John Willis: Well perhaps I'd just maybe just say a little something about the last point. I think we all agree, as you said Terry, that this is a very difficult area for all organisations in Britain to reflect the swiftly changing demographic make-up and the BBC is no exception to that. We certainly, it is an important part of the learning agenda to try to reach out to audiences from diverse backgrounds and in areas like digital curriculum for example will be actually making sure that there are courses and modules for English as additional languages to try to help. We have a number of programmes obviously in our schools, in our school service about the lives of refugees into Britain or cultures in different parts of the world. It's an absolutely default position for children's television and for schools broadcasting that on screen there is an ethnic mix and we're trying very hard to engage through some of the community activities in a way that is much more direct and one to one with young kids. You know I myself mentor a 17-year old black boy from Hammersmith who is at the point where he's getting to the age of leaving school. He doesn't know what to do and I'm trying to you know use my experience to help him through. I hope he'll be Director General of the BBC one day. So we're trying but it is a really difficult area and we have to work with partners to identify the best practice and the best ways of reaching an audience that is really difficult for us and for everyone.

Prof. Andrew Pollard: I just wanted to say I thought another important thing that you brought up really was the whole question of representing a story. I think the most fundamentally important thing about education is building a sense of meaning, you know, about who we are and how we fit into our society. And for the BBC to do that effectively it has to represent the diversity which exists and has to enable people to draw the experiences they get through their programming, you know your examples of the children's you know programmes being part of people's lives still is very, very important indeed. And I think that's a, you know it's not just the diversity; it's the way in which those stories are assembled by people to make sense of their lives.

Lord Burns: Thank you very much. Can we just take a 5 minute break just to give you time to have a break, check your mobiles and if you could get back and turn them off again and we'll finish and we'll return to the third area about working in partnership. Thank you very much.

(BREAK)

Lord Burns : Now you're all back. Thank you very much. Electronic equipment is off and we'll now move onto the third session. I do want to finish at 12.30 because some of us have another seminar this afternoon and therefore we have to be able to clear the decks and get things ready for that. Janet, would you like to start?

Prof. Janet Finch: Yes, I'll be brief. The third session is going to focus on partnerships but some of these issues have already been touched on and it's a question of trying to make sure that we cover all angles in the remaining half hour. I think there are, I'll just say I think you can put partnerships into three categories. There may be more but let's just try with three. One is the question of relationships with other suppliers, other commercial suppliers, which may be a competition or it may be a partnership or it may be a division of labour of some sort but there's a relationship there in the educational field which we've explored in part this morning and the BBC's responsibilities in that regard as well as their operation as a commercial enterprise. The second one is the relationship with educational institutions and providers – schools, colleges, the Open University and possibly other universities. And then the relationship with the key government department, the Department for Education and Skills, which is the driver of education policy in this country and so for example the introduction of the digital curriculum as I understand it has evolved a very close partnership with the Department for Education and Skills. And some of the questions…

David Walker: It's the driver of policy in England.

Prof. Janet Finch: I am sorry, David. Absolutely. I do apologise. In England it's the driver. We haven't heard much about the relationship with the Scottish Executive actually. It might be quite interesting to hear about it if somebody knows about it and its equivalent. I guess the questions that we've opened up earlier in the morning are questions about responsibilities, about the values that are embodied, about the pedagogical role of the BBC. I guess in focusing particularly on the nature of partnership, we've had one or two comments already about, I think somebody said and I can't remember who it was, one sometimes gets the impression that being a partner of the BBC is falling in with their agenda, or something like that. I guess, if I just sort of focus the questions, as a partner is the BBC, should the BBC be a senior partner, so the leader of the partnership if you like in those cases, in what circumstances should it be a junior partner in the partnership that somebody else leads and let's bring out the hidden message in some of this, what are the kind of partnerships that the BBC gets into because it's actually the funder? Is the BBC's partnership, let's be quite specific with the Department for Education and Skills and other government departments, a relationship of a funder amongst other things? The BBC pays for the things that other partners want to do.

Lord Burns: Good. He's in charge of questions. We won't start with the BBC.

