

QIR consultation responses

Introduction

This online response form supports the Qualifications Information Review consultation document and should be used to submit responses to the consultation.

YOU CANNOT SAVE THE ONLINE VERSION OF THIS FORM WHEN IT IS PARTIALLY COMPLETED. This Word version of all consultation questions is for your reference whilst preparing your responses. The online form should then be used to submit your consultation responses.

There are 9 sections to this form which cover

- information about the respondent
- questions relating to each of the six recommendations
- questions relating to realising the full potential of the review outcomes
- questions relating to implementation and resourcing.

UCAS wishes to consult widely on the proposals outlined in the consultation document and welcomes feedback from all stakeholders. Please feel free to answer those questions that are most relevant to you.

UCAS believes that the first three recommendations will be of interest to a wide range of people and organisations as well as those within higher education (HE) including applicants, schools and colleges, other education, industry and governmental organisations.

Recommendations four to six are of a more operational nature and may be of greater interest and relevance to those working in higher education institution (HEI) admissions and those with responsibility for management information within HEIs.

Questions within the final sections may be of interest to a wide range of people and organisations.

UCAS would like to thank you for responding to this consultation.

About you:

Thank you for taking the time to respond to the Qualifications Information Review consultation. In order to allow us to understand the views of different stakeholders, it is important that we capture some information about you and your organisation/institution.

Please note that in any reporting of the data all respondents shall remain anonymous.

Please provide your full name.

Dr Geoff Parks

Please provide your full job title. (if applicable)

Director of Admissions for the Cambridge Colleges

Please tell us which stakeholder group you represent. More than one of these stakeholder types may apply to you but please select the group which best reflects which perspective you are primarily representing.

HEI staff with admissions responsibility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HEI staff with responsibility for management reporting	<input type="checkbox"/>
HEI Vice Chancellor	<input type="checkbox"/>
School or FE College	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adviser	<input type="checkbox"/>
Learner	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parent	<input type="checkbox"/>
Examination or awarding organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Government, regulatory or funding body	<input type="checkbox"/>
Employer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sector Skills Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Are you responding on behalf of your organisation or in an individual capacity?

Organisation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Individual	<input type="checkbox"/>

About your organisation:**What is the name of your organisation?**

University of Cambridge

What is the address of your organisation?

The Old Schools, Trinity Lane, Cambridge, CB2 1TN

Please indicate which UK country (or countries) your school, college or institution is in or which your organisation represents.

- | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| England | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Northern Ireland | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Scotland | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Wales | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| UK wide | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Email address:

If you are willing to be contacted in the future with respect to the Qualifications Information Review, please provide your email address below.

gtp10@cam.ac.uk

Recommendation 1: Qualification Information Profiles (QIPs)

UCAS believes that this section may be of interest to a wide range of people and organisations.

Full details of Recommendation 1 can be found on pages 11-14 of the consultation document.

Recommendation 1: The Qualifications Information Review recommends the development of UCAS Qualification Information Profiles (QIPs) and an associated database designed to give admissions tutors the information they need about applicants' qualifications.

To what extent do you agree, in principle, with the recommendation to develop Qualification Information Profiles and an associated database?

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree nor disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

QIPs would be particularly helpful for new Admissions Tutors and other staff involved in the assessment of applications. It would be very helpful to have consistent and robust information for the majority of qualifications presented to us by applicants. We would like to see a wide range of international qualifications included in the QIP database, not just a limited selection, and would strongly encourage the inclusion of information about grade distributions and frequencies to allow Admissions Tutors to put performance into context.

It would be very helpful for the QIP to provide accurate information on the size of the qualification and the assessment/examination methods, as well as the grading structure. Historical information should also be provided if there have been significant changes to the way in which the qualification is structured/graded.

If the QIPs do not provide the level of information required by Admissions Tutors to facilitate accurate assessment, then they will simply be ignored by HEIs.

What would be the impact of this recommendation on you/your organisation?

