



Future-proofing the FE curriculum: how do we do it?

In this episode we're looking at the FE and skills curriculum and asking what a new government needs to do to ensure it is fit for purpose and future-proof.

To do this we're joined by David Gallagher, CEO of **NCFE**, an educational charity and leader in vocational and technical learning, and Karen Spencer, Principal and Chief Executive of **Harlow College**. From the importance of Level 2 qualifications to the need for better relationships between employers and educators, and the need for Government to trust and respect the sector more, David and Karen outline their policy asks and hopes for whoever forms the next Government.

About Karen Spencer MBE

Karen is a highly experienced Principal Chief Executive Officer with a history of working in the further education industry. She was **awarded an MBE in 2021** recognition of her contribution to Further Education and Aviation.

About David Gallagher

David is NCFE Chief Executive Officer and a Non-Executive Director of the Federation of Awarding Bodies, as well as Chair of the FAB Policy Board. He has worked for big and small businesses, in the public and private sectors, and have also established several start-up businesses.

Transcript

Shane Chowen 00:01

Hello and welcome to a special pre-election series of Let's Go Further. The podcast from the Skills and Education Group, that challenges the way we think about skills and



education. In this series, a collaboration with FE week, we're shining a spotlight on the FE and skills policy issues that we think should take centre stage at the upcoming General Election. We'll be asking what we need from the next government and looking at how well our sector is positioned to fight for those needs. I'm Shane Chowen, Editor of FE Week, and I'm delighted to be your host for this series. In this episode, we're looking at the FE and skills curriculum. The conservatives want to give 16- to 19- year olds a new advanced British Standard, replacing A levels and T levels with a single qualification comprised of major and minor subjects. For adult learners, we're seeing a steer from businesses towards smaller and more modular courses, moving away from the big time consuming qualifications that we're used to. And labour meanwhile, haven't said very much on this yet, other than a commitment to pause and review the defunding of Level Three qualifications. So what does the new government need to do to ensure our FE curriculum is fit for purpose and future proof? Joining me to discuss this are David Gallagher, CEO of awarding organisation NCFE, and Karen Spencer, Principal and Chief Executive of Harlow College. Welcome to you both. Now, David, coming to you first thinking about all the ways that society and the workplace are going to change in the next five to ten years. What do you think a good FE curriculum is going to need to deliver for students?

David Gallagher 01:27

I think that none of us truly fully know the answer to that, because I think if, if the last couple of years has taught us nothing else, it's to sort of expect the unexpected. You know, the world, the economy, the labour market keeps changing in really unexpected ways, I mean, that's so many people during the pandemic and post pandemic expected, you know, the labour market to tank and then potentially be millions of people out of work. And if anything, it went in quite the opposite direction. So I think that teaches us to, that none of us really, truly fully knows the future. But I think that gives hints to, what is needed for individuals and for businesses to thrive. And things like adaptability, resilience, creativity, problem solving, you know, these are all things for me that absolutely should be at the heart of curriculum and hardwired in there. And we see fantastic educators and educational institutions actually making that happen, despite the fact that it's often missing from the core of a curriculum. But how do we put that into the mainstream. I also think alongside that, you know, we look at enrichment activity to supplement core curriculum as a means of helping people to develop the, I suppose, what you describe as the personal and social skills that are needed to get on in life and work. But, you know, this as well as anyone Shane, funding for anything outside the core curriculum, or even arguably, the time and space for that is incredibly challenging from provide for providers of all sorts, so that there is absolutely the need for me to adding in essential skills to the core of the curriculum, to give us that sort of adaptability for every individual, for



employers, so that we're better prepared to deal with the unexpected. Alongside of course, you know, technical and vocational skills been increasingly important for us to have a thriving economy. You know, for a long time, we've talked about this missing middle of level four, level five qualifications, but without us cutting off the starting point for many learners, which of course, could be could be entry levels could be level one, could be level two. And I think one of the things to me that's been hugely disappointing in the last couple of years is the big shift away from level two qualifications, which are the lifeblood of FE as we know. And it's so important to give people that first step on the ladder towards a career. And also knowing that people may well have a number of different careers over a lifetime. So we've become a little fixated with one occupation, being the only thing you should study, particularly at 16 to 18, or an apprenticeship. So things like multi skilling, and this is where modular, stackable credentials, I think need to come into play as well, to give us that flexibility.

