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1. Introduction

Background to the Review

The Diploma in Foundation Studies (Art and Design) (FAD), is a Level 3 qualification which is used as preparation for entry onto Art and Design degree courses, often by students already holding A-Level or equivalent qualifications. The course can cover a broad range of disciplines including Painting/Drawing, Sculpture, Graphics, Textiles, Ceramics and Media and, therefore, can be resource intensive, in both the need for significant studio and workshop space and the need for materials and technician support.

The course is usually seen as a transition to a degree course. As such, it occupies a unique position in the qualifications framework, being designated a Level 3 course which actually takes place, for the majority of learners, after they have already achieved Level 3 qualifications. Most learners will already have achieved A-Levels, but will not have embarked on a Level 4 course. It is a diagnostic course, used by the art & design profession to introduce students to a wider range of specialist art & design experiences than they will have previously studied. Its aim is to help students determine the specialist art or design field they wish to study at Higher Education level. This extract from the Leeds College of Art & Design prospectus illustrates the place of the course within the art and design qualification framework.

"The Foundation Course is an exciting and challenging experience and is often an essential qualification when applying for highly competitive degree courses.

There is a bewildering variety of specialised disciplines within art and design on which you can build a rewarding career. We will help you make an informed choice. More than that, we hope to provide the creative groundwork on which you can base the rest of your professional life.

Within our highly structured course your needs and abilities are nurtured and developed. Working in an intensively creative environment, you’ll become inventive, experimental and analytical; the course is challenging and thought-provoking”

It is a one year full time or two year part time course with recommended guided learning hours (GLH) of 540 hrs.¹ The course is divided into 9 units, each with a recommended GLH of 60 hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploratory Stage</th>
<th>Information &amp; Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>180 GLH</td>
<td>Recording and Responding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Media Experimentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway Stage</th>
<th>Combined Experimental Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>240 GLH</td>
<td>Media Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparation &amp; Progression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirmatory Stage</th>
<th>Integrating Theory and Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120 GLH</td>
<td>Personal Confirmatory Study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Edexcel define GLH as “…the time that might be allocated to direct teaching or instruction, together with other, structured learning time such as directed assignments, assessment on the job or supported individual study and practice. It excludes learner-initiated private study” (BTEC Course content p.11)
However, the majority of enrolments on the FAD for Further Education (FE) Colleges and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are delivered within the range of 450-569 GLH as recorded on the Individualised Learner Record (ILR) 2004-05.

**Distribution of GLH and Success Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Number of Institutions</th>
<th>Number of Enrolments</th>
<th>% Claiming Entitlement</th>
<th>Median GLH Range</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
<th>Achievement Rate</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General FE</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>8,722</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>450 - 569</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist FE A &amp; D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>600 - 629</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6,036</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>450 - 569</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on 2004/05 F04 ILR Return except HE which is based on 2003/04 HESA Return
2 Based on 2003/04 F05 ILR Return

The funding rate in 2005/06 reflects delivery of 700 GLH. The Learning and Skills Council's (LSC) standard funding approach therefore meant that there needed to be a proportionate reduction in funding. It was, consequently agreed that the rate of £2,904 for 2005/6 be reduced to £2,805 for learners aged 16-18 and £2,781 for learners aged 19 or over for 2006/7 to reflect better the patterns of delivery across providers.

In 2004/05 over 200 providers offered the qualification, including HEIs, Specialist FE Art & Design Colleges and General FE Colleges. The majority of these providers delivered the Diploma in Foundation Studies (Art & Design) through the awarding bodies Edexcel and ABC. For many of the smaller providers, especially the Specialist FE Art & Design Colleges, this course comprised a relatively high proportion of their provision. Any changes to the funding would have a substantial impact on their overall finances and might unintentionally de-stabilise small providers and threaten the viability of learners’ programmes.

On the other hand for many of the HEIs, the FAD is the only LSC-Funded course. Although a small part of the Institution’s overall budget and not therefore subject to the financial pressures of small specialist colleges, the FAD programme should still be financially viable in its own right without cross-subsidising.

Whilst these factors should not influence the development of a price for the qualification, it may influence how and when changes are introduced, through dampening the impact over time, as set out in ‘Agenda for Change’.

**The Review Brief**

Because of the potential significance of the changes to specialist providers, the LSC recognised that further work needed to be undertaken before decisions on funding rates were made for the funding year 2007/8. Tribal were commissioned to advise on how the FAD should be treated in terms of the size of the course, conventionally measured through guided learning hours (GLH) and resource intensity, represented through a programme weighting factor. In the Art and Design context issues requiring careful exploration included:

1. How well the concept of GLH captures the nature of learning in a workshop-based approach where learners can move between different studios / workshops as their work requires;
2. How costs can best be apportioned between activities when learners are not rigidly timetabled into set classes;
3. Whether the different settings (specialist – general; FE – HE), where FAD takes place, offer essentially different experiences.

It was felt necessary to ensure that any calculation of the costs of delivery for the Diploma take into account the particular circumstances of Art & Design. As a result, the sample of providers who were to be part of this study needed to cover all types of provider, including:

1. General Further Education providers offering the Diploma in Foundation Studies (Art & Design);
2. Specialist FE Art and Design Colleges;

The sample also needed to cover a wide range of delivery models and methods to ensure that the costing sample was representative by sampling a wide spread of provider types as stated above. A representative geographical spread was also felt to be advantageous although any specific regional salary differentials (e.g. London weighting) needed to be factored out since these are funded separately by the LSC.

Objectives of the Review

The Objectives of this review were:

1. To review and examine in detail the current range of delivery methods across a representative spread of 10 providers currently offering the Diploma in Foundation Studies (Art & Design).
2. To evaluate the appropriateness of the national base rate and the programme weighting factor allocated to the provision.
3. To make recommendations to the LSC Steering Group for any revision to the funding of the Diploma in Foundation Studies for 2007/08. Any recommendations will, as a minimum, need to be based upon the evidenced delivery costs.
4. To comment on any other issues arising during the course of the project that are felt to be of sufficient materiality and importance.
5. To make recommendations for any further analysis that is felt will be beneficial and relevant but that falls outside the scope of this project.
2. Methodology

Formation of the Steering Group
The project team from Tribal, comprising Chris Legg (Finance Consultant & Project Manager), Julie Tolley (Curriculum Consultant) and Mick Fletcher (Associate Consultant), met with the Learning & Skills Council representatives in an initial project meeting on Thursday 11th May 2006. One of the purposes of this meeting was to agree a suitable representation for the Steering Group.

The representation for the Steering Group was proposed as the National Learning & Skills Council project members, Tribal Education project members, the Association of Principals of Specialist Colleges of Art & Design (APSCAD), the Council for Higher Education in Art & Design (CHEAD), the Association of Colleges (AoC), Adult Learning Inspectorate (ALI), along with additional provider representation from a General FE College (Newcastle College) and an HE Institution (the University of the Arts, London).

Steering Group Remit
The first Steering Group meeting was held on 25th May 2006 at the Techno Centre, Coventry University. The members of the Steering Group in attendance were informed of the objectives of the review and agreement was reached on the purpose and remit of the Steering Group.

The Steering Group was being convened for the duration of the study and it was anticipated that the group would meet at least twice with the final meeting of the group scheduled towards the end of the study. The Steering Group would act as advocates for the study and as a practitioner sounding board. The remit was agreed as follows:

1. To advise and assist the contractor on finalising the methodology and help ensure the completeness of the study;
2. To offer advice on the providers to be contacted and to assist engagement with the provider’s selected for participation in the study;
3. To comment on and test the reasonableness of the provisional results of the study.

Selection of Provider Sample
At the first Steering Group meeting, discussion took place on the selection of suitable providers to be invited to take part in the project.

The criteria for the sample were decided as follows:

- Only the providers with good success rates should be invited to take part since the costing exercise should aim at the higher quality providers and derive the cost of “quality provision”. These criteria were assessed through LSC data on success rates for 2004/05 for the FE Colleges and 2003/04 for the HEIs.

- The sample should comprise 4 FE Colleges, 4 HEIs and 2 Specialist FE Art & Design Institutions. Some members of the Steering Group volunteered their own providers in Newcastle College, University of the Arts (Central St.Martin’s College) and Leeds College of Art & Design. The Steering Group agreed to attempt to assist in acquiring the remaining
providers' participations. It was suggested that the remaining providers should aim to cover the maximum geographical spread possible.

The resulting sample comprised the following providers:

**General FE Colleges**
Newcastle College  
Northbrook College  
Stroud College

[N.B. A fourth General FE Provider was approached but did not submit any results]

**Specialist FE Colleges of Art & Design**
Leeds College of Art & Design  
Cleveland College of Art & Design

**Higher Education Institutions**
University of the Arts (London Institute)  
Loughborough University  
Manchester Metropolitan University  
Falmouth University College

The second Steering Group meeting was held on Tuesday 11th July 2006 at the Tribal London Offices. This second meeting was arranged to discuss the interim findings from the project team and a final Steering Group meeting was arranged for Friday 8th September 2006 again to be held at the Tribal London Offices to discuss the final draft report which would be circulated to the group prior to the meeting no later than Friday 1st September 2006.

**Provider visits**
After initial contact was made, Cleveland College of Art & Design and Northbrook College declined to take part. These providers were replaced in the sample by Plymouth College of Art & Design and City College, Brighton respectively. Chris Legg then visited each of these ten providers during the period Tuesday 13th June to Friday 30th June.

Follow-up visits by Julie Tolley were arranged to view the teaching and learning spaces, discuss all curriculum-related matters and gain a thorough understanding of the delivery of FAD.

The sample for the follow-up visits comprised:

**General FE Colleges**
Newcastle College  
Stroud College

**Specialist FE Colleges of Art & Design**
Leeds College of Art & Design

**Higher Education Institutions**
Loughborough University  
Manchester Metropolitan University

These visits were made between 13th June 2006 and 20th July 2006 with the purpose of gaining a greater understanding of the context of the delivery of the FAD across a range of different
institutions. At each institution, opportunities were afforded to speak with the course leader/s, discuss the framework for the course delivery and the philosophy informing the delivery method and structure, view the teaching and learning spaces and, in some cases, view the student’s work.

Additionally, Mick Fletcher also attended the visit to Falmouth University College.

Key stakeholders were identified in discussion with the LSC and interviews took place with UCAS, EdExcel, ABC and Creative and Cultural Industries Sector Skills Council.

The methodology for the costing exercise can be found in Section 4.
3. Stakeholder Interviews

Stakeholders
Discussions about the review took place with UCAS, the two primary examining and awarding bodies – Edexcel and ABC as well as the Sector Skills Council - Creative and Cultural Skills. These discussions took place either face-to-face or via a pre-agreed telephone call.

The bullet points below report key issues raised by the stakeholders during the interviews. They do not represent the views of Tribal.

Stakeholder Comments
The discussions were wide-ranging and the points raised by stakeholders are summarised below.

- The FAD was felt by all stakeholders to be a unique and highly-valued course;
- It was reported that a study by Oxford University had described the FAD as a learning journey whilst ‘A’ levels were about unit accumulation. This view was believed, by the stakeholder, to encapsulate the role and value of the course;
- The award, can be seen as between Level 3 and Level 4, which can cause some students a problem getting grants or awards since some LEAs see it as double funding;
- Since accreditation on the NQF, awarding bodies have started approving delivery of the FAD in schools. It was speculated, by two of the stakeholders, that the FAD might increasingly be delivered in schools rather than in Colleges;
- One awarding body believed that increased costs for course delivery were due to the breadth of resources needed and the higher cost of lecturers’ salaries paid at HE levels;
- Edexcel do not specify the minimum number of specialist areas\(^2\) which should be available to be taught on the FAD. However, it was felt that 2 were the minimum (2-D and 3-D) whilst ABC reported that they required a minimum of three specialisms for centre approval. The “norm” was described (by the awarding bodies) as 4 or 5 although it was as high as 10 in a small number of institutions;
- The view was also put that ethos and methodology made the difference to success and progression not the number of specialist pathways on offer;
- There was agreement among the stakeholders that FAD courses had higher numbers of students with dyslexia and difficulties with basic skills than the average level 3 FE programme. This was also the view of the providers interviewed (see Section 5 below);
- It was observed by one awarding body that the extra resource going to colleges for the FAD doesn’t always reach the course. This seems to bear out the lower recorded GLH on the ILR;
- It was felt that FAD students were likely to have higher retention rate in HE compared to direct entry A-Level students;

---

\(^2\) A specialist area is usually defined by the type of media used e.g. textiles, graphics, printing, ceramics, book-binding etc.
4. Provider Visits (Costing)

Costing Methodology
The costing exercise was aimed at deriving the additional cost incurred in the delivery of the FAD over and above that of a traditional classroom-based ‘Programme Weighting Factor A (PWF A)’ course. In order to achieve this, the cost baseline needed to be established. This was achieved through data collected in a previous costing exercise to derive the cost of a PWF A course, where an average was calculated from a sample taken in the autumn of 2005 across 14 FE, ACL & School sixth form providers (predominantly GFE Colleges).

For the purposes of the study, therefore, this has eliminated the need to ascertain the total cost of providing the FAD which would have involved apportioning every provider overhead (e.g. Principal’s salary, finance department costs, estates costs, etc) - a very time-consuming element of the costing process which could not have been completed within the available time.

It is recognised, however, that as the LSC does include a contribution to overheads in their funding rates, the LSC considers it necessary to address the question of overheads in the final options. We are aware of a study completed by Learning & Skills Network (formally Learning & Skills Development Agency) commissioned by the LSC entitled “Understanding Costs”. The LSC is interested in taking forward the Understanding Costs with the current report to inform the final options. The report was a longitudinal study carried out over three years into the cost drivers that should inform funding. It included a maximum of 20 participants at any one time and took a view on the means of apportioning overheads. We believe that the LSC intends to make this results of this study available for consideration.

Costing Data Collection
Much of the data was collected on-site during the visits, but additionally, discussions also took place to determine the appropriate format and detail of the data required to enable the costing to be accurate and sufficiently evidenced. Most providers were able to provide a sufficient level of detail to enable the evidence to be materially robust.

A costing template was produced (Appendix A) to guide the providers through the process of producing the required information in a standard format to enable reasonable comparisons to take place and ensure a consistency of approach. The template comprised five sections:

Direct Teaching Staff Costs
This section sets out the cost of the direct teaching element of the programme. It also calculates the total number of GLH that were allocated per member of staff to arrive at the combined total GLH for all cohorts of this programme. This included lecturers as well as technicians, instructors and demonstrators delivering aspects of the curriculum. The hourly direct teaching cost per GLH could then be derived.

Teaching Support Staff Costs
This section sets out the cost of the teaching support element of the programme. It then uses the previously calculated total number of GLH to derive the hourly teaching support cost per GLH. The main categories of staff costs allocated here were technicians and life models.
Course Equipment Costs
This section identified the cost of the programme’s materials and equipment requirements. It was sub-divided between Capital expenditure and Revenue expenditure. The Capital expenditure section identifies the cost of each capital item and then apportions it to arrive at an annual cost based on the estimated number of years of economic life and the number of groups of learners that have access to each item of equipment. The Revenue expenditure section simply identifies the annual consumables that are used in the delivery of the FAD. If any student contribution is made towards the cost of these consumables, then this was deducted from the expenditure to arrive at the net cost to the provider.

Course Other Costs
This section was included to capture any other course-related costs that had not been identified elsewhere in the costing form. Throughout the process of the costing exercise, many plausible additional costs were identified by the providers but none of these could be easily verified, quantified or evidenced so could not be included here. The section on “Results” sets out the nature of these costs and explains why they could not be included.

College-Wide Estates Costs
This section of the costing form was intended to apportion an additional estates cost to this programme due to the larger dimensions of the studios and workshops used by these students when compared to a typical classroom.

The total estates running costs are calculated by adding the annual costs of the utilities, rents, rates, estates staff, cleaning, security, maintenance, etc and then dividing this by the total m² of the entire provider to derive the running cost per m².

Based on evidence from the providers visited during the course of the review, the workshops and studios used by the FAD students are largely designated learning spaces and are not shared with other groups of students.

To arrive at the additional estates cost, therefore, the size of a typical classroom is taken as a proportion of a typical Art & Design workshop or studio and the difference in m² is multiplied by the cost per m² for the entire institution and added to the costing.
5. Provider Visits (Contextual)

Observations

Size of cohort
All providers visited had a large cohort for the FAD. Four out of the five providers visited had cohorts of around 200 full-time students or more. The smallest institution was an exception, in this sample, with circa 100 students.

All but one institution also had large cohorts of other students studying Art & Design full-time either at undergraduate level and/or at Level 3 for the National Diplomas in Art & Design. One institution’s Art & Design department was, in terms of full-time students, the size of a large general further education college.

The table below sets out the size of cohort at each provider visited by Julie Tolley, along with the number of groups these learners are split into and the size of the overall Art & Design programme area within each provider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FAD Cohort Size</th>
<th>No. of FAD Taught Groups</th>
<th>Other Art &amp; Design Cohorts in Same Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>8 groups</td>
<td>450 on National Diploma, 700 on Foundation degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5-6 groups. Sometimes double-staffed</td>
<td>None. FAD is 20% of whole college f/t student cohort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>8 groups ratio of 1:30</td>
<td>860 undergraduates and 230 National Diploma/A level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>Average group size not available, but 19 specialisms are offered across this large cohort of students</td>
<td>FAD is 17% of total College FTE and 46% of the School of Art FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>16 groups Ave group size 14/15 for workshops and 30 for studios.</td>
<td>1,000 f/t undergraduates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Average group sizes not available but ranged from 180 for Contextual Studies to 5 for Foundry work.</td>
<td>3,500 art &amp; design students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- General FE Colleges
- Specialist FE Art & Design Colleges
- HEIs

The large cohorts (within and beyond the FAD) allowed a large range of facilities/workshops to be made available to the learners and this appears to impact positively on the climate and culture of how the course is delivered in the institution. It contributes to the creation of a rich
and diverse environment which is well-resourced in terms of specialist facilities. There is also evidence for economies of scale, with the large cohorts, as it is possible for institutions to maximise average group size and also flex delivery to the resources available by adding or subtracting options.

It may be useful, as a future piece of research in this area, to compare success rates of institutions to size of cohort to see if there is a meaningful correlation that could produce a benchmark for optimum cohort size on a resource intensive course of this nature.

**Delivery by Immersion**

All providers were clear that, in order to be successful, the FAD required intensive “immersion”, in the subject and also in the subject’s different media, for the learner in a short space of time. Each provider found a different way of doing this within their own institution.

Despite the variance in recorded GLH (in this sample from 500 to 800+ hours), students at all providers were expected to be in college around 23-27 hrs per week as a minimum for 30-36 weeks (see table below). All providers made this clear in course handbooks and most had rigorous registration systems to enforce it. Non-directed time was usually expected as an additional requirement.

However, four out of the five institutions visited augmented the base course hours through the delivery of additional qualifications. Two providers had or were about to introduce NCFE and two providers, with low recorded GLH for FAD, delivered 5 OCN courses thus bringing the learner attendance hours up to over 900 GLH. This additionality appeared to be being utilised to ensure student “immersion” in the subject with the purpose of providing every opportunity for the learner to prepare a portfolio of sufficient quality to gain entry into the Higher Education Institution of their choice. This approach seems to be counter to the recommendations of the awarding bodies who recommend that any additionality should be limited. Edexcel state that:

*Centres are reminded that the Level 3 Diploma in Foundation Studies (Art & Design) is a demanding programme and any combination with other qualifications must not be to the detriment of the standard and integrity of the programme. However, some students may wish to take an additional programme of study alongside the Level 3 Diploma…Such additional study may comprise an AS GCE in Art History, key skills units or a supplementary craft award. Centres are advised that they must ensure that the course of additional study does not undermine or impinge upon the Level 3 diploma…”* (BTEC content specification.)

In one institution, the course GLH and average group size were “traded” one against the other to maximise learner contact time. E.g. large group sizes (circa 30 students) allowed more Guided Learning Hours to be added when the funding methodology average group size is calculated at 1:14.

The table below shows the difference between the hours stated as contact time for the student and the GLH on the ILR.

**Contact time** is the number of hours that the course handbook states the student must attend and be in college for directed/supervised study. It excludes any time which is stated must be set aside for unsupervised/self-study.

---

3 **“Complete Involvement: Involvement in something that completely occupies all the time, energy or concentration available” Encarta**
Additionality: These are additional qualifications that were advised as being delivered with the FAD. Usually these qualifications would be delivered within the stated student contact hours...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Stated course contact hours as per Student Handbook</th>
<th>Total contact time per Student (as per Student Handbook)</th>
<th>Additionalities</th>
<th>GLH on ILR for FAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>24 hrs per week for 36 weeks</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>Course includes NCFE &amp; Key Skills</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mon-Fri 9.30-4pm 35 weeks</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>Course includes X5 OCN</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9.00-4.00 5 days a week for 10 weeks then 9-4 for 4 days per week, 36 weeks in total.</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>Introducing NCFE and key skills communication in 05-06 but not in 04-05 GLH.</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 hours per week directed over 4 days plus an additional undirected 5 hrs per week. 32 studio weeks</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>Course includes additional ABC awards and/or a Key Skill</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>20 hours per week directed over 4 days plus an additional undirected 4 hrs per week. 30 studio weeks</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Course includes x5 OCN</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>9.30-4.30 4 days per week plus 3 hours self-directed study 34 weeks</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a consensus amongst the institutions visited that:
- The FAD course was aimed at ensuring a student successfully gained entry into Higher Education;
- Entry to Higher Education would be dependent upon the quality of the student portfolio;
- A portfolio of the appropriate standard could only be achieved through this “immersion” in the subject requiring 700-800 hours in college; and
- The qualification could be achieved in fewer hours but it would fail in its primary purpose to serve as a diagnostic course in preparation for Higher Education.