QIPs could support consistency of assessment and reduce the number of enquiries we deal with, both from applicants and their advisers, as well as colleagues internally. It is important to stress, however, that our Admissions Tutors will retain autonomy in admissions and will continue to assess each applicant academically on an individual basis; the QIP will simply be an additional reference tool.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation supports fairness, transparency and efficiency in HE admissions?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Fairness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transparency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

If appropriately detailed, QIPs should increase efficiency as qualification information would be collected once and used by a large number of institutions. If the QIPs contain the correct level of information then the amount of independent research required on qualification profiles will be reduced. The availability of consistent information for a wide range of qualifications could further support Admissions Tutors in assessing applications fairly and transparently.

A number of stakeholders have identified additional information that they would value about qualifications. To what extent do you agree that the following information should be included, alongside judgements relating to academic demand?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Personal skills (e.g. team working and self management)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vocationally related skills and knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify below)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other: *Detailed information about grade distributions and frequencies in qualifications would be very helpful in assessing how strong an individual applicant's performance is.*

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

Whilst there might be some benefit in providing information on how well a qualification develops team-working and self-management skills, we believe that the primary focus of the QIPs should be on how well a qualification prepares applicants academically and identifies potential for Higher Education study. Information about grade distributions and frequencies would be very helpful in this regard.

Please share any views you have on how this information might be collated and presented.

Collect it from respective Department of Education, examination boards and overseas equivalents. Grade distributions could be presented as a graph but raw data should be provided so that HEIs can make their own judgement on the appropriate level of offer.

To what extent do you agree that profiles of apprenticeships and Access to HE courses should be made available to HE, alongside level 3 UK and selected international qualifications?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Apprenticeships	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Access to HE courses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail, including suggestions for additional information.

We would strongly support the inclusion of Access to HE courses in the QIPs as this would be particularly beneficial for our mature learners and Colleges. We have no strong views

about the inclusion of information about apprenticeships. We would certainly not object to the inclusion of such information if other HEIs would find it useful – as long as the QIP database is easily searched.

Some stakeholders have suggested that they would like UCAS to provide further information about other courses/qualifications/tests, such as level 2 qualifications and/or admissions tests, alongside that proposed for level 3 qualifications. To what extent do you agree that this additional information should be made available?

	Strongly value	Value	Neither value nor not value	Do not value	Strongly do not value
Level 2 qualifications	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Admissions tests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other, please specify below	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other:

Please use this space to explain your answer in more detail:

We believe that the QIPs will be most useful if their primary focus is on Level 3 qualifications that properly prepare applicants for entry into Higher Education. Admissions Tests are useful additional assessment tools, but are not qualifications in their own right. The inclusion of Level 2 qualifications might be helpful, particularly international equivalents, but we would much rather see a wider range of Level 3 qualifications included in the QIP database than resource being diverted to lower level qualifications.

Please indicate whether you would favour a September 2013 or January 2014 launch of the Qualification Information Profiles and associated database and why you give this preference.

Favour September 2013

Favour January 2014

Neither of the above

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

It will be absolutely essential to ensure that applicants are not disadvantaged by the launch of the QIPs and associated database. A September 2013 launch will ensure that the information is available in time for the start of the new admissions cycle and HEIs will have access to enhanced qualification information and guidance via the QIP database.

We would not support a January 2014 launch as this is mid-cycle and, for Cambridge specifically, means that the QIPs will not be available for full use until the following admissions round – we believe this will unfairly disadvantage our applicants.

Please use the space below to outline what transition arrangements, if any, you think may be necessary to ensure that future applicants are not unfairly disadvantaged by implementation timing.

Please use the space below to outline what communications and guidance you feel would be necessary to support implementation of this recommendation.

It will be essential to ensure that applicants and their advisers, as well as HEIs, are all fully apprised of the changes arising from the QIPs. Effective and unambiguous communication from an early stage in the transition phase will be important.

Please use the space below to add any further comments you have about this recommendation.

Recommendation 2: A move towards grade-based entry requirements

UCAS believes that this section may be of interest to a wide range of people and organisations.

Full details of Recommendation 2 can be found on pages 15 – 16 of the consultation document.

Recommendation 2: The Qualifications Information Review recommends that HEIs consider the gradual withdrawal of the use of the UCAS Tariff for setting entry requirements and for offer-making, coupled with the promotion of the greater use of qualifications and grades for setting entry requirements and for making admissions offers and decisions. This would need to be accompanied by an extensive communication programme to support applicants and advisers. UCAS would commit to maintaining the existing Tariff for an agreed period of time, but would not evaluate new qualifications for inclusion after an agreed deadline.

To what extent do you agree, in principle, with the recommendation for the gradual withdrawal of UCAS Tariff points for setting entry requirements and for offer-making, coupled with the promotion of grade-based entry requirements and offer-making?

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

The University of Cambridge has never used the UCAS Tariff for setting entry requirements or for offer-making and we believe it is up to each individual institution to decide on the approach that works best for them.

What would be the impact of this recommendation on you/your organisation?

None.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation supports fairness, transparency and efficiency in HE admissions?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Fairness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transparency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

What are your views on the proposed timing of the withdrawal of the use of UCAS Tariff points so that grade-based entry requirements are encouraged for all courses starting in 2015 (set by HEIs in 2013).

If agreed, we plan to introduce Qualification Information Profiles from September 2013. During the transition phase, there will be the need for the Tariff to run at the same time as this new system. For how long should UCAS maintain the UCAS Tariff after the introduction of Qualification Information Profiles?

From when should we cease to evaluate new qualifications for inclusion in the Tariff?

Please use the space below to outline what actions UCAS could take to support you/your organisation during any transition from the use of Tariff points in admissions to a qualifications and grade-based model.

Please use the space below to outline what communications and guidance you feel would be necessary to support implementation of this recommendation.

Please use the space below to add any further comments you have about this recommendation.

Recommendation 3: A means of comparing 'demand' across qualifications

UCAS believes that this section may be of interest to a wide range of people and organisations.

Full details of Recommendation 3 can be found on pages 16-20 of the consultation document.

Recommendation 3: The Qualifications Information Review recommends the development of a rigorous means of comparing academic demand/difficulty across different qualifications, underpinned by independent criteria and validated by HE, to support HE admissions.

To what extent do you agree, in principle, with the recommendation for the development of a means of comparing 'demand' across different qualifications, underpinned by criteria and ratings validated by HE?

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree nor disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

It would be helpful to have a reliable and robust tool with which to compare academic demand across different qualifications. However, we recognise that in practice this will be extremely difficult to develop and implement. It will be essential that all institutions are happy (or at least content) with the recommended demand scale and where qualifications are placed within it. Given the diversity across the sector, we feel that this might be extremely difficult to achieve.

If taken forward it will be essential to seek advice from assessment experts when developing an acceptable means of comparing demand, especially given the differences between the designs of qualifications. As recognised in the consultation's briefing paper "Thinking about demand", in reality demand is a multi-faceted concept encompassing time, knowledge and skills requirements, the degree of difficulty/challenge and, arguably, the frequency with which top grades are awarded.

We are mindful of the fact that an academic demand indicator (or indicators) may have widening participation implications, particularly for those students already undertaking particular qualifications at the point that this change is implemented. Careful consideration will need to be given to ensure that applicants are not disadvantaged during the implementation phase.

What would be the impact of this recommendation on you/your organisation?

It is not possible to quantify what impact this recommendation might have until more details on what it entails are available.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation supports fairness, transparency and efficiency in HE admissions?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Fairness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transparency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

At this stage it is impossible to judge whether the implementation of this recommendation will support fairness, transparency or efficiency in HE admissions. It has the potential to support all of these, but the devil is in the detail; it could equally easily harm all of these.

Please use the space below to share any comments you have on the proposed academic demand criteria outlined in the consultation document.

The criteria outlined in the “Thinking about demand” represent a good starting point for further discussion. We would recommend that the frequency with which top grades are awarded (or similar measures of the degree of differentiation between high ability students) should be included among the criteria considered.

