Improving Quality and Adding Value

Delivery of Key Skills in Modern Apprenticeships

QPID Study Report No. 89
November 2000

QPID
QUALITY and PERFORMANCE
IMPROVEMENT DISSEMINATION

Delivery of Key Skills in Modern Apprenticeships

November 2000

Quality and Financial Assurance Division
Quality and Performance Improvement Dissemination Unit
Level 3 North
Moorfoot
Sheffield
S1 4PQ

© Crown Copyright November 2000

QPID
QUALITY and PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT DISSEMINATION

DfEE
Department for Education and Employment

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The sector frameworks for Modern Apprenticeships (MAs), designed by National Training Organisations (NTOs) and employers, include both occupational and key skills[1]. The effectiveness of delivery of key skills has been observed to vary widely both within and among the various sector frameworks. The overall aim of this study was to attempt to identify the factors that appear to have a major influence - whether positive or negative - upon key skills delivery.

1.2 The specific aims of the study were to:

- identify the factors which promote and the barriers which inhibit effective delivery of key skills in Modern Apprenticeships[2];
- identify how those barriers have been overcome by the NTOs in sectors where frameworks are effectively delivered, and by individual employers/ providers offering particular frameworks;
- identify whether some key skills present greater difficulties than others, and in which circumstances;
- identify the points in the "supply chain" (NTO, TEC[3], employer, training provider, careers service, trainee) where barriers to, or good practice in, effective key skills delivery arise, focusing in particular on the part played by the NTO;
- identify the quality assurance arrangements in place at different levels (NTO, TEC, training provider) to underpin the delivery of key skills;
- identify the kinds of support needed by sectors to improve the delivery and assessment of key skills within Modern Apprenticeships;
- identify some particularly successful examples of good practice which can be used to raise achievement elsewhere; and
- make recommendations designed to increase the effective delivery of key skills by reducing or removing the barriers identified by the study.

1.3 Eight sector frameworks were selected for inclusion in the study. The criteria for the selection of the frameworks were that together they should cover a significant proportion of trainees on MAs, a range of MA completion rates[4], and a variety of sectors and occupations. The eight selected frameworks were:

- Business Administration (a cross-sector occupational framework);
- Construction;
- Engineering Manufacture;
- Hospitality;

1. For the purposes of this study, the definition and explanation of the term "Key Skills" was that used in the DfEE publication of 1999: ***Key Skills Explained*** (ISBN 1 84185 044 6), extracts from which appear as Annex 1 to this report.
2. Whilst the study concentrated on Modern Apprenticeships, many of the findings apply also to what, at the time of the fieldwork, were called National Traineeships - now known as Foundation Modern Apprenticeships.
3. Throughout this report the term TEC or TECs is used to represent both Training and Enterprise Councils (TECs) and/or Chamber of Commerce, Training and Enterprise (CCTEs).
4. This was not a study of MA non-completion *per se*, nor was any assumption made of a causal link between key skills and MA non-completion, although the possibility of such a link was investigated as part of the study. DfEE has commissioned a separate, large-scale project on non-completion.

- Motor Vehicles - Service and Repair;
- Plumbing;
- Retail; and
- Telecommunications.

1.4 Fieldwork was undertaken between January and March 2000. The fieldwork was undertaken at a time of considerable change, and the perceptions of those interviewed were informed, inevitably, by their knowledge and experience of key skills at that time. Although the separate certification of the key skills of communication, application of number, and information technology (IT) became mandatory within Modern Apprenticeships in September 1998, many people in industry (including trainees) seemed to have little practical experience of them. Additionally, some interviewees seemed unaware that key skill requirements have changed in the latest versions of the MA frameworks for their sectors. In the construction industry, for example, key skills were explicitly included only in 1999, coming into operation in July of that year; before that, they had been assumed to be contained within the units of the NVQ.

1.5 Further details of the study design and methodology are given as Annex 2. It should be noted that the inclusion of eight sector frameworks was to ensure a robust, overall picture of key skills practice, free from the distortions of the particular conditions in any one sector. It was not intended to give a separate, definitive view of each sector. Similarly, whilst fieldwork was undertaken in more than eight TEC areas around the country, this was to avoid undue regional bias rather than to point up differences in practice between one region or TEC area and another.

2. SUMMARY

Types of Training Delivery

2.1 Two general types of training delivery - including that of key skills - were found, the adoption of one or the other being determined largely by the economic, cultural, and institutional norms of each sector. Any proposals aimed at increasing the effectiveness of key skills delivery and assessment must take account of this: what appears to work well in one sector might not easily transfer to another.

2.2 Among those sectors which have a long tradition of apprentice training and related further education - such as Construction, Plumbing, Engineering, and Motor Vehicles - delivery of training tends to be curriculum-driven and off the job, typically in further education (FE) colleges but also in training providers' training centres. Training tends to be delivered in training workshops, with supporting knowledge often handled in classroom situations; assessment, also, is rarely undertaken in the work situation.

2.3 The other type was found typically in those sectors and occupations such as Business Administration, and many occupations in Hospitality and Retail, where the gradual adoption of NVQs represented the first significant move towards structured training for young entrants in the workplace. In these sectors and occupations, most training may be typified as guided work experience, assessment-driven, with only very short periods away from the workplace for specific modules of instruction or assessment.

2.4 Within this latter approach it was rare to find key skills being delivered separately, the principal exception being IT. It seems often to be the assessor - rather than the trainee or his or her supervisor - who takes primary responsibility for assembling the trainee's evidence portfolio. It was not uncommon within this approach for both trainee and supervisor not to realise that key skills were being covered at all.

Factors Promoting Effective Delivery

2.5 In most sectors and settings, key skills are among the most problematic aspects of the MA package, but there seem to be several fundamental principles which, if applied in any situation, are likely to lead to the development of effective key skills delivery. These are little different from the principles which generally underpin all effective learning systems:

- clear, shared understanding of the purpose of key skills;
- shared commitment to effective delivery;
- effective initial assessment of trainees' training needs;
- occupationally-relevant key skill specifications;
- appropriate delivery and assessment mechanisms; and
- development of user-friendly delivery material.

Difficulties with Particular Key Skills

2.6 The two key skills which were most often cited as causing particular difficulties were *application of number* and *IT*. The basic problem seems to be that it is often difficult to interpret the requirements in ways which make them relevant to the work experience of the trainees.

2.7 The three wider, "personal" key skills were considered to be important but inherent to most of the jobs for which apprentices are being trained and, therefore, likely to be covered by their NVQ training and work experience rather than being delivered or assessed separately.

Good Practice

2.8 Examples of good practice were identified in the following areas:

- increasing employer awareness and understanding of key skills;
- employer endorsement of key skills as an integral part of the MA;
- initial assessment of trainee needs;
- development of key skills training materials;
- integration of key skills delivery with occupational training;
- assessment of key skills; and
- staff training in key skills delivery and assessment.

Barriers to Effective Delivery

2.9 Barriers to effective key skills delivery - often the absence of those factors seen to promote effective delivery - were identified as follows:

- lack of ownership, understanding, and knowledge of key skills;
- perceived irrelevance, or inappropriate level, of particular key skills;
- inappropriate use of the MA;
- inadequate initial assessment - or inadequate attention to its findings;
- separate delivery of key skills;
- workload;
- staff competence;
- unco-ordinated development work; and
- funding.

Quality Assurance Arrangements

2.10 Most of the NTOs limited their role in the quality assurance of key skills training and assessment to one of framework compliance. They tend to regard the awarding bodies and TECs - backed up by the Qualification Curriculum Authority (QCA), the Training Standards Council (TSC), and the Further Education Funding Council (FEFC) - as the custodians of the quality of both occupational and key skills.

2.11 Most organisations have tried to subsume key skills within their overall approaches to quality assurance, although it was difficult in many cases to make judgements on the effectiveness of these approaches, as so few trainees have achieved key skills requirements so far. Among practitioners generally, and among employers who knew enough to express a view, there was unease about inconsistencies in the judgements made by awarding bodies and the inspectorates. Many of these could be seen to be related generally to the issue of staff knowledge and competence.

Views on Future Developments

The New Key Skills Qualification

2.12 At the time of the field work (January - March 2000), levels of understanding about the proposed qualification were generally low. Some of those interviewed expressed in principle objections, on the grounds that it was contrary to the philosophy which sees key skills as an essential element in occupational competence. For some it was seen as further confirmation that key skills are part of a government agenda to use vocational training to make up for the failures of secondary education.

Externally-administered assessment or testing

2.13 Much of the opposition to the separate key skills qualification was, in reality, rather more to do with the introduction of formal, external assessment. However, there were varying reactions to this from employers.

2.14 Employers in sectors where there was a long tradition of training and vocational FE tended to be relatively happy with the concept, believing that it would help to reduce inconsistencies and raise standards. Employers in those sectors for which NVQs and MAs were a step change in commitment to training, tended to have a much more negative view of external testing.

2.15 Serious reservations were expressed by most people with a professional training perspective on Modern Apprenticeships and NVQs - NTO staff, managing agents, training providers, and trainers and assessors themselves. These reservations fall into two broad categories: issues of principle and issues of practicality.

2.16 Among trainees, there was a more varied reaction to the prospect of testing. Trainees who had entered industry with good GCSEs or A levels, and who were training to be telecommunications or technician engineers, for example, tended to profess no real concern at the prospect. Trainees with poor academic records at school, and who were training for jobs which were essentially practical in nature, tended to react more negatively.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 DfEE should ensure that the current Key Skills Support Programme, which aims to help teachers and trainers deliver and assess key skills, gives high priority to raising the levels of awareness, understanding, and ownership of key skills - stressing particularly the benefits to employers and trainees.

3.2 The Support Programme should assist all stakeholders to understand how key skills can be delivered in a sector - or occupation-specific environment and yet be useful across a wide range of sectors and ensure that useful and relevant development work is widely disseminated. Priority should be given to raising awareness and understanding of the nature and role of future assessment arrangements for key skills.

3.3 NTOs, in developing MA sector frameworks should make it clear that key skills are not to be seen as belonging exclusively to a specific level of the NVQ or a particular stage of training.

3.4 Consideration should be given by NTOs, within MA frameworks which have different occupational options or routes, to the possibility of differential key skill requirements for the various options.

3.5 Clearer guidance should be given on the recognition of prior achievement and exemptions from key skills requirements within MAs.

3.6 Much more attention needs to be paid by providers to the initial assessment of key skills and its effect on individual training plans.

3.7 The wide range of development work which has been undertaken on the integration of key skills with NVQ requirements should be evaluated and widely disseminated.

3.8 Through the Key Skills Support Programme, encouragement should be given to training practitioners - particularly those with a specific, occupational focus - to develop their understanding of key skills and their own methods of key skills delivery and assessment.

3.9 In view of the widespread concern, among employers and trainers, about the implications of the external assessment and separate certification of key skills, special care should be taken to monitor their introduction within Modern Apprenticeships and within work-based training in general.

3.10 Careers services should be enabled and encouraged to develop a better understanding of the place of key skills within the MA so that they are better able to explain this to their clients.

3.11 The arrangements for inspecting key skills delivery should be reviewed to identify good practice and improve the quality of key skills training and assessment across all sectors.

3.12 There should be a clearer, shared understanding among the various players - Department for Education and Emplyment (DfEE), NTOs, awarding bodies, TECs, local Learning and Skills Councils, training providers, TSC, and FEFC on the staff competences that are needed to deliver key skills.

3.13 QCA should explore, with awarding bodies, ways of enhancing the knowledge and skills of assessors and verifiers, giving particular attention to the need for consistency.

3.14 TECs and local Learning and Skills Councils, should consider how best to encourage and support the development of competence in key skills delivery and assessment, and give consideration to such competence in their contracting and monitoring of MA delivery.

3.15 NTOs should ensure that all stakeholder organisations have available the up-to-date versions of their MA frameworks, together with any explanatory and supporting materials.

3.16 NTOs should consider whether they need to adopt a stronger co-ordinating and monitoring role on the delivery of the MA - and, in this context, of key skills in particular - in their sectors.

4. TYPES OF TRAINING DELIVERY

4.1 Two general types of training delivery were found among the sectors studied and, unsurprisingly, delivery of key skills tended to follow the overall delivery pattern of the NVQ, although there were variations and exceptions within each type. It is important to identify and distinguish between these two types, as the adoption of one or the other seems determined largely by the economic, cultural, and institutional norms of each sector and/or occupation. Whilst key skills are a national training policy initiative, the approaches to their delivery are likely to be influenced most by these sectoral norms. Any assessment of the factors which seem either to promote or to inhibit effective delivery must be made in this context, as also must any proposals aimed at increasing the effectiveness of delivery: what appears to work well in one sector might not be transferable to others.

4.2 Among those sectors which have a long tradition of apprentice training and related further education - Construction, Plumbing, Engineering, and Motor Vehicles - delivery of training tends to be curriculum-driven and off the job, typically in further education (FE) colleges but also in training providers' training centres. Training tends to be delivered in training workshops, with supporting knowledge often handled in classroom situations; assessment, also, is rarely undertaken in the work situation. The Telecommunications sector operates in a very similar manner, and a similar pattern is adopted also for many apprentice chefs in the Hospitality sector. In some cases, the pattern is for a period of full-time, off-the-job training, followed by day or block release; in others, day or block release are more usual throughout the training period.

