

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

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

In principle, it makes sense to provide information, readily accessible by Higher Education, about qualifications, and that this information should be organised within a single database using common fields designed to meet the needs of HEIs.

However, the creation and, *especially*, the maintenance of large databases is notoriously difficult and there are plenty of examples of spectacular failures and sub-optimal solutions. We would advise against taking this route at least until all other options have been exhausted and there is absolute clarity about its purpose and the level of demand. We are not convinced that the proposed content is in high demand or would be widely used. We are aware from work with a wide range of admissions tutors and officers that there is a variety of quite different needs in relation to qualification data and information and we believe these need to be segmented and defined. For example those institutions (or departments) that currently make substantial use of the UCAS tariff will have quite different needs to the many HEIs that do not.

Careful thought needs to be given to the sources of any information. What are the incentives for relevant organisations to provide complete and timely information? Suppliers of information will be more likely to dedicate resource to this activity if there is a regulatory requirement or a clear commercial advantage. It will be necessary to consider whether data transfer arrangements could work with partners who collect some (but not all) of this information already – notably Ofqual, awarding bodies, funding agencies and UK NARIC. It may be a better approach to simply signpost UCAS customers to relevant data in other existing sites.

There is an argument that the Ofqual register of qualifications already exists as a single source of qualification information and it would be advisable for UCAS and Ofqual to consider the merits of developing this existing database to meet the needs of HEIs in the context of the wider information needs of young people, parents and providers of advice and

guidance. This may be timely as Ofqual is currently consulting on a variety of qualification types to inform the future design of its register of regulated qualifications (see Ofqual, Risk Based Regulation- A consultation for Awarding Organisations, February 2012). Given that UCAS has argued that the information would be taken from information already in the public domain, it seems likely that this could be achieved. However, in order to achieve this, not all of UCAS’s proposals would be possible and some compromise would be needed.

If UCAS believes something bespoke is needed for HEI’s purposes, it would still need to be sure that UCAS was the best placed organisation to host such a database.

As previously stated, we believe further work is needed to establish what information would be meaningful and manageable for HEIs, the level of demand for the information and the purposes to which it would be put. It is clear to us that many of the suggestions put forward in this consultation are too ambitious, or open to misinterpretation, or simply wouldn’t be used by the bulk of universities, especially those who make full use of the current tariff system.

For example, the proposal to introduce a new metric of “academic demand” is fraught with difficulty and we expand on this in our later responses, especially under question 3. The inclusion of grade distributions is meaningless without detailed information about the cohorts, at which point the level of detail required becomes unmanageable.

In the past, awarding bodies have always submitted details of their qualifications to UCAS for inclusion in the Admissions Tutor’s Handbook and on-line equivalents. Other than the highly desirable aim of making the information easier to interrogate, we struggle to understand what additional benefits there might be, or what valuable new information might come from this proposal.

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

In terms of resource, this would rather depend on what additional information would be required of awarding bodies, and how frequently these would be collected. Clearly, if new metrics were introduced which were seen as advantaging or disadvantaging different qualifications, we could see changes in patterns of uptake, possibly for superficial or invalid reasons. We would need to monitor this carefully.

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.

This depends on the information provided and the extent to which it is used in an informed and evaluative way. If information is kept at a high level and is largely objective this will help. We would be interested, however, in mechanisms which encourage users to look at the content, design and purpose of qualifications instead of using a points score or equivalency process as some kind of proxy.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Vocationally related skills and knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Other (please specify below)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Other:

Much of the feedback we have heard from colleagues in Higher Education suggests that basic information about qualifications taken by candidates from overseas is becoming an imperative. We wonder whether this is a more urgent priority than most of the changes proposed in this consultation.

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

We have consulted closely with a range of admissions officers and tutors about the sort of information they need about qualifications. We believe there is a manageable core of *information*: clearly specified **aims**, clarity about its **target audience**, clarity about the **skills and knowledge** it develops, precise information about the **assessment requirements** (down to length of exams etc), notional **size, level** and a description of any **grading** structure. Access to more detail about content is addressed by access to the specification/syllabus, which already exists.

We are continuing to explore through our Higher Education consultative forums the possibilities of providing more granular *data* about the achievement of individual candidates in relation to the rest of their cohort. Some HEIs are particularly interested in identifying candidates whose marks place them close to a grade boundary. We believe this information is useful, but, it has to be at individual candidate level, subject level, and for a specific examination session. Furthermore, the use of such data is resource-intensive for HEIs, and many see little benefit for their institution. This is not the sort of information that can feature on a national database, available to all, and has to be issued with a candidate's result. We have already stated that more generic, high level data about grade distribution etc is of little benefit and is already available to those who wish to use it. Finally, such data may not be so easily produced or interpreted where candidates have taken different types of qualifications with pass/fail or other grading approaches, or where candidates have taken qualifications from overseas.

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

As we have said, most of the information is probably in the public domain, but may not be as easily extracted by HEIs as they would wish. The first step is to agree what the fields or headings should be and to explore whether other providers of databases of similar information could carry this in the required format. Clearly the international dimension may provide challenges. The Federation of Awarding Bodies would be able to support any consultation with the many vocational awarding bodies that have an interest.

Clearly all parties involved in supplying, checking and using the data will need to consider their accountabilities and liabilities. The provision of incorrect information, or the incorrect interpretation of it, could lead to a young person being denied a university place. This places a significant burden of responsibility on all parties as there are social, legal and regulatory implications.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Access to HE courses	<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, including suggestions for additional information.

We see no reason for excluding information about apprenticeships. They are, however, made up of qualifications which would also qualify for individual entries in the database in their own right. Many of the proposed examples of information, such as grade distributions, cannot be applied to pass/fail, hurdle-based programmes such as apprenticeships.

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

Other:

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

In the first instance HEIs will need to be clear which Level 2 qualifications have a bearing on their decision-making about undergraduate recruitment. We suspect the demand beyond English and Maths GCSE is limited.

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.

This depends on the nature of the information provided. If some qualifications are to be given 'points' according to academic demand or some other metric, this may advantage or disadvantage qualifications that have yet to be allocated points. A decision would have to be made as to when the database was complete enough for decisions to be made that take into account points scores, or what alternatives would need to be in place to ensure that candidates with qualifications that have not been allocated points are given equal consideration.

If it is intended to include data about achievement, grade distributions etc, there will be no data that is relevant to new A Levels until Summer 2016, when the first new cohorts will complete.

However, if the intention is to provide useful information about qualifications in a helpful format, rather than a definitive source, then there is no reason why the database, if one were needed at all, should not be built and released in a series of phases beginning at any time.

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.

See above.

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

The proposals need greater clarity of purpose if messages are to be effective.

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.

We would always encourage universities to make offers based on actual qualifications and grades, and drawing on their own knowledge about the qualifications being asked for. OCR has long been critical of points systems which tend to misrepresent qualifications and generate false, numerical equivalences. The current tariff can distort the value of some qualifications and exclude candidates where no tariff has been allocated. For this reason, we would always strongly advise against using the tariff as a sole mechanism for selection purposes.

However, we have to recognise that in a global education market, the variety of qualifications with different grades and different levels of demand will continue to grow. As much as we would wish it to be possible to develop a full understanding of the features of all qualifications potential undergraduates might hold, we appreciate this won't always be realistic. The tariff does provide a broad, general indication of equivalence and has helped to widen access to HE to a variety of 'non-A Level' students. In contrast, we believe the proposed metric based on academic demand would exclude many 'non-A Level' students.

We are uncertain that it is possible or ethical to 'phase out' the tariff as opposed to withdrawing it in a single step. The risk of so doing would be that some students would gain

university access due to their tariff points and others, with qualifications of a similar nature, but without tariff points, would not gain access. To address the risk of unfairness, we believe the tariff system should be maintained with new and redeveloped qualifications continuing to be allocated points, or it should be withdrawn entirely at a single moment.

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

The fact that a qualification attracts UCAS points is a key factor, sometimes disproportionately, on the uptake of technical and vocational programmes aimed at 16-19 year olds. Their gradual withdrawal in particular would impact on the patterns of uptake of vocational qualifications with a shift over time towards A Levels.

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 type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transparency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<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).

This feels like a tight timescale in which to introduce such a significant change with a potentially high impact on some HEIs.

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?

There is nothing about having a QIP that rules out the continued use of the Tariff. If the Tariff is to be continued it must be maintained to include new qualifications. If a need for a measure of 'academic demand' expressed as a metric, should be introduced (we are strongly opposed to this), there is still no reason why the tariff should not continue. There must be no perception that a measure of academic demand could replace the need for the Tariff. They measure different things and could only be used for quite different purposes (see our response to question 3).

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

From the date it is withdrawn – no earlier.

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.

N/A

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

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

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

The response from Cambridge Assessment to this consultation sets out clearly the technical challenges of this approach and, in particular, why the CRAS methodology is inappropriate.

Compared to the current tariff process (which has never been described as light touch), any attempt to carry this out in a valid and reliable way would consume a great deal of time and resource – far beyond anything that could be justified.