Prof. Edward Melhuish: Well you can reverse the application to the DfES. I mean if DfES want a particular kind of programme content, maybe they should pay for it out of general taxation. And that could be part of your formal educational content on one or other channels but it's seen as beyond the normal activities of normal goals of the BBC and would be satisfied as a supplier who supplies a, somebody who supplies a market.

Lord Burns: Well I think there is some suspicion, I think what Janet is alluding to in her very delicate way is there some suspicion that, you know, DfES want certain things doing and they don't want to do it in their budget and they think that the BBC has got rather nice budgets and therefore we will partner the BBC and we will manage to use their budget rather than our own budget and is this their healthy relationship between the Department and the BBC and it also comes to the issue of how far on some of these issues the agenda, which was raised earlier by one or two people, how far is the agenda being set by the Department and how far is the agenda being set by the BBC? I mean I just say that as a very, I mean I'm not saying I agree with this.

Alan Tuckett: My observation is very different in relation to the schools agenda, where the programming the BBC makes fits in with a whole statutory-shaped environment than its impact on post-compulsory education where I would say the Department you know really ought to be on the table kind of thing and asked why it doesn't take this stuff more seriously because I mean you're asking…

Lord Burns: Okay, you want to turn that relationship into something which is older?

Alan Tuckett: Well at least that if the BBC is the most articulate voice of the public interest other than the state, and we saw that debated wonderfully, I say wonderfully last year, then there's a key issue around the learning society about how the BBC strategy and other public investment strategies work alongside one another. You don't have to posit that one dominates the other to say that the absence of a proper dialogue about that and that I think is the heart of the kind of tone of voice in the LSC's remarks that were circulated. Better if it's an informed dialogue. And I think that is a problem of partnership that the BBC sometimes has, that if it hasn't got an immediate use value for partnerships it doesn't have a focus in this arena of learning that's well enough developed to keep the dialogue kind of bubbling along really. And I've been saying that, I've said that to Liz for years and I know it's right.

Lord Burns: Andrew?

Prof. Andrew Pollard: I mean I would give a fairly I suppose classic answer to this question I think. In Britain we have various ways of working out these things and a position which I think we've been quite comfortable for a long, long time is to do with the independence of the BBC. That is not to say anything against the importance of the DfES or whatever other form of organisation represents, you know, a legitimately elected government. That is also terribly important that we do have a kind of division of responsibility that's grown up and I think that citizens across the country generally speaking value that and would want to see it maintained. So I think whilst this, there has to be a relationship of constructive engagement, it's very important that the terms of that relationship are clear to all parties and to be honest I think they are and I think it is a constructive engagement and I would have thought it should continue.

Catherine Bush: Yes, I would agree. I mean I think we used the word "complimentary" earlier in the discussion and I would say that that's most appropriate. I mean I wouldn't say the BBC is there to sort of slavishly follow every policy, directive or whim of the department but there are big and important issues which actually, they may be initiated by the department but they are about sort of society as a whole. I mean I suppose the skills-wise one is the case in point and I think that the work that we've done to support that, you know, is very important. But I would see it very much as complimentary and certainly not being the deliverer of you know sort of government programmes in initiating them but identifying what they can, you know, may be able to contribute to those.

Lord Burns: And what about working as a, in a sense a commercial relationship? Do you have experience of working in the BBC, in that role and are you going to be quite as complimentary about that, a different compliment?

Catherine Bush: Yes. Yes, we have, the City and Guilds has been involved with working with the BBC on the certification or certificates attached to the webwise programme. I think my observation on that was we would engage partners at an early stage. Don't come to us with a sort of fait accompli and can we provide a certificate and I think that's also important with the other stakeholders and the other providers in the education arena. And I'm very pleased we have actually started early dialogue with the BBC on the next stage of the schools-wise campaign because I think quite a lot of that is to do with fulfilment. The BBC has had a very good role in raising awareness, in engaging people and then there does need to be the delivery mechanisms there to follow through. So I think early dialogue with partners is important.

Lord Burns: Good. Simon, do you have….?