Shane Chowen 04:06

Karen, as somebody who's you know, at the interface of students and industry, what are your thoughts on what a good FE curriculum is going to need to deliver?

Karen Spencer 04:15

So I'd like to echo some of the things that David has said, I certainly think that what we're going to need is a set of transferable skills, and that you can't possibly plan for some of those big interrupters that will come along and take you from the side. So therefore, what that means is you need to build all of those wider skills like resilience, and all of the broader things that prepare students for that changing future. I think to do that we need something that's much more flexible and responsive than a curriculum and a model that's based on Victorian principles of design and assessment. So I would like to see something that's much more adaptive and recognises all of those big themes that are going to come through like digital technology, AR, VR, AI, green skills. And we can't possibly do that with the setup we've got at the moment.

Shane Chowen 05:33

Well, lots for us to unpick there throughout this episode, I want to start with the sort of infrastructure around the curriculum and how we develop curriculum. Earlier in this series, we heard from employers about closing skills gaps, and, you know, we often hear from businesses or the voices of businesses that they say what gets taught in schools, colleges



and universities doesn't align with what they need. How does the next government stop that? And how does the next government fix that problem? David, let's come to you first.

David Gallagher 06:02

Recently, it's been suggested that education may become part of the government's National critical infrastructure in future that very much talks to the resilience of a system. And it was interesting recently to hear from a consulting business who came along to an Ofqual symposium to talk about resilience. And they talked about, you know, three major benefits of resilience. One is about at risk identification, mitigation and management. The second is about reducing chronic stressors. And the third is about a phrased they used with adaptive capacity. And I would argue that policy and regulatory changes and challenges have actually increased from stressors in the system. And to some extent, the hardwiring in a rigidity at rather than taking us towards adaptive capacity, we need a system with some flexibility, even if that flexibility is around the edges. Do you know the notion that we can get away with it taking two years to design and develop a standard or some of these big qualifications, another couple of years for general the system to really adopt that and start to scale up and then possibly another couple of years before the learners pop out the other end knowledgeable skill, competent and productive in the workplace. You know, worst case scenario, we're talking about five or six years from inception, through to the product of that delivering benefits, you know, for the individual, certainly, for that employer and for the economy as a whole. Yet we know that most occupations, particularly through this phase of , unprecedented disruption are going to need to adapt and change every couple of months. So five or six years to you know, hardwire something in where we need more agility, more responsiveness more flexibility, it seems to me that policy has taken us in a direction. Further further away from that. One of the things that we suggested as part of our work in partnership with the advent foundation and comm Dell was, for example, could we look at I think it's the Dutch system that has a proportion of their delivery of apprenticeships, that is ring fenced for either a local need, an employer specific need, an emerging need for that particular occupation. So you've essentially got a standard that talks to say, 70-80% of the programme, and then you free the provider up to work with the employer to figure out okay, so what's changed? Or what's unique in this particular instance? And how do we make sure that we're delivering the maximum value for you as an individual learner and for that employer? Do you know we hear from SMEs often that they would like to see people who are multiskilled because in smaller businesses, you're less likely to see hyper specialisation of a particular occupation. Yet our apprenticeship system is now predicated on that standard, and that standard been rigid over a number of years. And absolutely, you know, we've got a programme of updating, you know, maintenance of the standards



and qualifications if they exist in that programme, to try and keep them up to date. But we are still working in a very analogue and linear way that simply does not deliver an agile and responsive system. We're also started MCA's (Mayoral Combined Authority) essentially saying that the national system we don't feel it's going to meet our local needs. So could we consider non-regulated provision? Could we consider it you know, bite sized to meet local community and labour market needs? And I think we can find a way to have the best of both worlds, you know, that the benefit of standards and you know, raising standards and quality over time, but that flexibility around the edges to best meet emerging needs I think is absolutely crucial.

Shane Chowen 06:16

MCA is there for the benefit of the listeners as Mayoral Combined Authority so if you live in a devolved area with a mayor like Andy Burnham nearly said Andy Street then but he's just lost his election didn't he?, Richard Parker in the West Midlands, then that's what MCA's means. Karen, I assume you will agree with lots of that. No college principal wants, you know, less freedom and space to deliver what their students need. But I was just wondering, could you like maybe help us make that a little bit more real for us. So, you know, if you did have the time in the study programme, for example, and the funding that came with it, you know, what sorts of things do you lie awake, lie awake at night thinking, I'd love to be able to do this with my students.

