

Minutes of the Education and Lifelong Learning Committee

Date: 17 May 2001

Time: 2.00pm

Venue: Committee Room 3, National Assembly Building

Attendance:

Members

Cynog Dafis, Chair	Plaid Cymru	Mid and West Wales
Jane Davidson, Assembly Minister	Labour	Pontypridd
Lorraine Barrett	Labour	Cardiff South and Penarth
Eleanor Burnham	Liberal Democrat	North Wales
Christine Chapman	Labour	Cynon Valley
Janice Gregory	Labour	Ogmore
Pauline Jarman	Plaid Cymru	South Wales Central
Gareth Jones	Plaid Cymru	Conwy
Huw Lewis	Labour	Merthyr Tydfil and Rhymney
Jonathan Morgan	Conservative	South Wales Central

Committee Secretariat

Chris Reading	Clerk
Holly Pembridge	Deputy Clerk

Officials

Richard Davies	Director, National Assembly Training and Education Department
Derek Adams	Head, Higher Education Division
Tony Widdrington	Office of the Counsel General

Apologies

Alun Pugh

Substitutions

Christine Chapman

Declarations of Interest

Cynog Dafis Registered Teacher

Jane Davidson Registered Teacher

Huw Lewis Registered Teacher

Lorraine Barrett School Governor

Pauline Jarman Member of Court of Governors, University of Cardiff; and Leader of Rhondda Cynon Taff County Borough Council

Gareth Jones Registered Teacher; and Member of Conwy County Borough Council

Chair's Opening Remarks

The Chair announced that there would be a joint meeting with the Economic Development Committee on 23rd May 2001 as agreed at the last meeting on 9th May 2001. The purpose of the meeting would be to scrutinise both Ministers on the recently announced package of measures to assist communities affected by the redundancies at CORUS steelworks. The joint session would be held in Committee Room 3 and would commence at 1.30pm. A total of 90 minutes would be allocated for this scrutiny.

The Chair also announced that since the Committee's last meeting on 9th May 2001, he had met with Mr Phil Gummatt of the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW). The purpose of the meeting was to review progress. The Chair asked for the Committee's consent for him to write to the University of Wales to obtain their opinion on the paper from Higher Education Wales (HEW), submitted at an earlier meeting of the Committee, outlining their proposals for clustering. Also, the Chair suggested to the

Committee that he write to HEW and HEFCW proposing to ask the two bodies to produce a (joint) paper on the issues of funding and clustering, as it would be useful to have the "voices" of the HE sector in Wales coming together. The Committee agreed to the Chair's proposals.

Item One: Policy Review – Higher Education – Presentation: Lifelong Learning and Widening Access – Lord Dearing

Paper: ELL 09-01(p.1)

1.1 The Chair of the 1997 UK Committee of Inquiry into Education, Lord Ron Dearing spoke about the issues of Lifelong Learning and Widening Access to the Committee. The Chair then invited Committee Members to pose questions to Lord Dearing.

1.2 The following issues were raised in discussion:

- Members asked Lord Dearing to comment on how the current 'A'-Level qualification could be broadened, in accordance with the Welsh Baccalaureate, as the current 'A'-Level qualification as it stood might encourage young people to refuse education. Lord Dearing referred to his paper and noted the correlation between social deprivation and low-levels of participation and achievement in education. He informed the Committee that he had been invited to prepare a report on the topic of 'A'-Levels. Lord Dearing described how in the UK, the students/pupils specialised in three 'A'-Levels but how nowhere else in the world focused in this way. Lord Dearing informed the Committee that he advocated encouraging breadth in this qualification area – and that the concept of 'AS'-Levels was a good mechanism for combining breadth. In principle, the Welsh Baccalaureate was a good way to encourage breadth. However, care had to be exercised with regard to university admissions, as admissions (staff) would be interested solely in whether students performed well in their chosen subject area instead of breadth of subject choice/provision. The International Baccalaureate had already fought this battle.
- Members were interested to know Lord Dearing's opinion on the issue of upfront tuition fees and their subsequent implication on broadening the social base of HE. Lord Dearing responded that to an extent, this was an issue of principle and also practicality. Universities had had their unit of resource depleted. The UK Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education was of the view that it was imperative to maintain the quality of education. Universities needed a new source of funding and the UK Committee had offered the Government four or five options. The Committee had preferred tuition fees as it was felt that the student benefitted from university education. Those who didn't go to university had still made a public investment, hence students should have been prepared to make some contribution as they would have had the advantage of undertaking a university education. This in some form was considered by the UK Committee to be a form of social justice.
- The Minister welcomed the breadth of Lord Dearing's paper in relation to the HE sector in Wales. The Minister raised the issue of North East Wales Institute's (NEWI) fair fee proposals and asked Lord Dearing to comment on this idea with regards to widening access. Lord Dearing undertook to provide a written response to the Minister regarding this query.
- The Minister commented on the valued work of Universities for Industry (Ufi Cymru) and asked Lord Dearing to comment on how Wales could utilise the Ufi system of delivery to widen access through all institutions in Wales. Lord Dearing responded that around 70% of course material (available in bite-sized chunks) could be accessed via the Web and could be accessed in any school, college or university. All materials were contracted out to individuals in the private sector. Lord Dearing commented that Ufi had proposed to help CORUS.

- The Minister referred to Lord Dearing's paper (p.3, 30-32) and asked him to comment further on his ideas on fostering collaboration between research-based institutions in the context of limited resources. Lord Dearing responded that he did not think that all elements of competition should be eradicated. British research activities used modest resources but had still produced world-class research. From the amount of competition that had existed, it had been ensured that the money had gone where it would have been used most effectively. The idea of consortia was good, as the distinctive strengths of various institutions needed to be identified in conjunction with a strategic approach formulated by the Funding Council. A clear framework of encouragement would be needed from the Funding Council. Research for the exploitation of knowledge should be limited to research-intensive institutions. Lorraine Barrett asked if Lord Dearing could provide a paper outlining the Hull scheme. Lord Dearing undertook to do so.
- Members raised the concern over the perceived hierarchy of respectable and non-respectable degrees. Non-traditional degrees such as Media Studies had recently come under criticism for not being traditional and therefore not as respectable as other degrees. Members wanted to know whether debate about the types of degree awarded would encourage access and motivation. Lord Dearing stated that the range of knowledge was developing fast. This growth in knowledge should fall in line with the expansion of the economy. People needed to be excited by the subjects they studied— media was a part of many peoples' lives. It was in students' interests to vigorously check out subjects relevant to their needs.

Item Two: Policy Review – Higher Education – Key Theme Discussion – Quality – Presentations by John Randall of the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) and Professor Mike Scott, on behalf of HEW.

Paper: ELL 09-01(p.2) and (p.3)

2.1 John Randall of the QAA and Professor Mike Scott, on behalf of HEW spoke on the key theme of Quality. Both presenters referred to their papers.

2.2 The following issues were raised in discussion:

- Members raised concern over what impact the QAA's new regime of subject review would have on an already over-burdened system and how this could be coped with. John Randall informed the Committee that subject reviews shouldn't put a burden on already well-run institutions; every university had its own internal means of evaluating themselves. The subject reviews would use the same information as the universities would also use/need for their own internal processes. There were risks in HE institutions over-preparing for the external reviews, mainly because of the fact that it was in the public domain. There should be a basis of sampling and looking at the best, current intelligence and then a decision on whether to assess everything.
- Members were concerned to know if the position of the Constituent Institutions and the University colleges within the University of Wales was seen to be ambiguous across the UK and if so, what were the dangers of this? John Randall stated that the potential difficulty was ensuring full accountability for academic standards and quality. Delivery at a distance would mean that there would be a longer chain of accountability. The lines of accountability should be clear and not too long.
- Members were interested to know about the Quality Assurance (QA) implications of moving toward one of the proposed models for HE in Wales: all institutions in Wales being brought together under

the banner of the University of Wales. John Randall responded that whoever had responsibility for quality measures should be properly held accountable. These quality measures should have an appropriate degree of externality at all levels.