Simon Fuller: Well I've said, I started off by saying something about this so I'll sort of restate it in a way, which is that I think by its various nature the BBC is a difficult organisation to partner with and that is because it is beset by its own agenda and its own legal requirements, which it always puts at the forefront of any discussion. And also by the nature of its size and influence, it doesn't sit happily other than as a senior partner in any discussion. So I think it's fair to say that that is the experience of a lot of people working with the BBC. I think in relation to its partnership strategy with for example Channel 4, I think if I'm honest there have been some frustrations that we haven't got beyond discussion into something more tangible

that says we are both public service broadcasters, let us carve this up so we don't go and duplicate within a reasonable timeframe, that we're both making the same kind of programmes and broadcasting at the same time. And I think that doesn't exist and I think that would be sensible for it to happen and I'm sure that's true of other providers as well. And I think that will be very much focused when you start delivering your content for the digital curriculum that there will be those who will say to you "Have you done an audit to ensure that you know exactly where you are competing with other providers and that you have some dialogue with them?" So my question might be, you know, what evidence is there of your understanding of the education landscape as a whole? And I think I started off by saying that I thought it was missing in your paper an analysis of what is the status of education, who are the key players, whether they're your competitors or your partners, who are they and what they're doing and how do you sit with them? I think that's quite important because whatever you do is going to have an enormous impact. Just going back onto the DfES, I know that for instance BECTU are overseeing the digital curriculum and so there is some government involvement in that and the 18 points that you have to adhere to, which are quite challenging, and I think that's perfectly reasonable but I think I would reiterate also that I think the strength of any institution like the BBC is that it should not be hand in glove with government and that would be a fundamental error, so I would support that. In relation to suppliers, I only say that I think that in your relationship with suppliers there will be some quite interesting negotiations of which I'm not aware of but for instance things like rights and the exploitation of future rights and what kind of negotiator is the BBC? Are you proposing to take content and sell it abroad and, if so, what are the returns to those who have put their creative energies into it? So I think those will be significant to the industry because obviously you will become a key supplier for that industry or a key provider of that industry's supplies. So I think on that basis partnership is incredibly important, it's increasing all the time and I think how you play it will be crucial to the success of your, certainly your schools operations.

Lord Burns: David, do you have any observations on these issues?

David Walker: It's not clear that DfES is ever going to be expecting the BBC to be a particularly sort of active deliverer of existing policy. I mean it's just not that kind of organisation. I mean again, if I can go back to the maths example that sort of worried me, I mean is a deficit in the number of high education involvements in maths and physics, which is exercising the Secretary of State, a consensual concern or is it part of this government's concern? How far should an independent body – and this applies not just to the BBC but to other bodies with this status – try and seek for policy agreements so that there has to be more than government pushing the agenda? I mean this came to my attention recently. We haven't spoken about the BBC's all in language learning. There is a growing consensus that we are seriously deficient in this country in East Asian languages, looking 10, 15, 20 years ahead. Policy is beginning to shift in the direction of trying to put premiums on acquiring Chinese particularly. At what point would the BBC as an independent body sort of attach itself to that public policy agenda and begin to move its language activities in that…it may for all I know be doing stuff already, but the question again is how does its independence get operationalised in terms of a public policy agenda which may initially come from one party or one government rather than reflect a deep consensus?

Lord Burns: Okay. Any other observations?

Alan Budd: I'd very much like to hear the answer to that question in due course.

Lord Burns: I'm just making sure no one else wants to comment on any of these partnership issues either with the DfES or with other people, you know suppliers or whatever. Okay, well let's…

Liz Cleaver: I think in the more formal arena, as with schools, the, this is just one of the context in which we would carry out our research. So this is an area we research extensively and have a lot of long-established relationships, so with teachers, with other educational institutions, a long-standing relationship, as was pointed out, with the LEU. We run ourselves national, so within Scotland, Wales, Ireland and England we have education councils. We have secondary and primary councils. We look at their sort of range, so with all, and we