Please use the space below to share any comments you have on the role of the qualification advisory group, as outlined in the consultation document.

The role envisaged for the QAG seems sensible and appropriate. It is important that the QAG is indeed made up of HE subject and qualification experts, and not, with all due respect to them, admissions administrators.

Please use the space below to outline what communications and guidance you feel would be necessary to support implementation of this recommendation.

At the stage it is difficult to be specific, but the communications and guidance requirements associated with the implementation of this recommendation will be substantial.

Please use the space below to add any further comments you have about this recommendation.

Recommendation 4: A simple qualifications metric for HE management information

UCAS believes that this section may be of greater interest to those working within HE including those with a responsibility for management information, planning and reporting. However other respondents are welcome to complete this section if they wish.

If you feel unable to comment on this section, please click next at the bottom of the page to proceed.

Full details of Recommendation 4 can be found on pages 21-23 of the consultation document.

Recommendation 4: The Qualifications Information Review recommends the development of a simple qualifications metric for HE management information in conjunction with HESA and HEFCE, SFC, HEFCW and DELNI and following agreement on the UCAS demand criteria and rating scale.

To what extent do you agree, in principle, with the recommendation to develop a simple qualifications metric for HE management information purposes?

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Strongly agree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Agree | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Neither agree nor disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Strongly disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

What would be the impact of this recommendation on you/your organisation?

Whilst we do not use tariff points for any internal reporting purposes, their principal use is in league tables and we consistently have the highest scores in the sector. The proposed methodology, which gives weight to qualification 'demand' would serve to strengthen this position.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation support fairness, transparency and efficiency in HE admissions?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Fairness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transparency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

Do you think that any dimensions other than academic demand and qualification size should be considered within HE management information metrics?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please use this space to explain your answer in more detail.

Some consideration should be given to providing an indication when the 'tariffable' qualifications reported do not reflect the full set of qualifications on which a student was admitted. This would be a case of reporting that a student has been admitted on a mixture of tariffable and non-tariffable qualifications (thus it would be misleading to correlate score and outcome).

Please use the space below to outline what communications and guidance you feel would be necessary to support implementation of this recommendation.

Please use the space below to add any further comments you have about this recommendation.

Recommendation 5: An annual report on the use of qualifications in HE admissions

UCAS believes that this section may be of greater interest to those working within HE. However other respondents are welcome to complete this section if they wish.

If you feel unable to comment on this section, please click next at the bottom of the page to proceed.

Full details of Recommendation 5 can be found on page 24 of the consultation document.

Recommendation 5: The Qualifications Information Review recommends the provision of a UCAS annual report on the use of qualifications within HE admissions.

To what extent do you agree, in principle, with the recommendation for UCAS to produce an annual report on the use of qualifications within HE admissions?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

It would be helpful for UCAS to produce an annual report on the use of qualifications within HE admissions but the content and timing of the report will need careful consideration and buy-in from HEIs. It will be important to ensure that applicants taking appropriate but less popular qualifications are not discouraged from applying to Higher Education. It will be essential that the report does not inadvertently misrepresent qualifications information, for example by overlooking previous Level 3 qualifications achieved by applicants.

What would be the impact of this recommendation on you/your organisation?

It would be helpful to have sector-wide information on the qualifications being used in the admissions process and this might assist us when reviewing our own qualification information advice and guidance.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation support fairness, transparency and efficiency in HE admissions?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Fairness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transparency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

Please share any comments you have on the scope of the annual report as outlined in the consultation document.

We do not feel that it would be appropriate to report on the qualifications used in admissions at an institutional level, although there would be value in providing some information for identified groups of institutions.

When in the academic year should this report be published so that it can be most helpful in supporting HE admissions?

This would require further sector-wide discussion. We would suggest that it is published in April each year. This will provide sufficient time for UCAS to process data from the previous admissions cycle, be too late for HEIs to be tempted to make knee-jerk responses affecting the admissions cycle then in progress, but allow plenty of time for careful consideration before admissions policy for the following cycle is finalised.

Please use the space below to outline what communications and guidance you feel would be necessary to support implementation of this recommendation.

Please use the space below to add any further comments you have about this recommendation.

Recommendation 6: Optional admissions tools

UCAS believes that this section may be of greater interest to those working within HE. However other respondents are welcome to complete this section if they wish.

If you feel unable to comment on this section, please click next at the bottom of the page to proceed.

Full details of Recommendation 6 can be found on pages 24-25 of the consultation document.

Recommendation 6: The Qualifications Information Review recommends the provision of optional admissions tools for those HEIs wishing to make more flexible grade-based offers, subject to consultation with the sector.

To what extent do you agree, in principle, with the recommendation to provide optional admissions tools for those HEIs wishing to make more flexible grade-based offers?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

The University of Cambridge is unlikely to make use of additional admissions tools that allow more flexible grade-based offers.

What would be the impact of this recommendation on you/your organisation?

None.

To what extent do you agree that this recommendation support fairness, transparency and efficiency in HE admissions?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Fairness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transparency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use this space to explain your views in more detail.

Would you/your organisation want to use such tools within admissions?

Yes

No

Don't know

Please use this space to explain your answer in more detail.

The principal aim of the admissions policy of the Colleges of the University of Cambridge is to offer admission to students of the highest intellectual potential. We do not believe that a more flexible approach to grade-based offers would help us achieve this. All of our offers are already tailored according to the individual academic profile of each of our applicants.

Please use the space below to outline what communications and guidance you feel would be necessary to support implementation of this recommendation.

Please use the space below to add any further comments you have about this recommendation.

Releasing the full potential of the review outcomes

UCAS believes that some questions within this section may be of interest to a range of people and organisations.

Full details about realising the full potential of the review outcomes can be found on page 26 of the consultation document.

UCAS is committed to ensuring that its products and services are strengthened in light of any agreed changes, so the benefits of the new qualifications information system are fully shared with learners, applicants, schools and colleges. Please use the space below to share any comments or suggestions regarding ways in which UCAS products and services might be revised in light of the proposals made in the consultation document.

Do the proposals outlined in the consultation documents take sufficient account of the education and HE environment in your part of the United Kingdom?

Yes

No

Don't know

Please use this space to explain your answer in more detail.

Do you believe that the proposals outlined in this document will be sufficiently flexible to accommodate any future changes to the UK qualification and examination systems?

Yes

No

Don't know

Please use this space to explain your answer in more detail.

Please use the space below to outline any additional features that you would like UCAS to provide in a new qualifications information system.

Implementation and resourcing

UCAS believes that some questions within this section may be of interest to a range of people and organisations.

Full details about implementation and resourcing can be found on page 27 of the consultation document.

The introduction of a new qualifications information system should deliver efficiency gains for HE providers. Please outline any views you have on the perceived efficiency benefits of the proposals and any suggestions for how any disadvantages could be minimised.

The cost of developing, delivering and running the new service will be met by UCAS. This means that there might need to be a small increase in the capitation fee. If you work for an HEI, would your institution be willing to pay a small increase for access to this enhanced service?

N/A, I do not work for a HEI

Yes

No

Don't know

Please use this space to explain your answer in more detail.

We have already invested significant resources in keeping up with UCAS developments, for example the imminent removal of copy forms and the introduction of our additional online application questionnaires that collect the information we consider essential that UCAS does not supply us with. We also anticipate that significant system developments may be required in light of the recommendations coming from the Admissions Process Review.

Unless the QIPs contain all the information we require (which seems unlikely) then the need for our own independent qualification research will not be removed.

If the proposals are agreed, UCAS plans to support implementation through a comprehensive, long-term engagement programme aimed at HE admissions staff, learners and their advisers. We would welcome comments on the particular needs of different stakeholder groups, especially more mature learners and those learners who have limited access to high quality information and advice.

Further Comments

This concludes the response form for the Qualifications Information Review Consultation.

Thank you for your responses so far. If you have any further comments that have not been adequately addressed in the previous questions, please add them below.

Further comments: