

Analysis of responses to our consultation on withdrawing our rules for Principal Learning and Diploma qualifications



June 2017

Ofqual/17/6231

Contents

Executive summary	1
About our consultation	2
Who responded?	2
Approach to analysis	2
Consultation response outcomes	3
Appendix A: list of organisational consultation respondents	5

Executive summary

We consulted on withdrawing our rules for Principal Learning and Diploma qualifications from 21 March 2017 to 18 April 2017. A copy of the consultation is available on our website.¹

There were 3 responses to the consultation, all from organisations.

All the respondents supported our proposed approach.

¹ www.gov.uk/government/consultations/withdrawing-principal-learning-and-diploma-rules

About our consultation

Our consultation took place from 21 March 2017 to 18 April 2017. It set out our proposal to withdraw our current qualification-specific rules for Principal Learning and Diploma qualifications.

Who responded?

We received 3 responses to our consultation – all from organisations based in England or Wales.

Table 1: Breakdown of consultation responses

Personal / organisation response	Respondent type	Number
Organisation	Awarding organisation	1
Organisation	Trade association	1
Organisation	Union	1

Approach to analysis

We published the consultation on our website and respondents could choose to respond using an online form, by email or by posting their answers to the consultation questions to us.

This was a consultation on the views of those who wished to participate and it cannot be considered as a representative sample of the general public or of any specific group.

Data presentation

We present the responses to the consultation questions in the order in which they were asked.

The consultation asked eight questions and each had a different focus. Respondents could choose to answer all or just some of the questions.

One respondent chose not to answer the questions directly, but instead provided a general comment that they were content with the proposals.

For some of the questions, respondents could indicate the extent to which they agreed with our proposals, using a 5-point scale (Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree and Strongly disagree), as well as providing comments on our proposals.

During the analysis phase we reviewed every response to each question.

Consultation response outcomes

In this section we report the respondent's views. We have structured this around the questions covered in the consultation document and provide analysis of the data broken down by stakeholder.

A consultation is not the same as a survey and the responses only reflect the views of those who chose to respond. Typically these will be those with strong views and/or particular experience or interest in a topic. What follows is a fair reflection of the views expressed by respondents to the consultation.

As set out above, only 2 of the 3 respondents answered our questions directly; the more detailed analysis below reflects the views of those 2 respondents.

Withdrawing our rules for Principal Learning qualifications

Question 1: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to withdraw all our qualification-specific rules for Principal Learning qualifications?

Both respondents said they strongly agreed with this proposal.

One noted it was withdrawing its Principal Learning qualifications.

The other commented that:

- because all Principal Learning qualifications are being withdrawn, the General Conditions of Recognition would be more than adequate to regulate these qualifications for the remainder of their lifetime;
- it saw no purpose in retaining additional sets of rules that add no value to the regulatory landscape; and
- it supported our proposed streamlining of our regulatory requirements.

Withdrawing our rules for Diploma qualifications

Question 2: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to withdraw our remaining qualification-specific rules for Diploma qualifications?

Both respondents said they strongly agreed with this proposal.

One noted that these qualifications are no longer available in England, and that it could see no value in retaining rules that do not apply to any 'live' qualifications.

Equality impact

Question 3: We have not identified any ways in which the proposed changes would impact (positively or negatively) on persons who share a protected characteristic. Are there any potential impacts we have not identified?

Question 4: Are there any additional steps we could take to mitigate any negative impact resulting from these proposals on persons who share a protected characteristic?

Question 5: Do you have any other comments on the impacts of the proposals on persons who share a protected characteristic?

Both respondents commented that there were no additional equality impacts we had not identified, and that, as a result, there were no additional steps we could take to mitigate impacts on persons who share a protected characteristic.

Both respondents also had no further comments on the impacts of our proposals on persons who share a protected characteristic.

Regulatory impact

Question 6: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our assessment of the regulatory impact of our proposals? Are there any regulatory impacts that we have not identified?

Both respondents strongly agreed with our assessment of the regulatory impact. One commented that it was withdrawing its Principal Learning qualifications, the other agreed that the General Conditions of Recognition would allow us to regulate Principal Learning qualifications until they were withdrawn.

One respondent further commented that it had not identified any regulatory impact of the proposals.

Question 7: Are there any additional steps we could take to minimise the regulatory impact of our proposals?

Question 8: Are there any costs or benefits associated with our proposals which we have not identified?

Both respondents commented that there were no additional steps we could take to minimise burden (with one noting this was because our proposals did not impose a burden).

One respondent further commented that it had not identified any costs associated with the proposals, and that they had the benefit of streamlining regulation.

Appendix A: list of organisational consultation respondents

We asked respondents to indicate the capacity in which they were responding as part of their response.

Below we list those organisations that submitted a response to the consultation. We have not included a list of those responding as an individual; however all responses were given equal status in the analysis.

- Association of School and College Leaders
- Federation of Awarding Bodies
- OCR

We wish to make our publications widely accessible. Please contact us at publications@ofqual.gov.uk if you have any specific accessibility requirements.



© Crown copyright 2017

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit <http://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3> or write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email: publications@ofqual.gov.uk.

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/ofqual.

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at:

Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation

Spring Place
Coventry Business Park
Herald Avenue
Coventry CV5 6UB

Telephone 0300 303 3344

Textphone 0300 303 3345

Helpline 0300 303 3346