research every year. We do a major piece of research to see what, you know what's there, what's working, what's not working. So I think in a sense we would be drawing our own conclusions. That would be a part of the information where we reach our own conclusions about where there are gaps and where we potentially or areas where we need to input into that market. I would say that would apply equally to the language-learning question. I mean language is again a long tradition in the BBC. We put out some sort of 300 hours; you know, live, websites whatever. We'll always be examining the best way to deliver it; the best language is to deliver. So we've only just put out within the last 6 months actually a series on Chinese. In terms of market analysis, again within the schools arena we've always done a fair amount of market analysis to be clear about what is happening but I think, as John touched on at the beginning, we, with the DC our conclusions that came out of that were insensitive to the market and I think that the, now the conditions that outline a DC very much put us in a position of having to find new and different ways to work. Actually Simon said earlier that this was an area already well covered and I would actually challenge that. I think decent broadband content for schools is not at currently particularly well covered and I think it's an area that does need to be developed and I think we have a part to play in that. I don't think, I think we sometimes, I kept thinking when people keep speaking we are often the elephant in the room too in that we don't necessarily always want to be an elephant but it's almost as though you can't help but be one because you're the BBC. So I think maybe being an elephant you have to be even more sensitive about how you enter a room and how you operate with other partners. So I think we've learnt a lot in the formal arena and that too with our commercial suppliers. I think the DC has led to a marked change in the way that we think about how we work with commercial suppliers and I think it's going to be really, really interesting to see what happens. It's a very complex project anyway into a very complex market and I think it will be a very interesting learning experience for all concerned about how we are genuinely equal in the way that we deliver that. It's interesting that Microsoft are delivering the VLE. We have now preferred suppliers on that list. How we operate as a genuine team as opposed to creating more us and them I think is going to be very, very, very interesting. If you look at the broader area about how we work with partners, within learning specifically obviously the year I've been in the job I've talked to many people and people often describe this about how pushed are we by the BBC agenda. I mean the truth is that everybody that comes into a room, us and our partners, are pushed by a certain agenda, a way of looking at the world, a way of thinking. I think it's true, when you ask about being a senior partner, I suppose the broadcast model has always clashed with a learning model because, as I referred to early, learning and many people involved in learning and institutions connected to this are very much about a long game and broadcasting is by its nature a shorter game. I think we've tried in the last year to think not just, actually in learning we've said "Right, how are we going to change this?" because absolutely any area you name that learning is in there will be a range of different institutions that we work with to deliver that. We absolutely can't deliver it on our own. So we are looking to have those types of relationships but by the nature, as I say, of the broadcast model, I think it's fair comment to say that we've often come late to discuss and not appreciated other people's time-lines in terms of the way that they work. In having a longer term strategy and a commitment as I talked to earlier over time, I was also thrilled to hear that Catherine mentioned that she's already seeing the benefits of this long-term planning. It was something like schools-wise now we think far longer and I've talked to people far earlier on. By doing that, that does allow us to in those same discussions, to hear what other people want to get out of that relationship and therefore form a proper partnership. I'd also stress that it's not just in learning but as the BBC in a whole, everything you will have read in Building Public Value. I think the BBC has recognised that in the 21st century the way that institutions react with other institutions and with people is changing and that we need to change. And therefore as a whole organisation in a few weeks time Mark Thompson, the Director General, will be making an announcement about how we can be better in the way as an organisation that we partner across the piste with other organisations. And within learning ourselves, we're just about to, we had a very good day earlier this week actually with the Libraries Association. They're one of our key partners in terms of how we deliver and hopefully in the New Year we'll be signing a strategic agreement with them to ensure again long-term planning. I think I would stress though in ensuring that in any partnership agreement we find the common ground where the strengths of any organisation and our own work complimentary as equals, and a grown-up relationship is incredibly important. But I think from both sides we're never able to do everything for

everybody and we'll never be able to satisfy any I'm sure group we're working for in delivering totally their agenda and I think that's why it's important in a way to ensure that the way we have those discussions works for both parties and we're both clear from the very start about what we're both going to get out of that relationship and what we're not going to get out of that relationship.

Lord Burns: Okay. I think it's probably a sensible point to throw it open to the audience now because I am sure there are some people here who have been supplies in one form or another.