Observed potential contributions to increased costs

From the work on the costs of the FAD as detailed in Section 6 of this report, it is clear that HEIs incur higher costs than FE Colleges in regard to staffing. HEIs pay higher rates of pay to lecturing staff than the majority of FE colleges. In Higher Education, it was also clear that there is an expectation that lecturers undertake research as part of their job role. This further reduces the number of contact hours lecturers have with students and thus raises the lecturer cost per GLH. Institution ‘H’ reported that, whilst at present only two members of the full-time Art & Design staff are on research-based contracts; the university was issuing new research contracts to all new staff.

The annual contracted teaching hours for a full-time lecturer in Higher Education is also lower than in FE, causing another increase in the lecturer cost per GLH. For example, a typical annual teaching quota for a lecturer in one of the General FE Colleges visited was 900 GLH. The corresponding annual quota in one of the HEIs visited was 540 GLH. Even if these...
lecturers were paid similar salaries, and all other factors were equal, the FE lecturer would be 40% more cost effective.

The research element of a lecturer’s contract in the HEIs is not a necessary cost to the delivery of the FAD. Nor did was evidence found that it was necessary to pay higher fees to all lecturers delivering this course. In the institutions visited there were a range of pay, terms and conditions for lecturers, unique to each institution, which did not appear to impact any more positively or negatively than any other on the quality of the outcomes achieved by the learner.

Space requirements for the FAD are larger than a classroom-based course and appear to be greater than on some vocational courses but space allocation is managed differently between institutions. In one institution each of 8 groups had a base room full-time throughout the year plus access to all specialist workshops - in effect, more than double the amount of space allowed for in a classroom-based course. Another institution, for the most part, used only the same number of rooms as numbers of groups, using the workshops as base rooms and expanding out into other spaces towards the latter end of the course when exhibition space was required. Again, whilst seemingly more space intensive than a classroom-based course, the degree to which space is allocated is a matter of institutional choice. The General FE Colleges were generally more efficient in their use of space than the HEIs or the Specialist FE Art & Design Colleges visited.

The large number of specialist workshops seems to require a large numbers of technicians to maintain them. Again, as with space management, technician resource management is handled differently in each institution. With economies of scale across a larger range of courses some HEIs were allocating specialist technicians to each specialist workshop and the FAD learner received access to a “slice” of that technician’s time when they were in the workshop. In other institutions, technician roles were more flexible and sometimes technicians were attached to the course and not the specialised workshop.

**Issues raised by providers which fall outside the remit of this review**

During the course of the visits providers raised a range of issues which relate directly to the course but perhaps, more obliquely to this review. However, it was felt important that they be noted.

The importance of, and necessity for, the FAD within the Art & Design progression pathway was supported strongly by tutors and course leaders alike in all institutions. It was repeatedly stressed by providers that the course should not be seen in isolation but as a contributory factor to the success of the Cultural Industries within the UK. It was felt that any action which was likely to jeopardise the course could have more far-reaching implications for these industries. However, this argument is equally valid for other, high priority sectors identified as critical to the economic success of the UK; e.g. construction and automotive. This review is tasked solely with looking at the funding of the FAD on the basis that the LSC funds each course on its own merit and not in the context of its importance within a particular industry sector. The debate about the importance of the course to the industry is one which should be taken up elsewhere – perhaps within the remit of the Sector Skills Councils.

It was felt by providers and stakeholders that Foundation Diploma students would have an improved retention rate in Higher Education compared with those students taking the direct entry route into Higher Education. Therefore, it was claimed, there are benefits to the education system as a whole in preparing students more carefully for their Higher Education course. No
over-arching statistics are available to support this, but their collection would be useful. Some individual Higher Education Institutions may have statistics on this.

It was reported by providers that Art and Design as a sector subject area attracts a higher than average proportion of students with dyslexia and other learning difficulties (E.g. Aspergers Syndrome). However, FE Colleges have access to and utilise additional support funds for these students (although HEIs have found it more difficult to access these funds).
6. Results of the Costing Exercise

Provider Costings
The following table sets out the results of the costing exercise based on data collected from the sample of ten providers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Direct Teaching Staff Costs</th>
<th>Teaching Support Staff Costs</th>
<th>Course Equipment Costs</th>
<th>Course Other Costs</th>
<th>Additional Estates Costs</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Cost Differential from PWF A Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td></td>
<td>£36.26</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.33</td>
<td>£0.95</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£37.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>£36.75</td>
<td>£3.59</td>
<td>£9.90</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£6.08</td>
<td>£56.32</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>£43.08</td>
<td>£9.77</td>
<td>£6.91</td>
<td>£0.29</td>
<td>£4.00</td>
<td>£64.05</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>£34.23</td>
<td>£4.51</td>
<td>£8.40</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£3.43</td>
<td>£50.57</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>£40.70</td>
<td>£24.46</td>
<td>£8.82</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£3.58</td>
<td>£77.56</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>£49.39</td>
<td>£5.95</td>
<td>£5.30</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£2.74</td>
<td>£64.38</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>£57.07</td>
<td>£13.97</td>
<td>£8.05</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£4.05</td>
<td>£83.14</td>
<td>121%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>£54.37</td>
<td>£13.75</td>
<td>£6.53</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£6.79</td>
<td>£81.44</td>
<td>117%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>£80.09</td>
<td>£17.63</td>
<td>£13.28</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£111.00</td>
<td>196%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>£34.73</td>
<td>£11.31</td>
<td>£13.89</td>
<td>£3.05</td>
<td>£3.61</td>
<td>£66.59</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Orange: General Further Education Colleges
- Green: Specialist FE Art & Design Colleges
- Blue: Higher Education Institutions
Analysis of Results

The table demonstrates a large variation in the cost of delivery between the providers within the sample. Despite this variation in cost, it is still possible to obtain conclusions from these results.

The FE Colleges have similar results within an acceptable tolerance as do the Specialist FE Art & Design Colleges and a meaningful average can be taken from these providers.

The costings for the HEIs are generally higher than the FE / Specialist College results.

As discussed in more detail in the previous section, the primary differences between the FE / Specialist FE Art & Design Colleges’ costings and the HEIs’ costings are explained below:

1. Salaries of lecturing staff are significantly higher within the HEIs than those of the FE Colleges and the Specialist FE Art & Design Colleges.
2. The typical annual teaching quota for a full-time lecturer is materially lower within the HEIs than within the FE Colleges & the Specialist FE Art & Design Colleges.
3. FE Colleges utilise the expertise of technician staff to contribute to the GLH of the programme which has a lower delivery cost than using a lecturer.
4. HEIs pay some of their technician staff more than some FE lecturers.
5. Time allocated to Higher Education lecturers for research is treated as a cost to the Diploma in Foundation Studies (Art & Design) if given to lecturers on this programme rather than taken out and paid for from another source.

Other Delivery Issues Identified but Excluded from the Costing Exercise

The following factors have been excluded from this costing exercise since they have been deemed difficult to quantify and/or difficult to evidence or verify. They are acknowledged as being possible costs of delivering the FAD and could potentially be taken into consideration and used to make the case for the PWF to be “rounded up” to the nearest existing PWF in the likely event that the calculated average does not perfectly match one of the existing percentages.

- All providers offer all applicants to the Foundation course an extended interview with portfolio discussion. The acceptance of candidates on examination results alone is not deemed acceptable practice. The numbers of applications to the institutions we visited are large and, in one institution, the interview times accounted for almost a full-time member of staff for a year. The costs of providing this extended interview process were suggested to be higher than that of a typical PWF A course although no actual evidence was collected to support this hypothesis.

- The provision of library resources on this programme and, to an extent, the whole of the Art & Design programme area is considered more costly than some other programme areas. This has proved difficult to quantify down to course level so has not been included in these costings, although one provider’s annual library resources budget was split by programme area and this evidence substantiated this claim.

- The providers spend a considerable amount of time working with the learners to compile their portfolio in preparation for interview for Higher Education places as well as helping to complete the UCAS applications. This is not logged as traditional guided learning hours and is also one-to-one time. This is therefore an expensive use of a lecturer’s
time and has additionally not been factored in to the costing process. However, Unit 7 of the course specification is focused on this area to enable students to identify their future aims and possible progression routes. This unit allows students to:

“Spend time in analysing their own interests and ambitions, evaluating skills and investigating directions to pursue and prepare for interview….it is a self-revelatory process, which requires time for personal and shared reflection with peers and tutors…” (BTEC guidance p.41)

- The end-of-year exhibitions involve a considerable amount of time and space which has proved difficult to quantify with any degree of certainty. Whilst Unit 9 of the syllabus encompasses and funds the need for the end of year show and exhibition, it was observed that the cost of providing this involved additional time and resources over and above those which the funding would normally cover such as the lecturer’s time, technicians, teaching and learning materials, etc. The time taken by other College staff to set the exhibitions up (e.g. premises staff) along with additional physical resources to display the student’s work, etc would all constitute additional costs. Additionally, if the exhibition space utilises areas outside the usual FAD workshop and studios spaces, then there would be an additional estates cost to the programme as a result of blocking out large areas as exhibition space.

- The FAD often comprises most or all of a HEI’s LSC funded provision. This brings with it a disproportionately high amount of administration per head given the higher data requirements of the LSC when compared to Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). This administration burden will require the employment of additional support staff. Since administrative staff have been excluded from the costing project under the assumption that management and administration here would be equivalent to a typical Programme Weighting Factor ‘A’ course, this will bring with it an additional staff cost.

- Where a provider has a mixture of age ranges studying the FAD (i.e. a mixture of 16-18 and 19+ learners), the provider will not give the 16-18 learners access to materials and education visits at a subsidy but charge the 19+ learners full cost. All learners will be treated equally which gives rise to additional costs, especially where 19+ learners do not qualify for fee remission. This is not confined to the FAD and is down to the tuition fee policy of the individual provider, so should not form part of this costing process.

- There is currently no requirement for Higher Education lecturers to hold a teaching qualification at level three or higher as there is in Further Education. Since this is a requirement of teaching in Further Education; it could be considered that there is an additional ‘continuing professional development’ cost specific to the Higher Education providers delivering any FE programmes.

**Conclusions**

GLH would appear to be a difficult basis for the calculation of an appropriate level of funding for this programme given the delivery methods of the FAD at the providers visited during the course of this review. However, by using the costing methods adopted through this study consistently, it has proved possible to provide recommendations that fit within the existing LSC funding methodology.
The FAD can be shown to be a more expensive course to deliver than a typical Programme Weighting Factor ‘A’ course. The providers visited were generally the larger providers who were able to benefit from larger than average cohort sizes and, therefore, larger average group sizes. This may possibly have had the effect of hiding some of the inherent costs of running this programme since the staffing costs were being spread across significantly larger learner bodies than the assumed group size of 14 per the LSC funding methodology. This statement can only be evidenced by broadening the study to encompass smaller providers.

The costs identified by the FE Colleges in our sample were generally the lowest costs of delivery of the FAD. Some of the costs within the Specialist FE Art & Design Colleges are within a similar range but with a higher overall cost of delivery on average. This may reflect the 10% Specialist Colleges' uplift. The HEIs’ provisions are generally more expensive than both of the other categories of provider due to factors specific to the Higher Education context and not due to the delivery methods of the course; i.e. lecturer salary levels and the average taught hours per full-time lecturer contract in comparison with a full-time FE lecturer contract.

There was agreement between the providers visited that “immersion” is required and that a high quality portfolio for entry in to Higher Education is the main objective of the course.
7. **Recommended Areas for Further Study**

The following areas fall outside the scope of this review, but are felt important to understand better the FAD in terms of both the cost of delivery and the overall curriculum context.

**Smaller Providers**

This study established the sample of providers to be visited through aiming at a representative geographical spread of institutions with the highest success rates. This provided a sample of the largest providers of this qualification nationally. The cost of providing the breadth of the Art & Design specialisms by these providers varies but it is possible that the smaller providers may offer fewer specialisms, which may also be the less resource-intensive specialisms. Since the smaller providers, through having smaller cohorts overall, may not gain the economies of scale of the larger providers and may have smaller average overall group sizes there may be a minimum level below which FAD is inherently uneconomic. With suggestions that schools might increasingly seek to offer FAD a review of the minimum cohort size for efficient delivery could be of great use.

It is therefore recommended that the provider sample could be further expanded to cover some of the smaller providers, whilst still ensuring that the project aims at costing “quality provision”.

**Higher Cost of Provision in Higher Education**

Further investigation could be undertaken to understand better the qualitative aspects of the provision in the HEIs to ascertain why the delivery of the Diploma in Foundation Studies (Art & Design) is more costly than in FE Colleges and the Specialist FE Art & Design Colleges. This would gain a better understanding of any additional benefits that may be received by the learners in the HEIs that may justify the additional cost. This investigation into Higher Education should not however delay the adoption by the whole sector of the rates determined for FE provision.
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## 9. LSC Programme Weightings by Subject Code 2006/07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Crafts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td>Art Studies</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td>Art Techniques / Practical Art</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JC</td>
<td>Design (Non-Industrial)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JD</td>
<td>Museum/Gallery/Conservation Skills &amp; Studies</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Collecting/Antiques</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JF</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Crafts: Leisure/Combined</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JG</td>
<td>Decorative Crafts</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH</td>
<td>Decorative Metal Crafts/Jewellery</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JK</td>
<td>Fashion/Textiles/Clothing (Craft)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JL</td>
<td>Fabric Crafts/Soft Furnishings</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>Wood Cane &amp; Furniture Crafts</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR</td>
<td>Glass/Ceramics/Stone Crafts</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>