- The Chair asked Professor Scott to comment on whether he believed the situation of variety of standards across Wales was satisfactory or if it was better to have a 'golden standard' across Wales. Was it credible for a small country to develop a 'golden standard' and hence, beneficial for marketing purposes? Professor Scott stated that when he had worked with the CNNA, the minimum standard of degree must have been met. Small countries should be able to meet this criteria in their institutions. This raised the issue of the function of the academic board in the University of Wales and whether it should have academic responsibility and accountability. This relationship would have to be exacted through the QAA.
- The Chair highlighted and reiterated his question on whether a degree was perceived to be the same at different institutions in Wales. John Randall argued that with regards to a minimum standard, a national framework for England, Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland should be established; rigorous descriptors should be in place. It would be better if First Class Honours degrees were abolished. A 2:1 degree classification was an averaging out of marks received. It would be more beneficial to move to a transcript system and record an individual's achievements more meaningfully.
- Members referred to HEW's submission on the theme of "Size and Shape" at a previous meeting when the concept of "clusters" was put forward. Members asked Professor Scott to comment on what the QA implications were for such a move. Professor Scott commented that there could be some apprehension when discussing clustering into strategic partnerships in particular regions for fear that collaboration/partnerships would just be on a regional basis. However, this had not been the case in North Wales: NEWI and the University of Wales, Bangor had formed an effective strategic alliance. One issue that had been identified from this partnership was how to maintain the quality and enhance the quality of two institutions that were equal and working for the benefit of the students.
- Members were interested to know what the possible QA implications were of the 'one country', one university' model being proposed via HEW, especially with regards to University colleges, institutions without degree awarding power and the Validation service. Professor Scott responded that there were anomalies within the University of Wales: Constituent colleges, such as the University of Wales, Bangor and the University of Wales, Aberystwyth did not have degree awarding powers, with the exception of Cardiff, Newport and the University of Wales Institute, Cardiff (UWIC). NEWI did not have the title of university but had devolved power like the University of Wales, Aberystwyth. There was a need to look to the future, as regionalisation and partnerships were occurring in Europe. Wales had to be careful it was not treated as a region. It would be beneficial to develop a strategy and start benchmarking with regions that were partners. John Randall added that the European dimension was important as it posed a competitive threat: a large number of subjects were now being taught through the medium of English in European universities. For example, Engineering could be taught through the medium of English; European institutions were tapping into the market of UK institutions. UK institutions had to compete successfully to match standards in Europe.
- The Minister raised the issue that legislatively, Funding Councils chose who delivered the QA agenda. Consequently, could Wales consider looking to a new University of Wales model and developing its own QA and where then, would the remit lie between the National Assembly and the Funding Council? John Randall agreed that the statutory responsibility for QA lay with the Funding Councils. Caution had to be exercised if Wales wanted to operate on a Wales-only QA system, as experience of other countries similarly sized to Wales had found it necessary to collaborate with others in order to recruit reviewers and obtain comparable standards. For example, there had been co-operation between the Scandinavian countries for QA purposes/development. If Wales went its own way, so to speak, it would have to overcome the problem of the small number of institutions it

had. Professor Scott added that he was surprised that there had not been any discussions between Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales (HEFCW). However, HEW had confidence in the ways QA were operating (through HEFCW) and its transparent accountability. This raised the issue of the nature and role of the academic board of the University of Wales.

- The Chair asked Professor Scott if he could provide a response to some of the questions he posed in his paper, (p.3, 5-7) or indeed if HEW had a timetable to assess these issues. Also, how did HEW intend to proceed with the debate? Professor Scott explained that he would go back to HEW and obtain a report for the Chair. Professor Scott recommended that dialogue should continue to exist between the National Assembly and HEW as this was the future of the debate.
- Members raised the issue that as individual Funding Councils contracted with the QAA for it to discharge the function on their behalf, could John Randall respond to the criticism from some of the Russell Group institutions (i.e. the London School of Economics), who have indicated that they have considered contracting out of this process? John Randall commented that the answer consisted of two elements: one of principle and one of legality. On principle, John Randall stated that he didn't think the HE sector could expect to receive the money it did without demonstrating spend. There would always be individuals demanding accountability and devaluing operations in action. With regards to contracting out, organisations were free to 'walk out'. The Funding Councils had statutory responsibility – as long as this was the case, there would be no question of the Russell Group stating these criticisms.
- Members asked how important it was that the QA system applied to Welsh HEIs was comparable or even exactly the same, as that across the UK. John Randall informed the Committee that the European Network of Quality Agencies was looking to develop greater comparability on a pan-European basis. Currently, the National Quality Framework was regarded as an appropriate benchmark.
- Members were interested to know how the Academic Quality Assurance for HE in FE be carried out within Wales and were there possibilities in Wales for efficiency gains whilst maintaining effectiveness? John Randall stated that the QAA was talking to The National Council for Education and Learning Wales (ELWa) about its responsibilities. There was a proper need to judge HEIs consistently, as they did not need burdens. Professor Scott added that both the NEWI project and the 'cluster' initiative worked on the basis of efficiency and quality of provision.

Item Three: Policy Review – Higher Education – Key Theme Presentation – Welsh Medium Teaching – by Gwilym Humphreys and Dr Cen Williams of the University Board for Welsh Medium Teaching and Dafydd Glyn Jones of the University of Wales, Bangor.

Paper: ELL 09-01(p.4) and (p.5)

3.1 Gwilym Humphreys (Chair) and Dr Cen Williams (Development Officer) of the University Board for Welsh Medium Teaching made a joint presentation on the theme of Welsh Medium Teaching. Dafydd Glyn Jones, (Reader in Welsh Language and Literature at the University of Wales, Bangor), also spoke on the same theme. All presenters referred to their papers.

3.2 The following issues were raised in discussion:

- The Chair asked to what extent was there common ground between the viewpoints of Gwilym Humphreys/Dr Cen Williams and Dafydd Glyn Jones on the issue of the possibility of moving towards a Welsh Federal College. Gwilym Humphreys responded that the views of Dr Cen Williams

and himself were not too far apart from those of Dafydd Glyn Jones. However, the fundamental difference in their ideas was that Dafydd Glyn Jones was setting targets for the future and the University Board for Welsh Medium teaching were considering the present situation and fully believed that Wales could build on the existing system and develop from the existing resources available. The aim that Dafydd Glyn Jones was setting was valid and the HE sector in Wales could aim for this in the future. However, Gwilym Humphreys added that he did not think that Dafydd Glyn Jones' idea of 200 lecturers being appointed over the next five years could be exacted in light of the present funding system. Overall, the University Board for Welsh Medium Teaching supported the idea of federalisation.

Dr Cen Williams added that he was asked recently if he believed in the idea of one Welsh College and he had replied "no". However, the way in which Dafydd Glyn Jones collaborated and thought was similar to his own ways. On the basis of the Support Unit, there could be an opportunity to develop a great number of lecturers in fields where there was no Welsh Medium teaching. At present, Welsh Medium teaching was confined to Education and Arts faculties. There was less Welsh Medium teaching in Business, Scientific and Professional fields. Before a Welsh Federal College (WFC) was established, Wales must have a sufficient number of lecturers in the Scientific, Business and Professional fields to maintain a credible system. Also, a move to collaboration via the Web/IT was a step in the right direction. In the Business Plan of the Board, the name, 'Federal College' was mentioned.

Dafydd Glyn Jones added that his views did not coincide with those of the Board. Critical mass could not be obtained with less than 200 lecturers: ten lecturers each would be needed in some 20 subjects and this would be essential for a credible system. The Chair asked Dafydd Glyn Jones to comment on whether he saw critical mass being achieved over a period of time, rather than instantly. Dafydd Glyn Jones responded that he envisaged this occurring over a period of five years. He added that it was a huge decision for the Funding Council but a positive suggestion from the ELL Committee would help move ideas forward.

- Members were interested to know what was the size of the current market for Welsh Medium provision. Dr Williams stated that the market for Welsh Medium provision had not increased that much over the last few years. When considering last summer's 'A'-Level papers, only 1800 were sat through the medium of Welsh. A questionnaire was also distributed to sixth forms of Welsh Medium/bilingual schools (a total of 52 institutions). 500 hundred forms were scrutinised out of those returned and 84 per cent of students wanted to pursue HE in Wales; this was compared with 60 per cent, some 10 years ago. The year 2003 would open up an operational level of bilingualism in the other 177 schools that were not teaching through the medium of Welsh. The market would increase in the future.
- Members raised the issue of whether e-learning was a practical and affordable solution and what contribution e-learning might have towards wide-scale provision of Welsh Medium teaching. Dr Williams argued that the packaging of e-learning was essential. Video-conferencing was available in universities but it was old-fashioned, as it could not transfer courses. There was a need for a more vibrant and interactive method of learning/teaching. E-learning would open up this market. Gwilym Humphreys added that when looking at the figures of students leaving Welsh Medium schools, a large number of students wanted to go to the universities at Cardiff and Swansea. However, these institutions did not offer any modules/courses through the medium of Welsh. The Board would like to see students offered Welsh Medium provision in these colleges.
- Members were interested to know whether the required level of Welsh Medium provision could be sustained without additional funding (given the many calls on HE resources) and if this were not the case, what level of funding would realistically be required? Dr Williams argued for the need for more developmental funding. At present, there were two streams for Welsh Medium funding: an additional

1.26% per capita premium for those students which followed a course through the medium of Welsh and there was another stream of funding available from HEFCW for development in Welsh Medium education. FTEs from previous years had to be withstood in order to benefit from funding. All the funding went to six institutions, including Trinity College (Carmarthen), the University of Wales, Bangor, the University of Wales Aberystwyth and UWIC. The University of Wales, Cardiff did not receive any of this funding, as neither did NEWI. There were 1600 Welsh speaking students who attended Glamorgan University and the University of Wales, Cardiff. Funding was also needed to help establish the Support Unit that the Board was proposing. Dafydd Glyn Jones stated that he would like to see HEFCW agreeing to fund the WFC, on the same principle that central services were traditionally funded e.g. the University Press and Gregynog. The WFC should be funded independently and centrally.

- Huw Lewis indicated to the Chair that he had some comments to address to Dafydd Glyn Jones regarding the paper he submitted to the Committee (p.5). Huw Lewis was not sure whether the paper was meant to be flippant and ironic or serious. If it was serious then, in his view, *"it was not of a standard that the Committee could consider"*. Huw Lewis expressed concern that in his view, the paper carried sexist and xenophobic undertones and pointed to certain phrases in the paper. *"I envisage three categories of fellowships..."* (p.13, paragraph 5.3) and *"The English in the University of Wales would be hopping mad..."* (p.21, second paragraph) – did this mean English by descent or English-speaking? There were references to *"sheep and goats"*, *"it would separate some of the sheep from the goats..."*, (p.17, paragraph 8.4) which Huw Lewis interpreted as to mean, *"Welsh speakers and non-Welsh speakers"*.

Also, Huw Lewis was concerned about Dafydd Glyn Jones proposing an elitist institution: *" at the same time, nurture a patriotic Welsh elite..."* (p.6, paragraph 2.1) and *" We should accept that Wales's central problem today is the lack of a stable and self-perpetuating, native governing class..."* (p.21, third paragraph).

The Chair responded that as Chair of the ELL Committee, he had decided that it had been appropriate for the Committee to read and accept the paper as Dafydd Glyn Jones had been arguing for the idea of a Welsh Federal College for many years. Huw Lewis then pointed out that Dafydd Glyn Jones's paper was not a value-free document. He proposed a motion that the Committee should strike from the record or not consider Paper Five (Dafydd Glyn Jones's paper). The Chair then informed Huw Lewis that he was not prepared to accept this motion at that time and wished to continue with questioning presenters. The Chair added that he would have preferred if Huw Lewis had expressed his intentions to propose a motion for Paper Five to be struck off or not considered by the Committee, prior to this meeting. The Chair would discuss this matter with Huw Lewis and the Clerk outside the Committee meeting and Huw Lewis could bring the motion up at the next Committee meeting.

Dafydd Glyn Jones stated that one had to be ironic when discussing the University of Wales as, in his view, it was an ambiguous and comic institution. Dafydd Glyn Jones accepted that his paper could be deemed ironic but he did not accept that his paper was flippant. *"There was not one word that had not been spoken out of care for the honour of the country (Wales)"; "if the paper is politically unacceptable there is nothing I can say...you won't go anywhere in Wales unless you rock the boat..."*

- Members were interested to know what should be done to ensure that sufficient Welsh Medium materials could be provided. Dr Williams informed the Committee that there were many aspects that needed to be considered with regard to the work that would happen in the Support Unit. Terminology experts were needed in order to translate the work of academics into Welsh, where relevant. There

was a need to translate the main things which students would need to follow courses effectively and successfully. Dafydd Glyn Jones added that, "*books would not write themselves, people were needed, hence the suggestion of 200 teachers/lecturers as a critical mass*".

- The Minister congratulated the University of Wales and the University of Glamorgan for putting money into the Development Unit. The Minister raised several issues. The Minister asked the Board's presenters to comment on the fact that legislation meant that the sector had to operate on a supply/demand basis. The Minister also asked the Board if they could provide the Committee with funding proposals/reasonable costings of expanding existing Welsh Medium provision in Wales as it would be useful for the Committee's HE Review. The Minister also accepted that in the University of Wales, Cardiff and the University of Wales, Swansea, courses could not be taken through the medium of Welsh. Therefore, the Minister was interested to know how distance learning could help expand Welsh medium provision. Also, the Minister asked the Dr Williams and Gwilym Humphreys to comment on the issues of equality of assessment, through bilingual external examiners. Dr Williams responded that the sector had not responded to the demand in Wales; a number of sixth form students had turned to English courses because Welsh medium courses were not available. There was a need to extend demand in order to achieve a bilingual Wales. Dr Williams added that the Board would consider funding proposals and would turn to the Funding Council for guidance. Dr Williams asked by when these projections would be required and what period would they cover. The Minister responded that the Committee would be looking to create a vision over a ten-year period and the projections would be needed in time for the Review; she advised Dr Williams to speak with the Committee's Expert Adviser, Professor Les Hobson. Gwilym Humphreys added that Dr Williams had been in post since last September and the issue of funding had been on the Board's agenda. Dr Williams also responded to the Minister's question on equality of assessment. A system must be in place at present, as a number of students chose to answer their examination papers and extended essays in Welsh. These were then translated in to English for assessment purposes. There was already expertise in two universities in Wales: academic translators picked out any detail in standard and any ambiguity. It was Dr Williams's intention in June to call on all translators to devise a system where one institution would be responsible for academic translation and subsequently Quality Assurance.
- The Minister also raised the issue of areas of shortage in Welsh speaking disciplines, i.e. Educational Psychologists and Speech and Language Therapists. She asked if the Development Unit could look at ways in encouraging people to fulfil these functions and help the National Assembly deliver its statutory agenda of delivering a bilingual Wales? Dr Williams stated that the Board would be looking at this issue next week when five medical disciplines, including speech therapy, would be discussed/represented in a conference at Gregynog.
- Janice Gregory asked to be included in the Chair's discussion with Huw Lewis and the Clerk outside the Committee meeting. Janice Gregory also asked Dr Williams what HEW's opinion was of Dafydd Glyn Jones's paper. Dr Cen Williams said that he could not answer this question, as he was not a member of HEW.
- Janice Gregory expressed support for Huw Lewis's comments regarding Dafydd Glyn Jones's paper and in particular, the allusion to a Welsh-speaking honour. As Janice Gregory stated she was born in Wales, she had found it offensive that it was implied that Welsh honour was held primarily by Welsh speaking people of Welsh origin. Also, Janice Gregory referred to Dafydd Glyn Jones's remarks regarding bringing student numbers down, "*If the University of Wales...it must bring the student numbers down, by raising requirements...*" (p.6-7, paragraph 2.2). Janice Gregory argued that one couldn't guarantee that those (elite) educated in Wales would remain in Wales after completion of their studies. Janice Gregory also queried whether Dafydd Glyn Jones was asking the Committee to send a message to the people of Wales that it was not possible to be educated anywhere in Wales through the medium of Welsh. Dafydd Glyn Jones responded that it indeed was not possible to

guarantee that those educated in Wales would therefore remain in Wales. He refuted the idea that he had drawn a line between Welsh speakers and non-Welsh speakers. As for reducing student numbers, the number of students was too large to initiate a common examination system. The fact was that the size of the University of Wales was far beyond the demand from Wales. Dr Williams added that earlier on the discussion, he had made reference to a number of faculties which did provide courses/modules through the medium of Welsh: some Education faculties, some History faculties and some Music departments did offer some form of provision. However, this provision did not extend to the Business, Science and Professional faculties and these faculties needed to be included in Welsh Medium provision. The Welsh College of Medicine had recently introduced some communication modules in Welsh for those students wishing to become doctors. Gwilym Humphreys added that through projects that the Board had funded, new ground was hopefully being broken, in aiming to include subject areas where there has never been Welsh Medium provision; flexibility was needed to respond to demand.