David Jaffa: Hello. David Jaffa from Sam Learning. We are the leading commercial supplier of online revision. So John, earlier you quoted that you served two-thirds of relevant students with bitesize. Last academic year we served about a sixth of them so. And my concerns specifically relate to formal learning and specifically to BBC online. I very much welcome your recognition that there have been issues in the past between industry and the BBC and the recognition of a desire to put things right and work more constructively with industry. And I would also say that in my discussions with the BBC I have seen that recognition. I think there is a wind of change in the BBC and the desire to work more productively with industry an I'm talking really not as working as partners but as recognising that other suppliers, who are competitors where they are doing something distinctive in the market-place that has value, that lines can be drawn between what the BBC does and what the commercial suppliers do. So first of all I'd very much like to see my own discussions on drawing those lines come to successful fruition. But I just want your take on do you agree with the principle that where an area is being already well-served by the commercial market-place that in principle that's not an area the BBC should be seeking to go into?

Lords Burns: I'll gather some up. Yes, there's one behind you Kate and then in front.

David Robinson: David Robinson, Open University. I just wanted to comment on partnerships because there have been some concerns expressed about partnerships. The University and the BBC have been in partnership for 35 years and I am expecting it to continue substantially into the future and that does show that you can work together in partnership. We are of course two, in some ways two public service organisations working together but I think one of the difficulties is the BBC has to be very independent and therefore when it works in partnership there are still issues that arise because of its need to be independent. And a lot of its partners, the Open University, has to have a certain commercial acumen and that sometimes sits uneasily with the BBC's need to keep itself at arms length from commercial operations. And I think all the future potential partners of the BBC have to look at that aspect of the relationship and perhaps the BBC also need to look at how they can work with partners and yet retain the independence that they so value.

Lord Burns: Okay. In the front row here.

Peter Gordon: Peter Gordon. I'm a private individual. I think there are plenty of educational programmes on the BBC, the trouble is finding them. Let me give you an example. Magazine programmes, programmes like Tomorrow's World no longer seem to be part of BBC1. If you look at News 24 on the odd half hour, in fact they're there trying to find them. Open University, a lot of programmes could be of interest to wider individuals. Well yes, you can apply for the Open University listing programme. I find those are difficult. There was an interactive programme after the Voice of Planets last Sunday, very interesting. I would have had trouble finding that and if I'd been recording it on video, I probably wouldn't have got it at all. My question is how can you go about advertising these programmes better so that people can find them? I find it very difficult to actually find out all the programmes that are on because the BBC tends to concentrate on certainly it's main channels, BBC1, BBC2, to some extent BBC3, BBC4 but not at odd times. I'm sure a lot of people miss good programmes because they don't know they're on.

Lord Burns: Kate over….

Naomi Sargent: The timing of all of this has been talked a bit about and most of the conversations focused on other programme providers but the BBC also works in partnership down the line with large numbers of other educational institutions to whom they make the resources available for people to use for delivery and dissemination and the timescale of commissioning the programmes is often not in synch with as it were the timescale in which you need to inform that very large number of partnerships. And I just think that's worth noting in the planning and in the dissemination. My second and more personal comment is that when I was in charge of all of this at Channel 4, we had an extremely well-functioning co-ordinating committee between the BBC, which was then continuing education – I mean it would now be Lifelong Learning – between the BBC's very big offering in this area and Channel 4's pretty big offering in this area and we had a tacit agreement that when we were planning major programming in areas of social need, that we absolutely didn't shoot each other in the foot but we collaborated. And when we were, as it were, talking about happiness programming or exciting or imaginative programming that, you know that it was a sort of free-for-all. Now I don't know at which point that co-ordination slipped but it's a co-ordinating thing that could be done, could bring in the DfES in a co-ordinating discussion and with the increasing role we hope of Ofcom in as it were mothering the amount of educational public service broadcasting on any other channel, could also well involve that.

Lord Burns: Thank you very much. Any more points?

Alan Tuckett: Could I, my colleague reminded me. We have a partnership model with the BBC. Every year we do Adult Learners' Week together and we take European money, and the government for that matter is a partner in it too. And I think when the BBC comes out to play it's glorious but it isn't always clear when in the cycle to say something to make sure they come out to play. Now of course they may not want to come out to play but often you feel they haven't come out to play because we didn't speak to them at the right moments and it's a problem about bigness and about who and where to press buttons to make things fluent in the down years really. And I mean it's been a successful working arrangement for 10 years and as you know little bits of European money come dribbling towards the BBC too but you can't but feel that that, I don't know if you've got a person whose job is to kind of make you hear all those disparate cacophony of people you are playing with but who might have slipped below attention span.