4.3 Some FE colleges and training centres have mapped key skill requirements into the NVQ curriculum, so that instruction, practice, and assessment can be integrated. Other colleges deliver what might be called the "technical" key skills - *communication, application of number,* and *IT* - in separate classes, sometimes with apprentices from various sectors in the same group. Even among those where most key skills delivery is integrated, it seems common practice to teach and assess IT as a separate subject. It is also common for colleges and training centres to set up projects in which a number of key skills can be developed and assessed: the preparation and presentation of job estimates and quotations was cited by several providers as a useful exercise which can cover several key skill areas in a meaningful way.

4.4 The other type of delivery is found in those sectors and occupations - Business Administration, many occupations in Hospitality, and Retail - where the gradual adoption of NVQs and, more recently, the MA, represented the first significant moves to structured workplace training for young entrants. (There has been a long tradition of full-time FE, pre-entry courses in some aspects of Business Administration and in Hospitality, but this study was concerned with young people going directly into employment). In these sectors and occupations, most training may be typified as guided work experience, assessment-driven, with only very short periods away from the workplace for specific modules of instruction or assessment. The typical role of the training provider - or, in the case of some larger employers, the company training function - is to map the NVQ requirements into the trainees' work experience and to provide an assessment service.

4.5 Within this type of approach to NVQ delivery and assessment, it was rare to find key skills delivered separately, the principal exception to this again being IT. Some training providers have themselves undertaken mapping exercises to make explicit which aspects of key skills are to be covered within NVQ units, and others have bought into work done by other agencies. It seems often to be the assessor - rather than the trainee or his or her supervisor - who takes primary responsibility for assembling the trainee's evidence portfolio and completing any necessary records. It was not uncommon within this approach, for both trainee and supervisor not to realise that key skills were in fact being covered at all.

5. FACTORS PROMOTING EFFECTIVE DELIVERY

5.1 It became clear as this study progressed that, in most sectors and settings, key skills are among the most problematic aspect of the elements which constitute the MA package. Even where they are not regarded as significant problems in themselves, the administration of key skills requirements can be seen as an unnecessary addition to an already crowded programme of occupational training. There appears to be a number of fundamental principles which are likely to lead to the development of effective key skills delivery. It is surely not surprising that these are little different from the principles which are generally seen to underpin all effective learning systems.

Clear, shared understanding of the purpose of key skills

5.2 It has been noted earlier that there is not the same sense of ownership of key skills, particularly among employers and specialist training providers, as there is of the sector-derived elements of MAs. However, where most of those involved in the delivery chain - NTO, awarding bodies, industry organisations, TECs, employers, providers, trainers and assessors, and trainees themselves - had a shared understanding of what key skills are for, there clearly existed the basis for the development of effective delivery systems. This often seemed to have as much to do with the general effectiveness of communications among the various players as with a detailed understanding of key skills.

Shared commitment to effective delivery

5.3 This was only seen to exist where a shared understanding was present, but it appeared to depend to a large extent on the perceived relevance of the detailed key skills requirements for the sector. The key player here was the employer: in that minority of situations where employers were seen to be committed, training providers and trainees tended to take key skills seriously.

Effective assessment of trainees' training needs

5.4 In many cases there was either inadequate initial assessment of trainees' needs or an apparent inability or unwillingness to use the results of such assessment in drawing up individual training plans. Where assessment tools were used, they were sometimes used for trainee selection rather than for assessing the needs of those who had been selected. Few examples were found of effective initial assessment practice during this study - but see paragraph 7.2 for one example which was judged to be good practice. Proper assessment of trainees' initial levels of competence - and hence of their training needs - is essential to the design of a training programme which properly meets those needs. This can be seen to be even more important in the case of key skills, as they are on a continuum with the basic skills - in reading, writing, speaking and number - which all trainees will have acquired to some degree as children and young adults.

Occupationally-relevant key skill specifications

5.5 It has been noted elsewhere that most trainees on Modern Apprenticeships have taken a conscious decision to enter the world of work, rather than to continue in some form of further education. Where key skill specifications are interpreted in terms that relate them to a trainee's own world of work, they can be seen to be relevant; where they are specified in generic, quasi-academic terms, they are likely to be seen as belonging to the world of school which the trainee has rejected.

Appropriate delivery and assessment mechanisms

5.6 Most training practitioners tended to believe that integration of key skills delivery with that of occupational skills should be regarded as good practice. It was also noted, however, that in many off-the-job settings concurrent delivery was rather more common than integration. In some work-based settings, on the other hand, the integrated approach being pursued could not be regarded as particularly effective practice. Key skills are intended to be transferable skills that trainees can use in different contexts. Where trainees are not actively aware of the key skills they are developing, it is difficult to see how such transfer could take place. Even where integration was generally effective, however, there were occasions when a separate approach was preferable.

5.7 Whilst it is clear that, where an integrated approach is appropriate, it can be very effective, there was little evidence from this study to suggest that integration was a necessary condition for the successful delivery of key skills. There were clearly situations where - whether because of the work context, for example, or the skills of available staff - separate delivery could be seen as a preferable option. The important point seemed to be that the delivery mechanism adopted should be appropriate to the setting, to the trainees, to those delivering the training, and to the range of skills being addressed.

5.8 Similar principles could be seen to apply to key skills assessment, a point of particular importance where this was undertaken in a different setting, or by different people, from the training delivery. Arguments were heard both for following integrated delivery with integrated assessment, and for adopting the opposite approach to assessment as a useful means checking the validity of the training. However, in cases where an integrated approach to the delivery of key skills training was followed by separate assessment, it was seen as critically important that the staff involved should have a good understanding of the occupational context. By extension, the same point applies to separate verification.

The development of user-friendly delivery material

5.9 In all situations, but particularly where key skills delivery was integrated, it was clear that effective delivery and assessment were much more likely where trainees, trainers, assessors, and supervisors had available to them some form of documentation which made clear what was to be achieved, how and when it could achieved and demonstrated, and how it could be recorded simply. NTOs did not generally see it as their role to develop such materials, but examples were observed in most sectors, developed usually by training providers (including the FE sector) and sometimes by awarding bodies.

6. DIFFICULTIES WITH PARTICULAR KEY SKILLS

6.1 The two key skills which were most often cited as causing particular difficulties were *application of number* and *information technology*. The main exceptions to this seemed to be in the Telecoms sector generally and for the higher levels of entrant into Engineering. In these cases, the nature of the work means that number and IT, at relatively high levels, are embedded in the NVQ units, and trainee selection takes account of this.

6.2 Elsewhere, the basic problem for each topic seemed to be that, for many occupations, it was difficult to interpret the requirements in ways which made them at all relevant to the work experience of the trainees. This was the case even when some attempt had clearly been made to put them into a context with which the trainee was familiar: an apprentice on the housekeeping option of the Hospitality MA, for example, could not understand why she ought to be able to calculate the wall and floor area, let alone the cubic capacity of the rooms she attended.

6.3 In the case of *information technology (IT)*, two approaches were commonly adopted, particularly where most training was off the job - either to put the trainees through a self-standing IT course which might have no particular relevance to the occupation, or to ensure that an IT unit from the NVQ menu was chosen by trainees as one of their optional units. The interest which many young people have in IT can be useful here, although this can also mean that the range of initial knowledge and expertise is very wide.

6.4 There were virtually no examples of the three “personal” skills being separately specified, delivered, or assessed. Whilst there was recognition of the wider key skills and that they are inherent to most of the jobs for which apprentices are being trained, this could be an issue worthy of further study.

7. GOOD PRACTICE

7.1 There is much development activity taking place at present in the whole area of key skills delivery and assessment, much of it at sector-provider level and much of it concerned with the integration of key skills with NVQ requirements and, specifically, with mapping. Whilst this work might be regarded, instinctively, as good practice, in most cases it is too soon to make a judgment because there has been little opportunity as yet to fully test the effectiveness of the output from such developments.

7.2 Some examples follow of developments and activities which were identified as worthy of consideration as good practice:

- A FE college has developed a diagnostic tool - which enables an assessment to be made, at any stage, of a trainee's communication, number, IT, and basic skills needs; available in paper and CD-ROM form, it has been purchased by some 170 Colleges of Further Education and training organisations. In view of the importance of initial assessment in the area of key skills, this was seen as a particularly worthwhile development.

- Special projects, designed to develop and assess clusters of key skills elements which might not otherwise occur in trainees' work and training were found in most sectors, and in both FE and work-based settings; projects which - though specially devised as key skills exercises - were nevertheless seen as relevant to company practices, or to supervisory/management functions not far removed from trainees' own work experience, were seen as particularly promising.

- In the Engineering sector, among others, examples were found of apprentices being enabled to develop and demonstrate groups of key skills in fulfilling real, workplace management requirements - such as the analysis of health and safety records and the monitoring of equal opportunities policies.

- Some large employers have emphasised their endorsement of the key skills concept by giving prominence, in training award ceremonies, to the successful demonstration by apprentices of key skills; a major Telecommunications employer/training provider has used the chief executive's welcome letter to every trainee to fulfil the same purpose.

- In the Engineering sector, there were examples of training providers and FE colleges consulting with their major employer-customers on the provision of uniform support material, in attempts to ensure that trainees receive consistent messages about key skills and avoiding duplication of effort.

- In the Plumbing sector, the NTO has produced and distributed a *Key Skills Pack* in an attempt to ensure that all training providers have a common understanding of the place of key skills in its MA.

- Examples were found in two sectors - Hospitality and Plumbing - of major providers who, have mapped. This has helped to demonstrate occupational relevance of key skills and gain the commitment of employers, by mapping the NVQ requirements to be found within key skills specifications.

- In the Hospitality sector, a major employer was receiving support from its TEC to map key skills into its comprehensive group induction programme, undertaken by all trainees shortly after joining the company, to ensure that trainees have early exposure to key skills which the company regards as important to its business needs.

- In the Motor Vehicle sector, a sector-specific awarding body has developed and provided trainee workbooks which incorporate key skills within technical training assignments, together with supporting assessment processes.

- Each member of the field staff of a major training provider in the Hospitality sector is receiving training in key skills, leading to the Key Skills Practitioner Award (KSPA).

- A NTO has contracted with a university to provide assessor training for its own staff and those of its member companies.

- In the Telecoms sector, a major employer and training provider has arranged for the TEC to contract with an independent organisation - all of whose staff have a telecoms background - to undertake all trainee assessment, including that of key skills.

8 BARRIERS TO EFFECTIVE DELIVERY

Lack of Ownership, Understanding, and Knowledge of Key Skills

8.1 There seems to be little feeling of ownership of key skills, much confusion about and/or misunderstanding of their purpose, and widespread lack of knowledge of the particular requirements of sector frameworks. On the part of some who appear to understand their purpose, there is nevertheless a belief that the MA is an inappropriate context in which to pursue it. In most sectors, employers and specialist training providers clearly feel that the occupational aspects of the MA belong to their sector. When many say, referring to key skills, that they are being asked to "make up for the failures of the school system, it is clear that there is no such sense of ownership. Their experience so far of key skills seems to have left them unconvinced of the contribution they might make to their trainees' competence at work.

8.2 The development of a new, stand-alone key skills qualification, together with a formal, generic, external testing regime to complement the collection of evidence, is seen as evidence that key skills are primarily part of the government's education agenda. Even among those who support such an agenda - whether on philosophical, long-term economic, or business-case grounds - there are serious doubts about having prescribed key skills as a mandatory part of a vocational programme. The obligation to pay, and to make available the time of trainees and other staff, for the delivery of key skills is not universally supported, even by those who support the concepts of the key skills principle.

Perceived Irrelevance - or Inappropriate Level - of Particular Key Skills

8.3 Most of the eight sector frameworks include a mandatory requirement for only the three "technical" skills - *communication, application of number,* and *information technology (IT)*. Although other frameworks also included the wider, "personal" skills, these were generally regarded as being subsumed, either expressly or by implication, within the NVQ units.

8.4 Much concern was expressed about the perceived irrelevance of particular key skills to the jobs for which apprentices were being trained. (Many such perceptions, however, appeared to be based on limited knowledge and understanding of what was required). When such concerns were explored, it was rare that any of the skills were seen as unnecessary. In the case of the "technical" skills there was often disagreement, both about the extent to which trainees should have acquired these skills in school and about the precise content and appropriate level within each skill area.

8.5 Level 2 is typically the requirement for key skills, with level 1 sometimes specified for IT. In several sectors some of the levels have recently been revised, usually downwards. In one sector, such a change was seen as a retrograde step by most employers, who believed that the previous, higher levels were entirely appropriate to their business needs. Some expressed suspicion that the move was more to do with maximising MA success rates than with meeting industry needs. (There were no reported examples of employers exercising the option of asking for their trainees to be taken to a higher level than that required by the framework; it seemed, in fact, that this option was not generally recognised).

8.6 There seems to be a significant problem, also, where there are several training routes within a MA framework. The levels and the ranges of key skills are generally common within the framework, and in off-the-job situations key skills training is often delivered to mixed groups of trainees. What is seen as appropriate application of number within the hospitality MA for an apprentice chef, however, might be seen very differently when required of someone on the housekeeping option of the same framework; a suitable level of communication skills for an apprentice in motor parts distribution might be regarded as unnecessary for a maintenance and repair apprentice. In some off-job settings, it was possible for apprentices from different industries to find themselves in the same teaching group for some key skills: this further compounds the problem.