- The Chair raised two issues. Firstly, in light of the universities outside Britain, using English as a medium of teaching (especially in the Sciences), did this raise any doubts in the minds of the presenters about the promotion of Welsh Medium teaching in Scientific fields? Secondly, the Chair posed the question to Dafydd Glyn Jones of whether he foresaw a student registered in the WFC becoming a full member of the college if he/she studied a small percentage through the medium of Welsh? Dafydd Glyn Jones chose to answer the second query. He stated that there was a case for anyone following a certain percentage of his or her studies through the medium of Welsh to become eligible to be a member of the WFC. Dafydd Glyn Jones stated that, "*the trend everywhere was to be English linguistically; another trend had been that countries were kicking the English out politically but adopting the language*". "*We all belong to the island of Britain but our (the Welsh) historical fate will be different to the English*".
- Members raised the concern that there was a lack of continuity between schools and the HE sector; also children/students could not continue their education in FE/HE through the medium of Welsh. Dr Williams responded that there was a need to look at the FE sector as well. The latest figure was 2.6%, so there was room to manoeuvre. He argued that the Support Unit could serve both sectors together and serve the whole Post-16 sector in Wales. The two sectors were currently apart in terms of Funding and Accountability.
- Members asked if there was anything that the Committee could do to ensure the establishment of a WFC. The Chair added the presenters to comment if they expected the Funding Council, the University of Wales and the National Assembly to respond to this venture. Dafydd Glyn Jones responded that, "*he would like things to happen at the same time*". He would like to see the establishment of a voluntary working party – a cross-college federal committee. It would be favourable if the Committee brought this idea into their report on this review and brings it to the Funding Council. Dr Williams added that the Board had more detailed papers, some outlining, the Marketing/Development of Welsh Medium Provision and Distance-Learning. The Chair responded that the Committee would accept the papers as written submissions.
- The Minister commented that "Further to Huw Lewis's question I think there is an issue which I would be grateful if you would consider with the Clerk, over the appropriacy of language in papers that come to this Committee. The discussion that we have just had means we were not able to have a proper discussion about the merits of a federal college because of the way the sentiments were expressed; and I think that in terms of papers coming to this Committee it's incumbent on a relationship between the Chair and the Clerk to look at the kind of language used in papers to this Committee, because I would suggest that the paper that was given to us today in terms of the presentation was acceptable in a way that some of the contributions in the paper that was given to us to read prior to the Committee - [like other members of this Committee] I'm afraid I did not find that acceptable and I think we do need to be more careful about that in the future in terms of

ensuring there are not attitudes that Members could construe as inappropriate in terms of coming from somebody who was there to give expert evidence to the Committee and this situation has not arisen before in any of the presentations in terms of the Higher Education Review".

Item Four: Inspection of Education and Training (Wales) Regulations 2001, for consideration by the Committee.

Paper: ELL 09-01(p.6)

4.1 The Deputy Presiding Officer, under Standing Order 5.6, had referred to these draft regulations to the Committee – with a remit to report back by 29th May. The paper included the draft regulations, an explanatory memorandum and a note on the significance of the Regulations and the Committee's powers. The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the draft regulations.

4.2 The following issues were raised in discussion:

- The Minister stated that she was surprised when the regulations were transferred to the Committee, as they had gone out to consultation and most commentators had welcomed them. There were five extra days allocated for translation. The Minister informed the Committee that she was grateful for its comments.
- Pauline Jarman asked why the regulations had not been implemented on 1st April 2001, as opposed to 1st August 2001. The Minister responded that it was appropriate that the regulations went in front of Plenary. Also, the FE colleges' term started on 1st August 2001.
- Gareth Jones expressed concern that the Committee had not participated in the consultation process. The Minister stated that Estyn were consulting on the next inspection cycle for 2004. The Committee would be involved in that process.

The Committee approved the draft regulations and explanatory note.

Item Five: Minutes of 9th May meeting

Paper: ELL 08-01(mins)

The Committee ratified the minutes of the previous meeting: 9th May 2001.

Paper to Note

Paper to Note: Revised Proposals on performance management for teachers, including draft regulations.

Paper: ELL 09-01(p.7)

Committee Secretariat May 2001