Lord Burns: Thanks very much. The BBC?

John Willis: Perhaps I'll just pick those up in no particular order. I'm pleased that the BBC is glorious when it comes out to play but I think really echo Liz's point earlier on, I think we've realised that it is quite easy – and I think someone else said the same – to get out of synch with what partner organisations want, whether they're commercial partners indeed or partners in the learning sector and what the BBC's imperatives and timetable are. And we're trying very hard to take a much more long-term view. We're trying very hard to plan more up-front so that we can align our objectives because that's the only way that we can be effective as the BBC. So we are trying to do that and take a long-term view. I think just coming back to the point that Naomi made about Channel 4 and the BBC, I worked at Channel 4 myself for a long time and I realise that the BBC is quite an elephantine partner because I tried very, very hard to get them to work more with the BBC and I kept being sent to McKinsey's, who as far as I know were not working in the BBC at the time or were not part of the BBC. We've really worked hard to make sure that we do compliment what Channel 4 do. There's a very good informal relationship. It's absolutely clear that if we're doing a particular subject we make sure that we're not duplicating what Channel 4 is doing and not actually both doing the same subjects for the same age group. That's, you know, that's wasteful. And although probably the relationship is less formal than it was and our Head of Learning you know goes to chat on an informal basis with his equivalent in Channel 4, those relationships do happen and I talked to Heather Rabbatts, or Liz does, quite often too. So that's on the agenda, it's just a more informal style I think but you know we'd like to get it stronger. I think in terms of Peter Gordon in the front here, we don't want anyone to miss out with programmes but it is very difficult in a multi-channel landscape to drive them all towards the right place. We're trying really hard, if anyone's seen the Alan Titchmarsh series about the geology and shape of Britain or indeed Who Do You Think You Are?, the genealogy series that Floella mentioned, right at the end of

it there is something that is directing people to specific examples of learning, which is sort of embedded at the end of the programme. And equally, we try really hard through a whole range of different platforms the BBC has to make sure that people know what is happening and if it isn't clear because one of the difficulties of a very crowded market-place with lots of competing voices all shouting, but we want to make sure that programmes that have a learning dimension have as much chance of cutting through the noise as any other. And part of the strategy of having some very big programmes and some very big campaigns means that actually it's really hard to ignore. People do know The Big Read is on. They do know, you know people have got their pedometers and tape measures for Fat Nation. We are able to get those big messages through, which is one of the reasons why our strategy is to concentrate on that. I agree with absolutely everyone who said that the independence of the BBC is critical. We lose the trust of our viewers if we stop being independent and, although our relationship with any partners, including the government, is important, it's an important part of the overall context of what we do, the BBC has to be independent. And very often it comes to the same conclusions about the need for, you know for more Chinese speakers but from a different group, not because we've been told by the government that it's a priority but it is actually our own consultation and research that's headed us in the same direction. And finally, the question about the commercial market place. I'm pleased that you've noticed a wind of change in the BBC. We are trying to recognise more the needs of other commercial players in the market and we're trying to be complimentary to what others do and I hope, as I said at the beginning, the digital curriculum acts as a stimulant to the market. So we're, I assure you that it's not our aim to dominate the market. It's our aim to be part of it and you know we want to make sure that we thrive but others too and there's space for everyone in what is a very, very exciting time on the threshold of a digital revolution for, you know for both adults and for children.

Lord Burns: Well thanks very much. Can I thank everybody? I think that more or less completes our agenda and more or less to time. I am very grateful to you all for your participation and I think we've learned a lot about education. We've also learned a little bit about dancing with elephants and I think we've heard a lot about how some things are beginning to change but I find it very helpful in terms of defining a lot of the issues that we have been trying to think our way through and this is one big area where some of the other questions that we have been looking at so far, you know you begin to test whether or not those messages we've heard previously apply when they come to look at individual areas and it's been very helpful. Thank you very much.