The concept of ‘academic demand’ has not been greatly considered – this is revealed by the interchangeable use of the terms ‘demand’ and ‘difficulty’ and there also seems to be some confusion between the *amount* of demand and the *level* of demand. A measure such as this would need to take account of variability between units, grades and subjects. In this context it is worth quoting from Michael Gove’s recent letter to Ofqual on the reform of A Levels: “I would not wish standards in any particular subject to be constrained artificially as a result of any concept of comparability between subjects”. An effective measure, if such a thing could be developed and used on an industrial scale, would need to show up variations between subjects within A Levels and not just between qualification types or families.

More clarity is needed on what the purpose of this measure is. The purpose of the current tariff is to take a range of different qualifications with different features and qualities and to provide a numerical process for treating them as though they were the same. Although the problems with this are well-rehearsed, they do allow for a wider range of qualifications to be considered, at least initially, and have played a part in widening access to undergraduate study.

The metric proposed here, identifies a single notional constant, ‘academic demand’ and seeks to identify ‘how much’ of this can be found in each of various different qualifications. The effect of such a measure is likely to create far greater differentiation between qualifications, rather than grouping them into similar classes. We would want to discourage any comparison between qualifications based solely on this metric. It is analogous to measuring the amount of salt in various different foodstuffs, and deciding which to eat solely on that basis. A wider range of nutritional information would be required.

Such a metric would not help those seeking to distinguish between the able and the most able applicants, or to make decisions about candidates who have just missed a higher grade. These depend on granular data about the cohort and the individual candidate and, crucially, relate to decisions between candidates who have taken the *same* qualification.

If there has to be a numerical score, we believe a better starting point would be to ask what sorts of skills, knowledge and attributes represent the best preparation for undergraduate study and to build the domains from that. Research from Cambridge Assessment, commissioned by OCR could be used to inform this understanding of the needs of HE from qualifications that prepare students for undergraduate study. We would also recommend considering the proposals put forward by Edexcel in its response to this consultation which develop some of the domains already used in the current UCAS tariff process and retain the purpose of creating a metric which creates broad similarity rather than differences between qualifications.

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

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

Strongly agree Agree Neither agree nor Disagree Strongly disagree

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fairness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Transparency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

This would be expensive, unfair, and depend on a process that would be impenetrable to most onlookers.

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

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.

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

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

To a large extent, it is for the bodies named to specify their requirements, assuming they are looking to UCAS to provide them with such a measure. But we wonder whether a set of codes, based on qualification type, subject area etc, rather than on a numerical value, would be a more useful basis for collecting meaningful data to provide management information.

We have already provided our view about the suitability of a metric based on academic demand. We are also wary of placing undue weight on GLH as a measure, except as a very broad indicator of size.

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

That would depend on how HEFCE etc intended to use this data.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transparency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

Don't know

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

Again, we defer to the bodies that have asked for this information, but a value based on two unrelated dimensions does not seem appropriate.

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

It would be difficult to explain why these dimensions had been selected.

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.

An annual report of this nature should provide useful analysis for all involved in the sector and therefore we would welcome it. UCAS needs to recognise that it is an active influencer in the sector – the way it structures its admissions process, any metrics it sets, any information it provides will have an influence on behaviours in the sector, positive or otherwise. To this extent, we would anticipate a need for some kind of self-evaluation by UCAS of its own impact on trends. The advisory group would need to be robust and

independent, and the involvement of an independent research organisation should be considered to secure the status of the report as academically independent and robust.

We hope that UCAS would also continue to provide data to third parties on a commissioned basis for a wide range of research purposes.

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

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.

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

We would just reiterate the point that this analysis should be independent, ensuring that the impact of any changes introduced by UCAS were subject to thorough interpretation.

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

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

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

There is considerable work to be done on the core proposals and basic principles of the full consultation before consulting on these wider proposals. An on-line calculator means reducing qualifications (and presumably grades) to numbers with all the associated problems.

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

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.

It would depend on the tools.

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.

N/A

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.

Anything that enhances and strengthens UCAS' products and services and brings them to a wider audience is to be welcomed. However, this consultation has not really interrogated what a specific audience – the admissions community – would do with these proposals, or how it will ensure that the metrics and data sets proposed can be used to make valid decisions. UCAS has also previously expressed concern that wider audiences, such as employers, have misused the UCAS tariff, by using it in job advertisements and for recruitment purposes. If information based on metrics is to be widely shared, those metrics must be thoroughly tested, and then only issued with clear caveats about their use.

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.

As previously stated, we believe further consultation is needed to establish the purposes and boundaries of the proposals.

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 believe UCAS has underestimated the scale and cost of its proposals as they stand.

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.

As we do not support the core proposals, it is difficult to provide an answer.

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: