



Self-regulation – the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one – 1 October 2008

Seminar report

1. This report sets out:
 - the aims of the seminar
 - emerging messages and areas for further discussion
 - a summary of speakers' presentations
 - a report of the discussion
 - the names of seminar participants.
2. This report aims to capture the substance and richness of the contributions and discussion. Other than the notes attributed to and agreed with the keynote speakers, the report does not attribute views to individuals and does not seek to imply consensus where none was reached.

Aims of the seminar

- To understand the policy context for self-regulation within the public service reform process;
- To discuss the rationale and key dimensions of the Single Voice's prospectus for self-regulation for the learning and skills sector; and
- To identify areas of consensus and dimensions of the proposals that require detailed exploration and discussion at future seminars.

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

Emerging messages and areas for further discussion

3. The discussion did not seek to reach a view about the specific proposals in the Single Voice's self-regulation prospectus since participants were invited to read the document issued on the day and respond after more reflection. However broad principles were beginning to emerge, together with an agenda of areas in need of further exploration as follows:
 - self-regulation should be primarily about improving the performance of the whole system not merely the *rescue* of failing providers; it's about helping all providers however good they are to become better;
 - self-assessment and self-improvement, embedded in the culture of individual professionals and organisations, should be key pillars for self-regulation in the learning and skills system;
 - for many sector organisations, excellent public trusteeship and governance should be a cornerstone of self-regulation; for those providers without boards, robust arrangements for public accountability need to be in place;
 - for self-regulation to succeed the professionals working in the sector must be trusted, and the sector overall must act with self-confidence, operate with greater autonomy, be willing to innovate, manage risk and be honest about failures without fear of retribution;
 - peer review and development and other forms of collaborative working have a potentially key role to play in developing the capacity for self-regulation and self-improvement. Further consultation will be necessary to establish the scope and status of collaborative approaches to review and development within a self-regulating system;
 - the model of self-regulation must be capable of adapting to new priorities, systems and structures as these evolve;
 - the political concern that self-regulation should be capable of dealing with under-performance must be addressed, whilst recognising that this is an issue for a small minority of providers;
 - a wide view of the scope of the learning and skills sector should be adopted, keeping an open mind as to the extent to which a single approach to self-regulation will be appropriate for all providers;
 - if the sector is to take responsibility for regulating its own performance, it must take collective ownership of the regulatory standards, including the key measures and indicators against which performance will be assessed;

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

- the performance measures and indicators should reflect a reasonable settlement between the three dimensions set out in the Cabinet Office's Excellence and Fairness¹ - the aspirations of the sector's learners, customers and communities (*empowered citizens*); the professional views of the sector (*new professional*); and of government's priorities (*strategic leadership*);
- the performance measures and indicators should be capable of reflecting organisational mission and capacity, local context and priorities; and
- the performance management system needs to take account of the evolving approach to public service delivery in the locality which increasingly requires collaborative action by public services to address local priorities, without compromising the greater autonomy required to operate in a demand-led system; the proposed Comprehensive Area Assessment (area-based inspection) already points towards integrated assessment of performance in the locality. Should a common framework be developed that facilitates collaborative delivery by local players, rather than a discrete system for learning and skills?

Summary of keynote presentations



Ben Jupp, Senior Adviser, Public Services and Democracy, Strategy Unit, Cabinet Office

4. Ben's address² focused on the broader landscape of public service reform – he said he was speaking on *public services as a whole* rather than FE and training specifically.

¹ *Excellence and Fairness: Achieving world class public services*. Cabinet Office, 2008

http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/%7E/media/assets/www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/strategy/publications/world_class_public_services%20pdf.ashx

A summary version is also available here:

<http://www.centreforexcellence.org.uk/UsersDoc/BriefGuidetoExcellenceandFairness.pdf>

² Slides associated with Ben's address are available through the following link -