8.7 There was more general concern, among both employers and training providers, about the wider, "personal" skills - particularly *working with others* and *improving own learning and performance*. Most employers and training providers regarded them as important personal *qualities* which could be selected for and should be developed in employment, but there was some difference of view as to whether they were appropriate skills to be delivered in a vocational training programme. There seemed to be a lack of understanding as to how these key skills could be formally trained for and assessed.

Inappropriate Use of the MA

8.8 Whilst there is some evidence that key skills could be a contributory factor in the failure of some apprentices to achieve their MA certificate, it seems unlikely that this is often the major reason. A separate study has been undertaken on non-completion, and it is appropriate here only to consider those factors which have a bearing on key skills delivery. The major factor appears to be the inappropriatness use of the MA for some trainees and, linked with that, the timing and mode of key skills delivery.

8.9 There is evidence in some sectors of a tendency to put onto a MA trainees for whom the achievement of anything more than a level-2 NVQ is not a realistic expectation - either because of their own abilities and aspirations or because their employer has no expectation of requiring of them the supervisory-level skills associated with a NVQ at level 3. This seems particularly true of, although not confined to, those sectors with no tradition of apprentice-type training.

8.10 If the training scheme is designed in such a way that the delivery of key skills is end-loaded - *i.e.* all or much of delivery and/or assessment is undertaken as part of, alongside, or after the level-3 NVQ - then any trainee who fails to progress to level 3 will miss out on all or most of the key skills work.

Inadequate Initial Assessment - or Inadequate Attention Paid to its Findings

8.11 In the NVQ system, the fundamental requirement is for trainees to be able to *demonstrate* competence, at an appropriate level, in the skills concerned: any training input is simply a means to that end. The assessment of trainees' competence at the start of training is of critical importance, therefore. The wording of the key skill specifications makes it clear that this general principle applies here also. As it is even more likely that trainees will have achieved a level of competence in some key skills before the start of their MA programmes, initial assessment will be even more important here than in the case of occupational skills.

8.12 In many situations, however, there appeared to have been no meaningful attempt at initial assessment, of either occupational or key skills. In other cases, such initial assessment as had been undertaken seemed to be concerned more with *basic* skills, sometimes alongside aptitude testing, and often used as a selection tool rather than a means of assessing training needs. On occasions, where some form of initial assessment had been undertaken, individual training plans made it clear, nevertheless, that all trainees were expected to go through the same training and assessment processes. Even where relevant competences had been certificated, they were sometimes ignored: perhaps the worst example seen during the fieldwork was an apprentice, who had a pass in maths at A level, who nevertheless had just sat with his peers in a class learning the difference between the mean, median, and the mode.

8.13 The administrative difficulty and increased costs of the preparation and follow-through of individual training plans were sometimes cited as the reasons for the lack of initial assessment. Whatever the reasons, it was clearly a frustrating and demotivating experience - not to say an inefficient process - for some trainees to spend time on training for, and later being assessed on, areas of key skills in which they believed they were competent from the start.

Integration and Concurrent Delivery

8.14 There was a consensus among witnesses that integration of the delivery and assessment of key skills - integrated, that is, within work done to enable trainees to achieve the units within their NVQs - should be regarded as good practice. Employers tended to feel that, if key skills had to be covered at all, it were better that they were subsumed within occupationally relevant training and handled in a way which avoided separate allocations of time and other resources. In addition to sharing these views, sometimes expressly as a response to the positions taken by employers, most trainers saw integration as correct philosophically and as something of a professional challenge.

8.15 In several sectors, however, there was little evidence that true integration has become embedded in practice. In some situations, typically where the MA and NVQs have superseded a traditional apprenticeship and formal off-job training is delivered in a FE environment, key skills are delivered alongside vocational skills training but in a separate setting and often using specialist staff from “academic” departments. Unsurprisingly, many trainees see this as tantamount to a return to school and, as most of them have been happy to leave the classroom behind them, it cannot be regarded as an inducement to take key skills seriously. (In some sectors, on the other hand, particular FE colleges have a good record of mapping key skills into NVQ training: there were estimates that up to 70% of *Communication* and *Application of Number* requirements could be met in this way. In such cases, special projects and/or workshop-based instruction might be used to fill any gaps).

8.16 Until recently, in sectors where there is less of a formal training tradition, key skills were often left by employers and/or training providers to the end of the apprenticeship period.

8.17 There are now indications in such sectors that training providers are developing means, which are essentially assessment-driven, of integrating key skills into work-based training. There is often a double financial motivation driving this trend: on the one hand, most employers will not release trainees for specific training in key skills and, on the other, most providers stand to lose TEC funding if key skills are not completed.

Workload

8.18 There is resistance from all types of stakeholder in most sectors to using precious time and other resources on either the delivery or assessment of key skills. There is a strong belief among employers and vocational trainers in some sectors, for example, that the technical and regulatory requirements of jobs is changing so rapidly that it is becoming difficult for trainees to achieve their NVQs in the planned three or four years. In other sectors, typically those where there is no tradition of formal training, and where virtually all training takes place on the job, many employers regard trainees as productive members of staff, for whom any training - and key skills in particular - must be fitted in the margins.

8.19 Key skills training may be seen, therefore, to be in competition - for time and other resources - with the demands of either vocational training or doing the job. Resistance can take several forms, such as:

- employers' unwillingness to release and/or pay for trainees to undertake off-job training, special assignments, or assessment in key skills[5];
- employers and trainers baulking at what they see as the bureaucracy of key skills evidence-gathering, assessment, and verification, which can be seen as a duplication of similar effort used on occupational skills;
- the reluctance of employers and/or training providers to invest in developing ways of integrating key skills into work-based training; and
- trainees' reluctance to spend their own time on training and evidence-gathering for key skills, which is expected of them by employers in some sectors.

Trainer, Assessor, and Verifier Competence

8.20 The competence and effectiveness of trainers is a key issue in any training system and, in a work- and competence-based system, the roles and the skills of assessors and verifiers are closely allied to those of trainers. Within the area of key skills, staff competence - at all levels of the delivery chain - appears to be more of a problem than with occupational skills. Most training providers who make separate provision for key skills delivery and assessment do so by using staff who are specialists in the skills concerned: indeed, a major reason for opting for separate provision is that occupational specialists are seen not to have sufficient knowledge and understanding of the key skills. On the other hand, few key skills specialists are seen to have sufficient occupational knowledge to enable them to relate their subjects to the work environment in a meaningful way.

8.21 This combination of classroom-type delivery and trainers who are specialists, say, in language or mathematics is associated, by many trainees, with the negative school experiences which helped to convince them that work-based training was what they wanted. Many employers, also, are quick to criticise what they see as an overly academic approach to training - confirmation for some of their belief that key skills are inherently academic and irrelevant to the world of work.

5. There is an issue here which concerns not simply key skills, nor even MAs, but NVQs in general: many employers in sectors where assessment is normally done off the job - either in FE/training centre workshops or by simulation - are very happy for this situation to continue; there are indications that they could resist strongly any pressure for more assessment to be undertaken in the workplace.

8.22 Where all training is almost entirely delivered in the work situation, key skills delivery and assessment is, almost by definition, integrated with that of occupational skills. In many cases, the individual charged with day-to-day responsibility for the trainee will have little or no formal understanding of training delivery - and even less understanding of key skills. Much rests, therefore, on the competence of the assessor and/or internal verifier, who is likely to be either an occupational specialist with a basic assessor qualification or a training specialist: it is unlikely, so far, that he or she will possess an award in key skills.

8.23 There is a further problem of staff competence at the level of external verification, particularly for training delivered in the workplace and where there has been a real attempt to integrate the delivery and assessment of key skills with that of occupational skills. Some of the key skills verifiers used by the awarding bodies are specialists in one or more specific areas of key skills, which can make it difficult for them to make judgements, for example, on portfolios of evidence which are occupationally based. Given that key skills are likely to be the area of assessment which many occupationally-skilled assessors will find most difficult in any case, there seems to be a significant need to develop shared understandings of what is acceptable.

Development Work

8.24 Examples were found in most sectors, and among TECs, of development work being undertaken on key skills issues, such as: mapping of key skills in NVQ units (or *vice versa*); several types of key skills workbooks and similar materials; diagnostic tests to identify appropriate entry levels and gaps in knowledge; materials for trainer/assessor training in key skills. Much of this work is being undertaken in isolation and in apparent ignorance of other, similar developments elsewhere.

8.25 Sometimes there is a belief that, in spite of the essentially generic nature of key skills, materials developed for use in one sector could not be adapted for use in others. In other cases, there was a proprietorial interest in developed materials which was not matched by a commercial strategy to exploit that interest. There was a surprisingly low level of awareness, also, of material published or sponsored by the DfEE, such as the *KS Training Provider's Survival Kit* and a series of case studies, developed by TECs and published by the Department, aimed at helping trainers and assessors integrate key skills into NVQs.

Funding

8.26 There are two basic funding issues which are seen as problematic for key skills delivery. One issue, of course, is the overall amount of money made available by TECs, and in turn by providers, for delivery of the MA, and the other is the way in which that money is used to encourage key skills delivery.

8.27 The rather more serious issue seems to be the amount of additional funding for key skills which employers and/or providers receive from TECs: its purpose, the amount, and the way in which it is delivered. Many TECs pay some sort of premium for completion of the MA framework requirements - effectively a bonus for the successful delivery of key skills - or, conversely, operate some sort of claw-back if key skills are not completed within a certain time after completion of the NVQ. This amount seems typically to be between £150 and £650, or between 10% and 20% of the total MA payment, varying both from one TEC to another and across sectors.

8.28 These payments seem generally to be regarded by TECs as primarily an inducement to complete key skills either alongside the NVQ or very shortly afterwards, rather than as a payment for what ought to be the small amount of additional work caused for providers by key skills. It is seen by many providers, however, as an inadequate payment for a significant amount of extra work. Even where key skills are well integrated with occupational training, providers usually see the need to arrange additional inputs - specific courses, for example, or some form or project work - to cover some aspects. It was claimed by providers in several sectors, however, that this need sometimes went unmet because the funding was not there - and employers were unwilling to make any contribution.

9. QUALITY ASSURANCE ARRANGEMENTS

9.1 The general attitude of NTOs on quality assurance of key skills training and assessment is that their role is limited to framework compliance, which essentially means ensuring that key skills certificates have been gained before MA completion certification is granted. The quality assurance of key skills delivery is viewed by NTOs little differently from that of occupational skills. They do not generally see it as either appropriate or possible for them to become involved in issues of training delivery and assessment, and regard the awarding bodies and TECs - backed up by QCA, TSC, and FEFC - as the custodians of the quality of both occupational and key skills.

9.2 Unsurprisingly, most organisations have tried to subsume key skills within their overall approaches to quality assurance. It was difficult in many cases to make judgements on the effectiveness of these approaches in the particular context of key skills. Although they have been on the agenda for some time, key skills requirements have been made explicit only recently in some sectors, there have been comparatively few trainees across all sectors who have achieved key skills requirements, and many organisations have had little practical experience so far of monitoring delivery and verifying assessments.

9.3 Having entered this caveat, it is fair to report that among practitioners generally - and among some of the few employers who appeared to have a good grasp of key skills issues - there were many expressions of unease about inconsistencies in the judgements made by awarding bodies and the inspectorates. Many of these could be seen to be related generally to the issue of staff knowledge and competence. In particular, there is seen to be a difficulty for staff who are specialists in a particular discipline but are required to make judgements about training delivered, and competences exhibited, in a range of sectors and settings. (It should be noted, however, that complaints about inconsistency of verification were not limited to key skills).

9.4 TECs were found to be moving away from exclusive reliance on quality systems auditing in favour of approaches which resemble those of the TSC, monitoring both training delivery and evidence of competence by sampling on the basis of assessed risk. In the area of key skills, this is highlighting staff training needs for TEC staff, and several TECs are putting their monitoring staff through key skills awareness training. Some TECs were seen to be monitoring against out-of-date versions of sector frameworks, which is particularly unfortunate in this context, as it is often only in the latest versions that key skills requirements are made explicit and, in others, requirements have changed significantly from those in earlier versions. Other TECs take a more limited, contract-compliance view of their monitoring role, leaving monitoring of the quality of both occupational and key skills to the awarding bodies, QCA, and the inspectorates.

10. FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

The New Key Skills Qualification[6]

10.1 Although the level of knowledge about the proposals was generally low, particularly among employers, considerable concern was expressed about the introduction of the new key skills qualification. There was particular concern that the proposals, as understood by those interviewed, were contrary to the philosophy which sees key skills as an essential element within occupational competence. There was also a feeling that key skills were part of a government agenda to use vocational training to make up for the failures of secondary education. This was seen by employers to weaken any business case that might be made for the importance of key skills.

Externally-Administered Assessment or Testing

10.2 Much of the opposition expressed to the separate key skills qualification was, in reality, more to do with the associated issue of formal, external assessment - often referred to, as "testing". Among employers, however, there were differences of view which aligned loosely with the two types of overall approach discussed in paragraphs 2.1 - 2.4. and 4.1 - 4.5.

10.3 Employers in sectors where there was a long tradition of training and vocational FE tended to be relatively happy with the concept, believing that it would help to reduce inconsistencies and raise standards. On this basis, some asked why external testing was not being introduced also for NVQs: it was seen to have the potential to be a much more rigorous means of assessing competence than the present system. (An external testing regime was often instinctively trusted, as it was seen to be similar to the vocational-FE examinations in which many small employers and supervisors had themselves been successful during their own apprenticeships.) Nevertheless, some of these same employers expressed serious concerns about the additional bureaucracy and cost which testing might create.

10.4 Employers in those sectors for which NVQs and MAs were a step change in commitment to training, on the other hand, tended to have a much more negative view of external testing. Some had philosophical objections to its introduction into a training and qualification system which has been sold to them as work-based and business-relevant. They regarded any move to formal, externally administered testing as evidence of a trend towards a more "academic" approach to training and qualifications.

10.5 Serious reservations were expressed by most people with a professional training perspective on modern apprenticeships and NVQs - NTO staff, managing agents, training providers, and trainers and assessors themselves. It was felt that the proposed reforms, as understood at the time, represented a move towards a more academic approach which would be less attractive to trainees who had actively chosen to enter the work based route. It could also add an additional layer of bureaucracy to already heavily loaded MA programmes of training.

6. A brief explanation of the Key Skills qualification is included in Appendix 1.

10.6 Although at the time of the study fieldwork, detailed guidance about the new testing arrangements had still to be issued and absorbed, many respondents were clearly concerned about the practicalities. In particular, the timing and logistics of testing arrangements were perceived as being potentially problematic and resource intensive.

10.7 Among trainees, there was a more varied reaction to the prospect of testing, although this variety tended to support, by implication, some of the fears of employers and training professionals. Unsurprisingly, perhaps, trainee reactions seemed to correlate quite strongly with their past educational record, the nature of the occupation for which they were training, and the NVQ for which they were aiming. At one end of the scale, trainees who had entered industry with good GCSE grades, or even A levels, and who were training to be telecommunications or technician engineers, for example, tended to profess no real concern at the prospect. By comparison, trainees with poor academic records at school, and who were training for jobs which were essentially practical in nature, tended to react more negatively.

11. CONCLUSIONS.

11.1 The study has found examples of good practice in key skills delivery but good practice is not yet widely or evenly spread. Effective delivery was found where there was acceptance of the value of key skills, particularly by employers, and where there is some shared understanding of their purpose. Occupational relevance seems to be one of the key factors in gaining such acceptance and understanding. There tended to be a broader interpretation of occupational relevance in those sectors where there was a tradition of apprenticeship training and which included training away from the workplace. Views on occupational relevance of key skills varied from sector to sector, depending largely on sectoral culture and tradition.

11.2 Although not generally well done, there was some good practice on initial assessment. Where this was done well, it helped to ensure the relevance and appropriateness of the training offered, both to individual trainee needs and to sector needs. There was also evidence of some stakeholders investing, in different ways, in developing the competence of trainers and assessors to ensure that key skills and occupational requirements are effectively addressed. However, there is a continuing need for support and guidance to ensure that effective delivery of key skills becomes widespread. The introduction of the Key Skills Qualification from September 2000 is likely to increase the need for support. The areas where there appeared to be greatest need were in:

- gaining full commitment to key skills from all stakeholders, in particular employers;
- increasing levels of understanding of the purpose and nature of key skills, including the new qualification;
- improving initial assessment of key skills; and
- developing the competence of trainers and assessors.

11.3 Achieving occupational relevance, usually through integration of key skills with NVQ training, also appeared to be an important factor in gaining commitment. While good work has been done by some stakeholders through mapping and other development work, there is an ongoing need for support to spread good practice in the design and delivery of integrated training and assessment.

11.4 The Key Skills Support programme, delivered by Learning for Work for the work based route and Further Education Development Agency (FEDA) for FE colleges, is already underway. This Programme's is designed to inform stakeholders about key skills and new developments in the field and also to support a range of development activities to improve practice, including trainer development and guidance on initial assessment. Further good practice guidance on initial assessment is also being produced by the Quality and Performance Improvement Unit of DfEE and is due for publication in December 2000.

11.5 Conclusions from this study will inform the on going planning and development of the Key Skills Support Programme to ensure that it is responsive to the needs of all those involved in key skills delivery.

ANNEX 1

EXTRACTS FROM DFEE PUBLICATION "KEY SKILLS EXPLAINED"

What are Key Skills?

Key Skills are essential skills which people need in order to function effectively as members of a flexible, adaptable, and competitive workforce. They are also invaluable in helping people function within society - and for lifelong learning

Originally developed by the former National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ) for use in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland, the Key Skills specifications cover skills important both in adult and working life *and* for which it is possible to set national standards. Scotland has a comparable system of "Core Skills".

Key skills enable people to be competent and confident in:

- communicating both orally and in writing;
- applying number - tackling numerical problems and collecting, recording, interpreting, and presenting data;
- using information technology (IT);
- working with other people;
- being able to improve their own learning and performance; and
- problem - solving skills.

The Key Skills are described in terms of units at five levels. They are applicable to everyone, from young people to adults established in their careers. The units make clear what people need to know and be able to do at each level. Copies of the revised units for use in programmes starting from September 2000 are available from:

QCA Publications - tel: 0202 7509 5555; fax: 0202 7509 6666;
internet: http://www.qca.org.uk

Basic and Key Skills - a continuum

The Basic Skills are reading, writing, speaking in English (or Welsh), and using mathematics sufficiently well to be able to function in society and at work.

Key Skills build on these skills in three main ways:

- they include a wider range of personal, learning, and work-related skills;
- they require the use of these skills in a wider range of contexts and up to higher levels; and
- they require individuals to make connections between contexts, demonstrating the ability to use skills learned in one environment to meet new standards.

Key Skills Qualification

In order to encourage more young people to develop their competence in the Key Skills, a new Key Skills qualification covering Communication, Application of Number, and Information Technology will be introduced from September 2000. This will consist of the units updated both in terms of the language in which they are expressed and the evidence requirements. This can be taken alongside any programme of study, either in full-time education or as part of work-based training. The qualification will be structured so that individuals can study at the level appropriate to their needs.

Assessment of achievement will comprise two components: an internally assessed portfolio of evidence and a form of external assessment which may be a test of underpinning knowledge, tasks, or an assignment carried out under prescribed conditions.

ANNEX 2

STUDY METHODOLOGY

Study Design

Stage one. In the first stage of the study, individual study team members familiarised themselves with the MA frameworks sectors assigned to them and with the relevant key skills guidance and support materials.

Stage two. Discussions were then be held with the relevant NTO about: its understanding of factors contributing to high or low non-completion rates within its sector; the relative importance of key skills-related issues; how key skills are delivered and assessed within the sector; its role in encouraging and supporting effective delivery; any particular examples of good practice either at sectoral or individual employer/provider level; identifying a number of individual employers and providers which appear either to experience problems with KS delivery and assessment or to display good practice. The Training Standards Council and TECs were also asked to help in this identification, the former based on its inspection experience and the latter based on their contractual relationships with employers and providers.

Stage three. Structured, face-to-face discussions were then carried out with a sample of those organisations identified (see below), using a common discussion schedule. As far as possible, the fieldwork for each sector was undertaken within the area of one TEC.

Stage four. Individual reports were prepared on each sector/area, and these formed the basis of the final report.

The Sample

For each of the eight sectors studied, the sample attempted to include:

- three large employers with their own training departments/premises;
- three smaller employers who rely on separate training providers;
- the training providers used by the smaller employers;
- trainees and, where possible, recent MA completers at all of the above;
- the appropriate TECs; and
- the careers service.

ANNEX 3

THE STUDY TEAM

Study Leads	Ken Holmes	HRH Associates
	Fiona Jordan	QPID
Fieldworkers	John Austin	
	John Barry	JB Consulting
	Fiona Dearling	Ecotec.
	John Embleton	Training Quality Systems.
	Ray French	HRH Associates.
	Ros Sutton	
	David Towler	
Additional Support	Dr Vince Keddie - QPID	

ANNEX 4

FIELDWORK AREAS

Sector Covered	TEC Covered	Regional Area/s Covered
Business Administration	Focus Central London	London and South East
Construction	North Derbyshire	East Midlands
Engineering	Leicestershire	West Midlands and West Midlands
Hospitality	Focus Central London	London and South East
Motor Vehicle Service and Repair	Wakefield	Yorkshire & The Humber
Plumbing	Sheffield	Yorkshire & The Humber and North West
Retail	Tyneside	North East
Telecommunications	North London	London and South East

Sector Covered	NTO	NTO Location
Business Administration	Council for Administration	South London
Construction	Construction Industry Training Board (CITB)	North Norfolk
Engineering	Engineering and Marine Training Authority (EMTA)	Watford
Hospitality	Hospitality Training Foundation	West London
Motor Vehicle Service and Repair	Motor Industry Training Council Ltd	London
Plumbing	BPEC (Training) Ltd	Edinburgh
Retail	Distributive NTO	Hertfordshire
Telecommunications	NTO tele.com	Milton Keynes

ANNEX 5

QFAD PUBLICATIONS

QPID Study Report Series

Study No.	Title	Published	Prolog Product Code
69	Funding Sources for Projects for Disaffected Young People	February 1998	QPID69
70	Work Based Assessment : National Vocational Qualifications and Youth Programmes	December 1998	QPID70
71	Modern Apprenticeships and Gender Stereotyping	March 1999	QPID71
72	Leaving TFW - Trainees who do not Achieve a Payable Positive Outcome	March 1999	QPID72
73	Training for Jobs - Job Outcomes from TFW	March 1999	QPID73
74	Modern Apprenticeships in Licensed Premises	April 1999	QPID74
76	Tackling Early Leaving from Youth Programmes	September 1999	QPID76
77	Entry to Work Based Training for Adults	September 1999	QPID77
78	Review of the 1999-2000 Careers Service Planning and Contracting Round	September 1999	*
79	TEC/CCTEs and Lifelong Learning	November 1999	QPID79
80	Use of the Business Excellence Model in TEC/CCTE Licensing	December 1999	QPID80
81	Mentoring for Work Based Training	January 2000	QPID81
82	Evaluation of Government Office Reports on TEC/CCTE Performance	January 2000	*
83	TEC/CCTE Core Business and Strategic Activities	March 2000	*
84	Modern Apprenticeships and People with Disabilities	March 2000	QPID84
85	TEC/CCTE Activities to Promote National Vocational Qualifications	May 2000	QPID85
86	Implementation of TEC/CCTE Equal Opportunities Strategies	June 2000	QPID86
87	TEC/CCTEs and the Learning Gateway	August 2000	QPID87
88	Investors in People Assessment and Recognition Units	October 2000	QPID88

* Only available on the Internet **- www.dfee.gov.uk/studynet.** Studynet also provides information on forthcoming studies and studies produced in 1996 and 1997.

QPID Good Practice Series

Family/Title	Published	Prolog Product Code
SOCIAL INCLUSION		
TECs and CCTEs Working Towards Achieving Social and Economic Inclusion	December 1998	GPGSI
Equality Assurance - Self-Assessment for Equal Opportunities in Training	April 1999	GPGSI/2
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT		
Using Management Development to Help Small Businesses Grow	March 1999	GPGWD/1
Mentoring for Work Based Training	April 1999	GPGWD/2
RAISING STANDARDS		
TEC/CCTE Activities to Promote National Vocational Qualifications	October 1999	GPGRS/1
Modern Apprenticeships and People with Disabilities Resource Pack	October 1999	RP/1
Health and Safety on Work Experience	November 1999	GPGRS/2
Emerging Good Practice in Developing Trainer Training	March 2000	RS/3
MONITORING, EVALUATION AND RESEARCH		
ROAMEF - An Evaluation Strategy (Photocopy version only)	November 1994	
ENTERPRISE AND THE TEC		
Planning Management Development Provision	May 1997	GPG6/5
Developing Joint Training Initiatives in Business Clusters	March 1998	GPG6/7
Developing Joint Training Initiatives in Business Clusters (Case Study)	March 1998	CS2
Key Worker Development in Small Firms	March 1998	GPG6/8
MARKET RESEARCH		
Planning TEC Market Research	December 1990	GPG7/2
Producing a Labour Market Assessment	January 1992	GPG7/3
An Overview	February 1992	GPG7/1
TRAINER TRAINING		
A Strategy for Trainer Development (Revised)	March 1996	
OTHER GUIDES		
TECs/CCTEs and Schools Working in Partnership	September 1998	GPG3/1

This document is subject to Crown Copyright. Permission is given to photocopy any parts of the document, provided it is not for commercial use.

Further copies of this Study Report, other Study Reports and Guides are available from:

DfEE Publications, P.O. Box 5050, Annesley
Nottingham, NG15 0DJ

Telephone: 0845 602 2260 Fax: 0845 603 3360 minicom: 0845 605 5560
email: dfee@prolog.uk.com

When ordering please provide full title of publication and quote the Prolog product code. For Guides please also state which family the guide belongs to.

Studies or Guides without a Prolog product code are only available from:

Department for Education and Employment, QPID Dissemination and Marketing Team,
Level 3 North, Moorfoot, Sheffield S1 4PQ
Telephone: 0114 259 4174 Fax: 0114 259 4713

Department for
Education and Employment

ISBN:1 84185 375 5
Reference No. QPID89