Karen Spencer 10:00

So I, often if I'm talking to an employer, about their current skills needs we'll say to them, you really needed to come to me five years ago. So I think that reflects some of what's been said about the central control of the system. I think for me, as a professional, I would like to be recognised as a professional, and be recognised in a way that would allow my institution to develop some of those flexibilities because you can't possibly have a responsive system that adapts quickly to a local or regional need. It was interesting that David mentioned the Netherlands, because I'm aware that they also not only their apprenticeship system have flexibility, but they also have that for their technical system, where their colleges can design modules, they're centrally validated, and they have the ability to accredit those and to deliver them to the young people and adults that they work with. And so therefore, I'd like to see a system with more professional trust, that recognises that you can free up further education to be much more responsive, and drive productivity, if you can loosen some of that heavy central control. And I think my final message would be one of in a bigger political sense, I think somehow we need to divorce education from political tinkering. Because otherwise, we will end up in this, you know,



five-year cycle of bits of things being changed, with no greater benefit at the end of the process.

David Gallagher 12:13

I couldn't agree more. And it's somewhat ironic, isn't it, that as an awarding organisation, that acts as a quasi-regulator really, that we want more trust in the system. And I don't think we're talking about blind faith here. But we're talking about respected professionals who have a deep interest in what's most valuable for learners, what's best for learners. And we would like to see more trust. And you will have heard me say this often, that if you run an organisation on low trust it very quickly, that turns into a fairly toxic culture. But I think there's enough evidence there to say that we're running the whole system on low trust. And I've got absolute admiration for college leaders, leaders of independence and community providers that despite all of that, you know, despite the low trust paradigm, despite the compliance regime, despite being you know, regulated, and, and controlled in lots of respects within an inch of the lives that there's still try and find a way to make it work. But if we can get to that, you know, highest higher sort of trust paradigm, then imagine what we could do. So that for me, I think is the most fundamentally, it's a trust thing, it's a culture thing. And when we've got highly, highly valued and respected, whether it's leaders or practitioners at all levels, we've got to find a way to get to that, whilst recognising that we're dealing with taxpayers money, largely, and that that comes with a great degree of responsibility. And there's got to be, you know, accountability there. And we think we'd all agree with that. But when you've got six, seven, eight regulators, or quasi-regulators, and a very heavy control and compliance regime, it's very difficult for I think, anyone to feel trusted.

Shane Chown 13:56

Just before we move on, I want to come on to this issue of trust. If a Minister or Shadow Minister was here today, they will be saying things like, of course, we want to trust the education professionals, the awarding bodies, the college principals, the teachers in the classroom, but we have to maintain a system which we know as the custodians of public money is protecting quality and sometimes that quality argument is used sort of against that, that trust argument, isn't it? So how would, Karen let's come first to you on this one, how do you think we can move the next government on from that, you know, quite unhelpful and binary discussion?



Karen Spencer 14:35

I would raise with them that they actually do it for higher education. And there's a greater model of trust. And there's a lot of talk about pride in the UK, higher education system. And so therefore, for me, I don't think it's impossible to translate some of those principles that sit in the higher education system through to further education, I think where we get caught up is that we're in that space between schools and higher education. So we sort of slip between two parts of the system. And that means we almost get the worst bits of both of them. So therefore, it's winning that argument on professional trust, identifying that it is done elsewhere in the system, and articulating the benefits and the wins from it. David mentioned that sort of freeing up the higher technical space, I think if we could free up the level two, three, four space into something that's much more responsive and flexible and fits together, we would have a system that would allow us to rescale adults for people to change careers. All of the system at the moment is too slow. And I think it's too slow, because it relies on heavy regulation, which, in terms of its development takes, you know, two to five years, sometimes longer. So I think it's the solution to driving productivity in our system. And what we're doing at the moment isn't working. So I think there's a lot to gain from looking at it differently.

Shane Chowen 16:33

Anything to add to that, David, would you close down some quangos?

David Gallagher 16:36

I have the benefit and the pleasure of working with lots of brilliant civil servants, you know, whether that's at the department or the SFA, the Institute for apprenticeships and technical education, Ofqual, the devolved nations, even devolved areas. And actually, what I find is that it, at an individual level, I think most of us broadly agree on these points. However, I think what gets in the way is complexity in sort of further education, we serve such a diverse range of needs in terms of learner demographics, levels of learning, every institution has got its differences and its nuances. And I think what I would probably say the government is, let us try and get our house in order a little better, you know, is there a way that your associations of colleges, your associations of employment, the learning providers, your federation of awarding bodies, your GSEQ's, you WorldSkills etc ETF's, etc., etc., can actually come together and find the common ground and get some consensus, and I think that would be probably to our elbow in terms of a dialogue with government and its agencies. I do often draw parallels with HE, and we know that, you know, there's a well organised, better funded lobby, that gives HE a lot of power and

influence, you know, based on what I can see. And I think if we can leverage the collective intelligence and the resources across the organisations in the sector, and find that common ground and make the case, I do believe, you know, the very good people in the stakeholders that we work with, will listen, because there is that that broad agreement there. But as you've sort of alluded to in the question that you've asked, Shane that there are lots of quangos, there's lots of organisations, there's, you know, inevitably at times, there's going to be a bit of bias, there's going to be a bit of self interest. And you know, that's perfectly understandable and perfectly normal. But I think we've got to work with governments to find the common ground, consensus even, if we can, and get better organised in terms of making the case. Do you know, there's some interesting examples, even when you get into the detail of assessment, for argument's sake, that we're seeing more written exams, creeping into vocational and technical qualifications. And the point that has been made by some of those stakeholders is, well provide the you know, the technical research and the evidence that demonstrates the types of assessments that you want to see maintained in vocational and technical, are reliable, they are valid, they come with high levels of assurance, we can be certain of quality. And so I think we've got to look at ourselves as well in this and say, Well, what can we do? You know, what can we do with a bit of latitude and a bit of space and some support from the public sector? To enable that, Ofqual recently, it talked about, you know, the notion of a regulatory sandbox, which gives us the space to test and trial methods of assessment that may be not prevalent in the system. Do you know, the Edge foundation again, would argue for more project based learning and assessment oracy receipt , you know, taking central stage for many types of provision. So absolutely, you know, there are some asks from government there, but it is the to come to the table when we find a way to you know, get some common ground and make the case and hopefully with some robust evidence to backup our arguments.

Karen Spencer 20:01

I've spent 25 years working on policy and curriculum development. And I have to say, in present times, it's much more fragmented than it ever was, if you looked back 10 to 15 years ago, and what seems to have been lost in the system, is what I would call evidence based design of curriculum and based on really strong pedagogy, with expert curriculum, people heavily involved in the design of that. And I think some of the issues we see with things like apprenticeships and T levels are that what you've got are missing parts of the design of the system. So you had a regulator, working with employers, so you end up with a big basket of things that are sort of stuffed into it, so to speak, you were intentionally excluded the awarding organisations and the colleges and teachers from those conversations. So you end up with qualifications that are designed in a way that are



undeliverable, or not achieving the outcomes that you want them to achieve. And I have a personal frustration that we have a lot of people working in the space of curriculum design, who've actually never been involved in teaching and learning or assessment themselves, apart from having experienced it, and I think that's where we go wrong compared to other countries.

David Gallagher 21:46

Karen, I completely agree with that. Do you know that apprenticeships is the best example, isn't it that we're going to speak to employers first and colleges and awarding organisations. Not you're not allowed in. Then we'll let the awarding organisations in next to do the assessment bit. And then it's a bit of a 'tadah' with, with colleges. Why would why would you not just bring all of those stakeholders together in one place? To have a sort of a comprehensive and holistic look at, you know, what, what's the reality of the starting point of many of the learners that may choose this type of provision, and listen intently to what employers want and need, with a healthy dose of sort of reality, coming from those who know best who are doing this day in and day out, and with those with experts in pedagogy and those in assessment to design it together. And one of the benefits, of course, is then we don't have this linear slow system, we can probably move faster.

Shane Chowen 22:43

We probably can't talk about curriculum without talking about English and Maths, albeit briefly, because it's one of the more contentious debates in the curriculum space in post-16 education. Listeners will probably know that for learners that leave school without the grade four in English and Maths GCSE, they do have to continue to retake those exams or similar in their post-16 education journeys. Very, very contentious, very, very hotly debated lots of arguments on either side, but Karen, if there was an opportunity for the next government to set a new policy around English and Maths for post-16 education, what would your main arguments be for them?

Karen Spencer 22:43

So I have to confess in the first instance, that I'm a Maths teacher by background, and it was actually working with young people who had failed their GCSEs that really attracted me to working in further education. So I'm very passionate that young people should have more Maths and more English. But I do think that once you get to Key Stage five to 16 plus, you need to look at it differently. I've been successively involved in, oh my goodness, almost every Maths report that they've been in the last 25 years, and there's



been a lot of discussion about having double awards at GCSE, assessing numeracy skills. I think I feel as though a bit like hamster in a wheel going back around the same debate all of the time. I do think we need to bring back professionalism in some way there needs to be a greater suite of Maths and English qualifications available. If we can't look at it as a continuum through from cradle to grave, then we at least need to be able to look at it post-16 and say, Is there a better diet of English or Maths we could give young people? that would prepare them better for that changing future for the world of work for managing themselves, their families and having healthy and prosperous lives. And I do sometimes, I was debating with a colleague, why does somebody need a Venn diagram? the other week, and we also discussed do plumbing students really need to do Daphne du Maurier clause analysis. And so I think there are some fundamental underpinning questions about what we're doing. And we could certainly do a better job. But I still think I would like to see English and Maths there.

Shane Chowen 25:24

David, how about you from an awarding body perspective?

David Gallagher 25:27

Couple of things that I'll pick up from a different angle. Do you know that if primary and secondary education has failed to deliver the results that those learners need, and I'm sure were wanting and striving for, with a few £100 in two years? What are the chances? With how we're now set up with GCSEs and with functional skills, which it has become over time very similar to the GCSE in some ways, we don't really have a fighting chance with that, and interesting Shane, that you use the word retake rather than reset. And I think that is the reality. So many of the centres that we visit, have a huge amount of their capacity taken up with retakes knowing that in all likelihood that whatever they do, however good the teachers are, however good the institution is that they are fighting somewhat of a losing battle. And so soaking up really valuable capacity in the system, to take people through qualifications and at times, you know, resetting exams six, seven, eight times, which is demoralising. The big worry for me there is, what could we be doing instead, that would be a value to that learner? And is that really switching people off from a from a lifetime of learning that we know is going to be so critical for them to stay current and relevant and a value economically for themselves in the family and of course of part of the labour market. So the funding issue, I think, absolutely is critical to address. And the second point, I suppose, comes back to something that Karen was alluding to, and we call them functional skills. But are they really truly functional? Do you know that we are teaching things and assessing things that may never have a use or a value in that person's life ever again, and I know I'm going down to a different key stage here, but my



10 year old now 11, as of yesterday, was sitting his SATs recently, and fairly sure where he doesn't need to know what a past participle is. You know, and the fact that he's going to sit an exam question that asks him to explain, and then point out which one is the past participle. I'm not sure that is particularly useful to him. And you know, English teachers out there, may stand corrected on that. But I think we are still stuck on a knowledge rich curriculum. That may be in some instances a little bit out of date. My worry is that, you know, we get a new government come in what we'll do a review of GCSEs and functional skills take to see through, you know, three, four years, maybe we've got a major problem now with too many learners having to retake having to reset. And fundamentally, I think that there's almost and it's a strong word, but there's almost a degree of cruelty there. And I really feel sorry for the teachers, the centers and particularly the learners that are having to go through something with scant resources that for many, there's an inevitability I think, which is a very sad indictment, really, that they are going to fail in the eyes of the system, certainly not in the eyes of their teachers and others. But as the exam states, you know, there's a there's a grid there.

Shane Chown 25:27

Yeah, we reported recently in FE week that mental health issues among young people has now overtaken general health issues as the number one reason for absence of college students and the college leaders we spoke to very much drew a line between rising mental health concerns among young people. And sadly, this is quite intense experience of going through that English and Maths, retaking situation that we do have to move on. Unfortunately, there was one final question that I do want to make sure I get your thoughts on, which is looking at this Advanced British Standard idea which whoever wins the next election looks like there's some movement by behind this new reform in the 16 to 19 space, this idea of having a bigger study programme with more teaching hours, which everybody welcomes, but the idea is still in its infancy looks like there's still some opportunity to influence what that Advanced British Standard might look like. Karen, you you've probably seen the idea in principle, obviously, the department had been doing some consulting on it. I want to know what you think about it, and if it was going to be brought in, what should it look like?

Karen Spencer 28:57

So, I went to one of the department's ABS events, and I think I have no issue with breadth it seems to go against some of the messages on studying a more specific discipline like at T level, or an apprenticeship. However, I do feel very strongly that you can't tackle Key Stage five without looking at what comes before it. And so I therefore, you know, I'm back in my hamster wheel again, I feel that when I first came into an FE



college, we were going through GNVQ, AVCA, Curriculum 2000s, I went around the block with Tomlinson as well. And I do sort of wonder if we've we're sort of picking up bits of a system in terms of education without looking at the holistic system and saying, what is it we want to achieve? So I think, for me for it to work effectively, it would need to be more than just tweaks. Otherwise, I do worry that what we'll get is more of the same.

David Gallagher 31:01

Yeah, so I mean, look, some of the features, benefits that were articulated, I think the vast majority of the sector would get behind, you know, the notion of breaths, certainly, we would want better paid teachers, do you know that they're able to teach more hours and teach that breath. But the real challenge comes in and again, Karen's alluded to this, that if a technical qualification, like a T level is to lead to competence, or even threshold competencies, it's sometimes described, how does that work in terms of breath?, and I'm not sure that you can have both actually. Simply because there would not be the capacity there, in terms of hours in terms of teaching time to do that, in terms of the fundamental design principles that's got to be looked at seriously, because it's just, I think it's quite obvious, isn't it, if you want competence, you've got to go deep, not broad. But we know that most people will have a number of different occupations or over their career, and therefore is breath going to be suitable for most, if not all, actually. But for learners, you know, that have a very clear career path, they know what they want to do after further education, that's a, you know, they've got a sense, even if it's newer directionally in terms of a sector rather than a specific occupation. And a keen to get a qualification that leads to at least threshold competence so they could get a job or possibly progressed to university and then on into work, maybe the, you know, the deep options that lead to that are a good thing for us to have in the system, you know, a good feature to have over 10 years and a number of political cycles. What is the likelihood that that's going to be the political will is going to sustain over that period? I think there are all sorts of things that could get in the way of that there is a lot of change fatigue in the sector, you could argue that slightly contradictory with some of the earlier points around, you know, give us more flexibility more freedoms. But but there is change fatigue, there, we've got to be very careful that we are not burning people out with those constant, extraordinary levels of change. Whilst also recognising that if we don't change at all, then we're not going to be fit for the now. Nevermind the future, apprenticeship policies, you know, the levy, apprenticeship standards, to some extent was done in splendid isolation, T levels, to some extent has been done in isolation. And the fact that we then got a problem in terms of a T level learner being able to progress to an apprenticeship, we've got an apprenticeship system that you know, is failed to deliver on 16 to 18. And on level two, who is the architect of the whole system, and all of these programmes to give us greater coherence,



very clear pathways for for learners, parents and carers to find their way through a system that is simple for employees to engage in, unless we have you know, the the grand architecture of all of the programmes and provision we'll never achieve those goals of you know, simplicity, coherence, and enabling people to make great choices at whatever age and stage. So what what I'd love to see a new government do with step back from everything, and be thoughtful and be intentional, and not look at the system piecemeal.

Karen Spencer 33:01

We have an awful habit in this country of putting academic constructs on technical disciplines. And when I visited Norway, they just laughed at me and said in the 1970s, we got rid of the concept of levels in technical education, because what you want to develop is a skilled craft person. And you have to recognise like if you know, somebody who played the piano, suddenly decided they were going to go and play the violin, that those are fundamentally different things. But in this country, we say, oh, some because somebody's got their GCSEs in Science, History and Math. They can you know, go and be an automotive engineer without understanding some of those hand skills that need to underpin things. And I also think that allied to that we've lost the purpose of the apprenticeship system. Is it about access into technical roles? And is it for giving young people a pipeline into those roles and work? Or is it about, you know, graduates doing, I have a particular thing about graduates doing level eight programmes that employers would have sponsored them for? Anyway. So I think there are some sort of policy things that need real careful thought there.

Shane Chowen 35:47

So that's the Netherlands and Norway on my list of places for possible FE Week study trips that I'll be pitching when I get back to the office after this. Thank you very much both. Unfortunately, we are out of time. I want to say a big thank you to my guests, David Gallagher and Karen Spencer, and to you for listening. We hope you've enjoyed the conversation and that it's got you thinking about what we in the FE sector should be asking of the next government. If you have a question for us or a comment based on what you've heard. Please join in the conversation on social media. And remember to subscribe wherever you receive your podcasts to access earlier and forthcoming episodes of Let's Go Further.