<http://www.centreforexcellence.org.uk/UsersDoc/E&FpublicServicesBenJupp.pdf>

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

5. As a whole, public services had improved greatly over the past 10 years, though Ben noted *things can be better*. For example, MORI has found that people are much less concerned now about the quality of the public services than they were in the past couple of decades. MORI also found that fewer people were concerned about the state of the education system than at any time since 1986.
6. Ben then spoke on the future of public services – *Where next?* The next phase of public service improvement will centre on the personalisation of services - on increasing the quality of person-to-person contact between public servants and those they serve. Improvement will come from improving citizens' interactions with front-line public service employees. *It is often within the individual relationship between public servant and customer that transformation takes place*. Ben cited the success of neighbourhood policing teams as an example.
7. *What are the critical elements of this relationship?* Firstly, users should have the knowledge and skills that allow them both to demand better services and to contribute to them. Ben argued that extending *the choice agenda* would allow citizens more control and influence over the provision of public services.
8. However, users cannot spontaneously develop these skills. They need support to properly access and shape public services. This is where the *new professionalism* agenda, cited in the recent Government publication *Excellence and fairness*, plays a role. Public servants must be better-skilled, more innovative and more self-regulating.
9. Previously, a culture of *individual amateurism* prevailed at the front line of public service delivery. Now, clearer guidelines and concrete professional standards have ensured better practice. But these guidelines should not be a bar to innovation by public servants – *they are a base from which people should innovate, not a ceiling*.
10. To foster innovation and achieve excellence, we must ensure that:
 - the sector recruits and trains the best people, the best graduates from universities and colleges. Ben noted that teacher quality makes the greatest difference to educational outcomes – the best education systems are the ones that recruit the best people to be teachers and lecturers;
 - peer-to-peer systems and other professional accountability systems are in place, including systems that are part of a self-regulating environment. There must be accountability to Government, to fellow professionals and to users – not to just one group (what some people call '360-degree' accountability); and
 - the public services are transparent about the outcomes they achieve and how they can achieve these outcomes, so that accountability can be effective.
11. Lastly, to foster an environment of personalised services, based on empowered users and professionals, Government still needs to exercise strategic leadership. It needs to focus on its strategic role without concerning itself with details. There would be fewer targets and more self-improvement in the public services.

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008



Sir George Sweeney, Chair, the Single Voice for Self-regulation

12. A 'prospectus for self-regulation' has now been prepared under the direction of the Single Voice and submitted to the Secretary of State. Following receipt of the Government's response, it is intended that the prospectus will be presented to the sector for wider consultation and feedback.
13. The Prospectus builds on the 'proposition for self-regulation' submitted to the Secretary of State in November 2007 and represents the culmination of the work of the self-regulation project team. Responsibilities for taking this work forward will now rest with the Single Voice, working with other sector-led bodies.
14. The case for self-regulation remains unchanged. The performance and reputation of the sector continues to improve and measures should now be taken to allow the sector greater responsibility in managing its own affairs, with reduced regulation by government bodies. The capacity of the sector to tackle underperformance, including performance that is not improving, will, however, represent a key challenge in developing a new self-regulating system.
15. The self-regulation prospectus offers a clear vision for self-regulation and the processes on which it should be based. The prospectus, intentionally, does not address structural issues, including those arising from changes in the Machinery of Government, but is sufficiently generic in scope to accommodate structural changes that might emerge at national, regional or local levels. The Single Voice will consult widely with the sector, sector-led bodies and government agencies in determining how proposals set out in the prospectus should be taken forward.

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008



Sue Dutton, member, self-regulation project team, Deputy Chief Executive, Association of Colleges

16. The self-regulation prospectus has been produced following an extensive process of development work and reflection by the self-regulation project team, deliberations within the Single Voice and consultation with the wider sector. It is a comprehensive document, totalling 55 pages, that is supported by a range of discussion and position papers. The prospectus offers more than a conceptual model of self-regulation; it establishes the principles and processes that should underpin a self-regulating FE system, the details of which will be explored at future seminars. It sets in, in broad terms, the responsibilities of those working within the system though it does not, at this stage, present detailed structural solutions to the system-wide management of self-regulation.
17. The prospectus sets out how the sector will develop and demonstrate its capacity for self-regulation and self improvement. It recognises that the primary responsibility for this must rest with individual providers and their staff, through agreed processes of organisational and professional review and development, based on best practice standards. The prospectus also emphasises the collaborative responsibilities of providers within a self-regulating system and potential importance of processes such as peer review and development in assuring and improving performance standards across the sector.
18. The prospectus recognises that the terms under which providers carry out their regulatory and development responsibilities must be set within regulatory standards and controls that are defined at a system-wide level. These must be consistent with greater provider autonomy on the one hand and the maintenance of sector standards on the other. The development of effective risk management systems will be critical to the achievement of these aims.
19. Finally the prospectus recognises that an effective and efficient system of self-regulation can only be achieved by reducing the current level of external regulation within the FE system. The Single Voice looks forward to further discussions with government to achieve this end.
20. These principles of self-regulation are developed more fully through four key propositions that underpin the prospectus for self-regulation:

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

- a Further Education Accord setting out the agreement on regulatory matters between government and the sector, to include the expectation that the sector will take increased responsibility for managing its own performance and reputation, with reduced levels of external regulation.
 - a Framework for Performance Management and Improvement which identifies individual, organisational, collaborative and sector-wide responsibilities for managing and improving performance.
 - a Framework for Accountability which sets out in more detail how the sector takes responsibility for its own performance and reputation, using approaches that are proportionate to risk.
 - a sector-owed vehicle, a 'further education authority', to oversee the implementation and management of self-regulation, to include a further education code, linked to a licence to operate and a differentiated system of intervention and support for tackling underperformance.
21. The production of the prospectus has presented a major challenge in defining, in sufficient detail, the key principles and processes of a self-regulating system whilst avoiding premature closure of discussions on ways of establishing the most appropriate balance of responsibilities within such a system (defining the 'self' in self-regulation) and the type and level of system-level regulation that is consistent with moves towards greater provider autonomy. In this sense the prospectus is conceived of as a starting point in more formal consultation with the sector and government on how a self-regulating FE system might be realised. It is hoped that the planned series of LSIS seminars on self-regulation will contribute to this end.

The discussion

The purpose of self-regulation

22. The model set out in *Excellence and fairness* is based on the premise that to move from good to great, public services have to empower, animate and engage the professionalism of their workforce; and government has to trust them to exercise their greater, *presumed*, autonomy. More autonomous professionals will better be able to empower customers to engage in co-designing services that meet their aspirations. We took this as the context for self-regulation – a means of moving the sector as a whole from good to great.

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

23. It was noted more than once that DIUS is very much committed to an empowered and self-regulating sector within a slimmer infrastructure. The important role given by DIUS to the sector-led bodies³ within the evolving landscape should not be overlooked and is another indication of government's determination in relation to this agenda. For example, the Bureaucracy Reduction Group acts in the interests of the sector as *grit in the oyster* of the existing regulatory landscape.
24. More generally, the Prime Minister's Office, the National Audit Office, HM Treasury and the Cabinet Office are all committed to a broader agenda of public service and professional autonomy – and to a shift from *earned autonomy* to *presumed autonomy*.
25. We were absolutely clear about the significance of this phase of development – potentially it is a leap as significant in terms of the learning and skills sector's role as incorporation was for FE colleges in 1992. Now the pressure is on to grasp the opportunity, demonstrate the sector's capacity and establish the learning and skills sector as an exemplar for other areas of education as well as for other areas of public service.
26. An ambitious view of the purpose of self-regulation is vital. A number of participants expressed a concern that self-regulation should not be primarily about *rescue* for those in trouble or combating *under-performance* – it should inspire and be about improving the performance of the whole system, *about supporting providers who are already good to get better*.
27. However, there is a high level of political interest in how the sector collectively can address under-performance. It was acknowledged that this encouraged the Single Voice to include a strong regulatory option in their prospectus. We did not resolve the critical question of where responsibility lies to *tell a deficient provider that it is under-performing*. Should this be a direct responsibility of the sector and if so how should it carry it out? Or should it be the responsibility of the sector to agree, with government and the existing or emerging funding and monitoring bodies, the standards and mechanisms for triggering intervention by others? The proposed Accord could be the natural vehicle for resolving such matters.

The scope of sector self-regulation

28. Seminar participants sought clarification of the scope of the self-regulation prospectus and what was meant by the term *FE sector*. The original invitation to develop a proposal for self-regulation had referred to FE colleges only, but more recently the work of the self-regulation team has addressed the whole of the *learning and skills sector* – a more all-encompassing and more appropriate term than *FE sector* it was suggested.

³ The term 'sector-led bodies' refers specifically to: the information authority, the Bureaucracy Reduction Group, the FE Communications Gateway Panel and the FE Reputation Strategy Group.

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

29. Representatives from providers such as adult and community, work-based learning providers, and specialist colleges for students with learning difficulties and/or disabilities argued the need for the scope to be clearer. Others suggested that the *footprint* of self-regulation could cover those providers contracted through the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) including private businesses, third-sector groups, the new adult careers and advancement service, and other providers. The implications of self-regulation for these providers will need to be considered with DWP.
30. The diversity of the sector and the differential consequences that providers currently face for under-performance must be clearly acknowledged. Some participants wondered whether this could make it difficult to develop a single proposition for self-regulation – will it be realistic to arrive at a single model to fit the whole learning and skills system? Self-regulation may need to differentiate its approaches to take this diversity into account. Others said that, although we are *collectively different*, FE and skills providers of all types have *shared goals*, which could provide a common platform for self-regulation.
31. There was a suggestion that LSIS's own client base of *autonomous providers* might provide a definition of *the sector*, a clientele that includes *the third sector, colleges, business and local authorities*⁴. Others at the table worried that the question of *defining* Learning and Skills would mean that every statement would have to be *qualified*, to specify what *FE* meant in each instance. We must work with *general concepts* so we don't allow the question of defining FE to *bedevil everything we say*.

The culture of a self-regulating system

32. There were a number of comments about the state of the culture in the sector and how appropriate it may be for a self-regulating culture. Several participants averred that the sector's culture had become risk-averse and dependent on central direction rather than self-actualisation – a culture that would hinder self-regulation. Some felt that providers have learnt to cede authority to LSC and other agencies because of the way the system has operated, diminishing the strategic role of sector leaders. Others disputed any analysis of the sector as compliant, infantile or fledgling – repressed perhaps, but not compliant. *We need to change the demeanour of the debate*.
33. Self-regulation requires an ambitious culture with high levels of professional autonomy, openness and commitment to rigorous self-assessment and to self-improvement. To be self-critical, transparent and open requires trust it was argued – time to fix early mistakes, time to change culture without being attacked for mistakes along the way. This trust and stability do not yet exist.

⁴ Although school sixth forms use some of LSIS's services, they are not currently within the scope of proposals for self-regulation.

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

34. The current culture does not always promote professionalism and autonomy; it is not the prevalent culture it was suggested. A challenge is to embed an ambition for greater autonomy and root out legacy cultures that impede this. The culture of new professionalism takes ownership and responsibility for performance. The new environment will be challenging - new relationships with learners, greater autonomy that brings greater responsibility. Being recognised as a professional is a privilege not a right, and it comes with both greater autonomy and greater accountability.
35. Concerted effort and a clear sense of direction will be needed. The importance of alignment of effort of national bodies and agencies – albeit within a less cluttered landscape – would be critical to create the dynamic for change. The National Improvement Strategy could be one powerful mechanism to secure effective collaboration.
36. For self-regulation to succeed, participants stated that the sector also needs to become more self-confident. If it does not, it will lack the nerve to be transparent, to publish both its failures and its successes, thus inhibiting honest sharing of experience and practice.

Supporting innovation and risk management

37. A sector lacking confidence would also be averse to taking risks or innovating. We need a culture that allows providers to be honest about underperformance without being vilified – honest self-assessment must be encouraged at all costs. If government shames the first provider to self-report under-performance, self-regulation will be dead. *Government must hold its nerve!*
38. Contributors stressed that, whatever form self-regulation takes, it should not stifle innovation or creativity in the sector, but support and nurture their development. In a related vein, self-regulation should also impart and encourage a proper understanding of risk management, so that FE providers are not afraid to innovate because they have a disproportionate fear of failure.
39. Providers in the FE sector have become very fearful of failure, and thus reluctant to publicise their mistakes and the lessons they might learn from them. There is a *lot of nervousness* about transparency.

Sharing and clarifying responsibilities

40. It was argued that one key to self-regulation will be establishing a clear division of responsibility within the system. At one level, this will require a negotiation with Government to determine what is *above the line* – that is, the powers and duties reserved to Government – and what is *below the line* – that is devolved to the sector's control. In rethinking responsibilities it was argued that the sector's role should not be about *what's left over* from the status quo – a principled position should be developed.

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

41. One possible model for this division of responsibilities is the Central-Local Concordat⁵, an agreement signed in December 2007 between the Local Government Association (LGA) and the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) that sets out the division of responsibilities between the central government and local authorities.

The pillars of a self-regulating system

42. Participants were able to take away full copies of the prospectus at the end of the seminar and were invited to comment in detail to Sir George Sweeney. Therefore in the seminar discussion participants had not read or fully interpreted the detail of the proposals. As a result, the bulk of the discussion was not about the specific proposals in the prospectus, but about the general scope and context for self-regulation.
43. A range of views was expressed about the basis for self-regulation. References were made to *de-regulation*, *simplification* and *stream-lining*; one participant argued that government should *define what you want and let providers get on with it*. Several speakers argued that self-assessment and self-improvement must be at the heart of the model - at the heart of individual practitioners and of individual providers. Self-assessment and peer review should be the drivers of self-regulation and improvement within the sector – peer review is *a metaphor for the sector helping itself*. Some attendees echoed the idea that *primary responsibility should rest with providers*, and opposed establishing any sort of new bureaucracy. One participant was concerned that the model may be *over-engineered and over complex – taking responsibility for self-improvement should be the key*.
44. It was suggested that participants should consider how each of the pillars of the proposal might fit with the policy priorities set out by the Cabinet Office's Excellence and Fairness. The Accord needs to empower learners, employers and communities, define new professionalism and describe how strategic leadership is exercised in the locality and at a regional and sub-regional level. How too should the demands of *empowered customers*, *new professionalism* and *strategic leadership* by government shape the priorities for the sector? Could this model help us to forge a stronger consensus between the sector, its customers and government about definitions of excellence?
45. How too would the system promote innovation and manage risk? Could the proposals stop desirable things happening? The proposals must take a proportionate approach to risk management and must not be designed to deal with the worst case scenario it was suggested.

⁵ The Central-Local Concordat is a 17-point agreement between CLG and the LGA, (the latter acting on behalf of England's councils), that '*establishes a framework of principles for how central and local government work together to serve the public*'. The document in full (about four pages) can be read here: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/localgovernment/pdf/601000.pdf>

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

46. Another participant talked of the role of a self-regulatory authority as quick intervention in case of *significant blockages* at the front line. Regulation can be as *heavy or as light as appropriate* – the sector needs to decide how regulatory it wants self-regulation to be and whether it is prepared to police itself. The prospectus does not prescribe how regulatory the system should be.
47. Finally, a desire echoed a number of times was that the model developed would not be dependent upon particular structures or priorities, but able to adapt to the evolving context and surf political and economic changes and turbulence.

Governance for self-regulation

48. Several delegates stressed the role of boards of governors or trustees in enacting self-regulation – governance must be a cornerstone of the way forward. Governors have a critical role in performance management of their organisations and in driving self-improvement. It was argued that governors would warm to any proposal that increases their autonomy or scope for self-determination but this must be within the context of public service, and should be concerned with the reputation and interest of the sector as a whole it was argued. A common code of conduct for governors across the sector that encapsulates their role as public trustees would be welcome as a guide to their role in a self-regulating system.
49. Although many private and third-sector providers have boards of trustees that essentially perform the same function as a college governing body, this is not universally the case. For example, it was suggested that provision made by large multi-national organisations may not be subject to the same levels of scrutiny or concern with a public service ethos. Moreover it was noted that some learning and skills providers do not have boards of trustees or governors. For example, it was suggested that local authority providers may have no separate or clear governance structures other than those operating across the local authority. The extent to which these arrangements provide a lever to drive a robust self-improving culture was uncertain. To what extent could contracting arrangements provide the mechanism for ensuring public accountability of these providers?
50. Another participant made the related point that, because the sector is so diverse, different providers derive *authority and legitimacy* from different sources – their reputation may be dependent on the reputation of similar types of provider for example.

The whys and wherefores of performance management and accountability

51. We turned a number of times to the performance measurement and accountability systems that self-regulation would apply to and whether they are appropriate.

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

52. Many participants felt that the Framework for Excellence (FfE) complicated the self-regulation project. It was described as *extremely regulatory, extremely interventionist*, and ownership was felt to lie somewhere out-with the learning and skills providers. A self-regulating sector must buy in to the performance management system it works within. It was suggested that FfE plays to a current *zeitgeist* that celebrates multiple and onerous outputs and indicators, and was perceived to lack flexibility when compared to the reformed indicator list now used to monitor local government (which has 198 indicators from which local authority-enabled partnerships choose up to 30 that encapsulate their own priorities).
53. The Local Area Agreement (LAA) processes, which have been *more successful than government expected*, enable joined up work at local level for tackling long-term problems. They were mentioned as a helpful model for a system in which leaders from across public services in the locality can select, through negotiation and collaborative mechanisms, the indicators they wish to focus on. Thus the indicator set from which priorities are selected, provides a means to craft a local agenda - one owned and accepted by the major players in the community.
54. It was suggested that the FfE could evolve to become the equivalent of a flexible national indicator set for learning and skills. Providers could select those indicators most appropriate to their local context and priorities and devise meaningful strategies to achieve them. Such an approach would still provide a means of explaining and accounting for what the sector will deliver for government. Data would be aggregated at national level.
55. LAAs work because providers select and take ownership of the indicators – *they make sense to them*. The implication was drawn that the learning and skills sector must own the standards by which it is judged. Participants talked here both about the need to shape a set of indicators that works for all parts of the learning and skills community which would define the scope of activity; and about the importance of the sector setting its own professional standards. It should be the professional responsibility of the sector to bring transparency to services – *to work out for itself what a fair approach to public accountability would look like*.
56. In addition it was argued that a function of FfE should be to allow local people and learners to assess whether their local providers are good or not. If the FfE can be developed along these lines, self-regulation could take the form of the sector agreeing to work towards meeting FfE standards – provided that the sector itself owns the performance priorities and the professional standards it embodies.

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

Self-regulation and new localism

57. A number of participants challenged us to think about self-regulation in the light of more place-based planning and accountability mechanisms. The evolving structures and partnership mechanisms (such as Local and Multi Area Agreements) that are being co-ordinated by local authorities, working with the NHS, police, education services and others at the local level, are now steering policy agendas and can be revolutionary it was argued. Central control is reduced, but there are new challenges in terms of accountability.
58. It was suggested that the time for a self-regulation proposal that only focuses on the learning and skills sector itself does not accommodate the reality of collaborative working for composite outcomes at the local level. How does self-regulation need to be reinterpreted for this new context? As we move to the *new localism*, we may need to reconsider self-regulation in the context of leadership of place. A common regulatory framework that encompasses all of these partners and their work, rather than a framework for learning and skills alone might be more powerful. The regulation of place may be the agenda to address.
59. Excellence and Fairness does not address the issue of government's strategic leadership role at regional and sub-regional level. The implications need to be thought through. There is a tendency to think of government as central government only and not to factor in the complexity of what government does in the sub-regional and local context. Although government talks in terms of moving from *earned autonomy* to *presumed autonomy*, the shift towards collaborative strategies to deliver shared outcomes in the locality complicates this concept. Autonomy of any public sector body is a mirage it was suggested – they all operate in related networks that are becoming increasingly integrated.
60. While a number of people highlighted the fact that we need a system that takes account of the local and sub-regional arrangements, a question was also raised about the implications for a self-regulatory system of empowered customers and citizens. One attendee recognised that the seminar lacked a learners' perspective on self-regulation – *their voice is absent*.⁶

⁶ Consideration will need to be given to mechanisms for securing the learner/customer perspective on self-regulation.

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

A difficult climate for self-regulation?

61. Some attendees brought up the recent crisis sweeping the banking and financial services sector. The financial services industry in the UK has elements of self-regulation within it, and the recent crisis in the financial sector has focused attention on the mechanisms for self- and external regulation. Indeed, the Government has drastically increased its role in the direct management of the financial services sector over the last year, enacting a new law allowing the nationalisation of banks and brokering the merger of two major financial services companies. Some felt this may create a more demanding environment in which to develop a proposition for self-regulation that commands government and public confidence.

Caroline Mager
Director for Strategic Policy
Learning and Skills Improvement Service

NB We would be interested in comments on the discussion and ideas in the report. Please send your comments to: Caroline.mager@LSIS.org.uk

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

Seminar participants

Seminar chair	Claire Ighodaro CBE , independent director and adviser	
Keynote speakers	Ben Jupp , Senior Adviser, Public Services and Democracy, Policy Unit, Cabinet Office Sir George Sweeney , Chair, The Single Voice for Self-Regulation (for Further Education) Sue Dutton , member of the Self-Regulation Project Team and Deputy Chief Executive, Association of Colleges	
Participant	Job title	Organisation
Yvette Adams	Executive Director	Learning and Skills Improvement Service
Alison Boulton	Chief Executive	NATSPEC
Nick Brown OBE	Principal	Oldham Sixth Form College
Wally Brown CBE	Board Member	Learning and Skills Improvement Service
Reg Chapman OBE	Researcher	Lancaster University
Phil Cox	Senior Project Leader - Self-regulation Project	Learning and Skills Improvement Service
Mark Dawe	Principal and Chief Executive	Oaklands College
Paul Eeles	National Development Manager	Association of Learning Providers
Toni Fazaeli	Chief Executive	The Institute for Learning
John Freeman	Director of Children's Services	Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council
Maggie Galliers	Principal	Leicester College
Steven Garschke	LSC Contract Manager	Construction Skills
Paul Hannan	Principal	Hadlow College
Lesley Hastings	Chair of Governors	Park Lane College
Marilyn Hawkins	Principal	Barnet College, chair, 157 Group of Colleges
Paul Head	Principal	The College of North East London, LSIS Board member

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

Barbara Holm	Head of Service	Westminster Adult Education Service
Cathy Hughes	Head of provider performance	Department for Work and Pensions
Melanie Hunt	Director, Learning and Skills	Ofsted
David Hunter	Chief Executive	Lifelong Learning UK
Chris Jeffery	Managing Director	Academy of Training
Sarah Johnson	Senior Project Leader - Self-regulation Project	Seconded from Bedford College
Madeleine King	Consultant	Mixed Economy Group of Colleges
Fiona Mackay	Programme Director: Aspiring principals and senior leaders	Learning and Skills Improvement Service
Caroline Mager	Director of Strategic Policy	Learning and Skills Improvement Service
Ben Margulies	Policy Research Officer	Learning and Skills Improvement Service
Linda Martin	Development Director	Hit Training Ltd
Roger McClure	Chief Executive	Learning and Skills Improvement Service
Maureen Mellor	Principal	Liverpool Community College
Sir Bill Moorcroft	Principal	Trafford College
Jean Morgan	National Operations Director	Rathbone
Susan Pember	Director, FE Learning and Skills Performance Group	DIUS
Helen Pettifor	Executive Director of Leadership Portfolio & Standards	Learning and Skills Improvement Service
Lynne Sedgmore CBE	Executive Director	157 Group of FE Colleges
Helen Sexton	Principal and CEO	National Star College, and Chair of Natspec
Dame Ruth Silver DBE	Principal, Lewisham College and	Chair, Learning and Skills Improvement Service
Carole Stott	Chair of Governors	City Lit
John Taylor	Director	Self-regulation Project Team
Alastair Thomson	Senior Policy Officer	Niace
Diana Watson	Marketing and Communications Director	Learning and Skills

Self-regulation - the policy context and the emerging proposition

Seminar one - 1 October 2008

		Improvement Service
Dr John Widowson	Principal	New College Durham
Dr Ann Williams	Principal	West Suffolk College
Simon Withey	Managing Director	VT Education & Skills, LSIS Board