

Federation of Awarding Bodies response to the Ofqual consultation on implementing functional skills reform, May 2018

Overview of the Federation of Awarding Bodies

The Federation of Awarding Bodies is the trade association for vocational and technical awarding organisations (AOs) with over 125 organisations in full membership ranging from large generic AOs to those working in specific occupational areas, including professional bodies.

Our members operate across a wide range of vocational/technical sectors and provide a range of qualifications to support learners to qualify and progress in their chosen sector. Some of our members award the current functional skills qualifications and our membership includes 14 of the 16 awarding organisations that currently award the functional skills qualifications (FSQs). We therefore have a significant interest in this consultation and welcome the opportunity to respond.

This evidence submission is provided on behalf of the Federation's membership following consultation with them and with the Federation's Board of Directors. However, AOs are a diverse community and our members may wish to make their own individual submissions containing their own perspectives and emphases, in addition to any comments forwarded to the Federation for inclusion in this overall response.

Organisation name: Federation of Awarding Bodies (FAB)

Name: Ailin O'Cathain

Position (if applicable): Head of Policy

Telephone number: 020 3786 3171

Email: ailin.ocathain@awarding.org.uk

Consultation questions

Q1: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to setting rules for assessment strategy documents?

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments:

The Federation believes that the proposed approach to setting rules for assessment strategy documents is appropriate. There are many detailed rules and requirements in relation to the assessment of the reformed functional skills qualifications (FSQs). We believe that the requirement for each awarding organisation to provide an assessment strategy will help to provide AOs with an assurance that the assessment arrangements that have planned are appropriate in each case. It will provide Ofqual with an opportunity to identify any misinterpretation of the requirements that could result in the assessment approach of a specific AO being more or less demanding in the marketplace and will aid consistency.

However, it is crucial that the requirements of the regulator are clearly articulated so AOs can be sure the assessment strategy they submit clearly meets all the requirements. The inclusion in the Draft Conditions, requirements and guidance of the proposed detail of the assessment strategies is useful and AOs will undoubtedly identify in their consultation responses if there are areas where the outline would benefit from further clarification prior to the final publication of the document. It is not clear how much detail an AO will be required to provide in relation to the policies and processes that the assessment strategy will need to reference to. This should be clearly stated at the outset and as the submission process gets underway it would be useful if Ofqual could issue updates to AOs where they identify any areas that are commonly being misinterpreted by AOs in the submission of their assessment strategy.

It will also be important to ensure that when an AO submits an assessment strategy and this is not successful in the first instance that the resubmitted document is not assessed by a completely different expert who then flags other, new issues. We welcome the assurance at the recent Functional Skills Qualifications Oversight Board (FSQOB) that resubmitted strategies will only be reviewed in terms of the issues that were flagged in the initial feedback and will not be subject to a full review at this stage.

Conditions FSE2.4b and FSM 2.4b require AOs to review their assessment strategy promptly to ensure compliance on receiving written communication of requirements from Ofqual. Whilst we are sure that all AOs will always seek to respond to such communications as promptly as possible, it is important that Ofqual recognises that their ability to do so immediately may depend upon the nature of the requirement. The on-demand delivery model of Functional Skills may mean that certain changes cannot be implemented immediately without causing disruption to centres and candidates and where this may be the case, it will be more appropriate for AOs to agree an action plan for implementation with Ofqual. The Conditions may therefore need to be amended to require AOs to respond with an action plan rather than to 'review promptly'.

Q2: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed rules around the technical evaluation process?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation understands the rationale for the up-front evaluation of materials, including the assessment strategies, prior to AOs commencing their offer of the reformed FSQs to their centres/learners. We understand that the FSQs have a high profile and we appreciate the need to ensure that all AOs who offer them in the market are well-positioned to ensure the consistent quality of the awards. This will be particularly important where new entrants are seeking entry to the market.

However, the consultation documentation refers to the requirement to submit 'certain materials' and although it refers specifically to the assessment strategy and sample assessment materials it does not indicate what other materials will be required. Given that the challenging timescales that AOs will be required to work to in order to develop the qualifications and submit information to the regulator for the upfront evaluation, we would welcome early sight of a comprehensive list of the materials that will be required and confirmation of the turnaround time that Ofqual will adhere to in terms of reviewing the materials and informing AOs of the outcome. The turnaround timescale for any required resubmission will also need to be clearly stated so AOs know in advance how long they will need to factor into their overall plans for a decision from the regulator. Clarity of the requirements is crucial and the overall timeline for the development of the new FSQs demands that this information is provided as a matter of urgency.

Following the recent meeting of the Ofqual FSQOB on 27 April, it is evidence that there is also a need to be clear with AOs about how much sample assessment material is required to be submitted for the technical evaluation. We would want to avoid a situation where an AO has

developed what it feels is sufficient assessment material but is then required by Ofqual to produce more for the technical evaluation. AOs will understandably not wish to invest in the development of an extensive range of assessment material until after the sample has been agreed with Ofqual. Prompt clarification of the requirements will be important.

We welcome the plan to allow AOs to make the qualifications available before they have made the changes required by Ofqual, where this is appropriate. This will allow time for minor issues to be addressed without delaying the launch of an AOs qualifications to the market. Given the challenging timescale that AOs will be required to work to, we believe this is a pragmatic approach.

Q3: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to interpreting the subject content requirements for new FSQs in English?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation and members of our Functional Skills Group have, on a number of occasions, discussed our concerns about the subject content with both Ofqual and DfE. This feedback sought to ensure that the final content was clear and did not present any significant risks to consistent interpretation and comparable assessment. We believe some risks still exist with the final content and consequently we welcome Ofqual's proposal to develop guidance to aid clarity, consistency of interpretation and comparability. It would be particularly useful if the guidance could address the issues that arise in relation to differentiation between the levels. The content specifications should set out at each level the skills and knowledge that differentiates that level from the level below to give a clear framework for what must be taught, learnt and assessed at each level. However, requirements are given by the Subject Content document that are substantively the same or identical at more than one level so there is no clear differentiation between the levels.

In the future it will be useful for Ofqual to keep this guidance under review and add to it as issues are identified, particularly following the early assessments of the reformed FSQs. AOs are committed to doing what they can reasonably do to ensure assessments are comparable and any guidance that Ofqual can provide to support this aim has the potential to be of value.

Q4: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to interpreting the subject content requirements for new FSQs in mathematics?

- Strongly agree
 Agree
 Neither agree nor disagree
 Disagree
 Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments:

Please see the response to Q3 above. In maths, the main areas to be addressed are:

- the extent of the sample of the content that needs to be included in each assessment.
- whether the problem solving requires the problems to be based on a real-world context.

Q5: To what extent do you agree with our proposed minimum and maximum overall assessment time requirements in English?

- Strongly agree
 Agree
 Neither agree nor disagree
 Disagree
 Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments:

In our response to the Ofqual Functional Skills consultation which closed on 22 November 2017, we responded to confirm that our members had indicated that a generous range with a minimum and maximum for overall assessment time would be the preferred way forward. This may contribute to the overall perception in the market of the qualifications being comparable if the overall assessment time sits within an agreed and published range.

We also noted at that point that it would be desirable to keep the range under review, particularly in the early stages of the life of the reformed Functional Skills Qualifications (FSQs), to ensure that the range is appropriate once there is evidence available from assessments. This may help to more accurately identify what the most appropriate minimum to maximum range should be.

Consequently, the Federation welcomes the approach that is proposed in this consultation and believes it will have a positive impact on the perception of users in relation to the qualifications offered by different AOs.

Q6: To what extent do you agree with our proposed minimum and maximum overall assessment time requirements in mathematics?

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

Please provide any comments:

See Q5 above. The Federation welcomes this approach and believes it will have a positive impact on the perception of users in relation to the qualifications offered by different AOs.

Q7: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to setting rules around the contextualisation of the reading and writing assessments at the entry levels?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation agrees with the proposed approach to setting rules around the contextualisation of the reading and writing assessments at the entry levels. We agree that it is appropriate for AOs to retain an appropriate level of control over any contextualisation that is carried out by centres to ensure this is contained within reasonable parameters.

Q8: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to set a rule on awarding organisations to provide guidance to centres around any setting, adaptation, delivery or marking of assessments that they undertake?

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

Please provide any comments:

Where centres set, adapt, deliver or mark assessments there is the potential for this involvement to introduce risk to the consistency and comparability of assessments. The Federation therefore agrees that it will be important for AOs to provide guidance to centres which clearly lays down what they can and cannot do and how to ensure their activities are within permitted parameters.

Q9: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to put in place guidance on assessment availability?

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

Please provide any comments:

It is not clear why guidance is being proposed in this instance and who the guidance will be for. The Federation can understand that the regulator would wish to make it clear to all stakeholders that there is no regulatory restriction that has been placed on assessment availability. This will help centres and other stakeholders to understand that the different availability across different AOs is not, in itself, an issue. Is the proposal to produce guidance for AOs to use as they develop their assessment strategies? If so, the timeline for this will be challenging and it will need to be addressed in the very short term.

Q10: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to mandate a common approach to issuing results, so that all learners who do not meet the required standard receive a result of 'Fail'?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation agrees that it will be clearer for centres and learners if all AOs use the same terminology for the results and pass/fail terminology clearly communicates the outcome of the assessments that a learner undertakes. However, any requirement to use of this terminology at qualification level raises some concerns. The candidate passes the assessment/s and is awarded the qualification. There is no 'pass' grade reported on the certificate. A 'fail' grade is never issued at the level of the qualification. The candidate can retake the assessment/s as many times as they

need and there is no restriction on the length of time between registration and being awarded the qualification/s. These arrangements have worked well for existing FS and predecessor qualifications.

Q11: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to setting rules around the number of assessments and tasks in the reading; writing and speaking, listening and communicating components?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation agrees with the proposal to set rules around the number of assessments and tasks in the reading; writing and speaking and communicating components. We believe this will make the approach to assessment more consistent and will have a beneficial impact on how stakeholders view the consistency of the offer across a number of AOs.

The different approaches that can be taken to assessing the spelling ability of the learners may well become a source of perceived inconsistency. If one AO approaches this through the written composition and another requires this as a standalone assessment, which is more akin to a traditional spelling test, this could cause some confusion and lead to allegations/perception of inconsistency. It would therefore be useful if Ofqual issued some information for centres which explains that these approaches are equally valid and offer slightly different routes to evidencing the achievement of a consistent standard. This might help centres to understand that different approaches do not equate to different standards being applied.

Q12: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to the assessment of the reading expectations?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation feels that this proposal requires further explanation. It is not clear what 'a representative sample' will be deemed to be and whether this will be specified further so all AOs sample to the same extent. The extent of the sampling will in turn dictate how many versions are required to assess all words and types of words. As it stands, this represents an areas where AOs could take very different approaches which could lead to centres/learners being disadvantaged by assessments that include a much bigger sample of words.

Q13: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to the assessment of the spelling expectations?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation did not support the inclusion of the spelling lists in the content for the new FSQs. We believe that the provision of a prescribed word list may well lead to 'teaching to the test' with a focus being on memorising the list and not on understanding the underpinning principles of spelling that may well help learners to spell a wider range of word accurately in work and everyday life. We do not believe that the move towards the use of traditional spelling tests, rather than tests of functional proficiency when constructing language and applying it in authentic situations, is a desirable way forward. There is also a risk that learners' use of language becomes highly repetitive and formulaic, according to these limited and apparently arbitrary lists.

However, we recognise that Ofqual has no choice other than to work with the content provided by DfE and find a way for this requirement to function within a regulated qualifications environment. Taking the overall situation into account it makes sense to specify requirements which aim to make the approach of the AOs comparable with one another. It would however, be useful to explain further how the coverage of the spelling expectations can be achieved without the assessments becoming predictable.

Q14: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to setting guidance around the use of language and stimulus materials that is in line with the reading and spelling expectations set for each entry level?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree

- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments:

The Federation believes it is important that every learner has access to fair assessment. Using language in the assessment materials, whether this is in the instructions, rubrics or stimulus materials which is beyond the ability of the intended learners is likely to result in learners being disadvantaged. This is important in the assessments for maths as well as the assessments for English. We therefore agree that Ofqual should provide guidance that clarifies what is required as this will support AOs in ensuring their assessments do not present any barriers to learners.

Q15: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed weighting ranges for spelling, punctuation and grammar at both levels 1 and 2 and at the Entry levels?

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

Please provide any comments:

At Entry level the proposal is to apply a 40-45% SPaG weighting. However, at Entry 1, there is only one non SPaG subject content statement specified for Writing. This is insufficient to support 55-60% of the marks without over-assessment of this single statement. The risk is that this creates an unreasonable barrier to achievement for the level.

For **Levels 1 and 2** the proposal is to lower the proportion of total marks for SPaG from 40-45% to 30-35% to take into account the decision not to allow the use of spellcheckers and dictionaries for spelling. However, it is difficult to model the impact the removal of these aids will have and whether the proposed adjustment to SPaG requirements is, therefore, appropriate.

In addition, the way learners currently access these aids depends on the medium through which the test is taken. Only the small percentage of learners who complete the test using a word processor would have access to inbuilt spelling and grammar checkers. Learners who take the tests on an on-screen platform generally do not have a spelling or grammar checker inbuilt to the platform and those who take the test on paper do not have inbuilt aids. This means that most learners do not currently have access to functionality which will check the whole document and can only use dictionaries or handheld tools to check individual words.

As it is not possible to model the impact of removing access to these aids it may be more appropriate to take account of this through an adjustment to the pass mark, rather than to impose a blanket reduction of the requirement.

Other concerns about this proposal include:

- The Ofqual Thematic Review noted that candidates were passing the Writing test with low standards of technical accuracy in SPaG. As AOs were generally already assessing SPaG at the highest proportion allowed the only way they could address this issue was to slightly increase the pass mark.
- Also as a result of Ofqual Thematic Review, AOs were steered to have less differentiation of the highest level of performance for SPaG, but when they came to apply this it would have led to a significant increase on the pass rate for learners who demonstrated an overall unacceptable level of accuracy.
- Within the current allocation some AOs have found this allows slightly too few marks overall to support the adequate differentiation of performance on grammar. This has led to situations where candidates who make a high number of mistakes achieve the same marks as those who make fewer mistakes. This is because it is only possible to deduct the same finite number of marks for these two groups of candidates.
- This adjustment will impact the number of marks AOs can allocate for punctuation. This is not justified by the removal of aids to spelling and grammar.
- Reducing the proportion of marks for SPaG will make the tests easier to pass because a lower standard of accuracy will be necessary to achieve the standard. This may have an impact on what is taught and learnt as there will be less incentive for learners with lower standards of accurate SPaG to improve.

The proportion of marks for SPaG at level 1 and 2 should not therefore be reduced (and it may be worthwhile Ofqual working with AOs to research whether a marginal increase is justified).

Q16: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed common assessment criteria?

Strongly agree

Agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments:

The Federation agrees with this approach but the performance descriptor may well benefit from some further development and clarification in response to comments from individual AOs. It is essential that this is clear so it can be used consistently.

Q17: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to require awarding organisations to produce exemplar materials to support assessor judgements in relation to the speaking, listening and communicating component?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation agrees that this is a suitable way forward as it will support centres to achieve consistent assessor judgements which maintain the standard over time. However, AOs will only be able to produce useful exemplars if there is sufficient time available to them and if the assessment criteria are clear to them in terms of what needs to be achieved by the learners. Ofqual should also clarify whether samples of these materials will need to be submitted as part of the evaluation process.

Q18: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to disapply our General Condition of Recognition H2 (moderation where an assessment is marked by a centre) in respect of the speaking, listening and communicating component?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation agrees that the H2 should be disapplied in respect of the speaking, listening and communicating (SLC) component. The alternative approach that is proposed offers a pragmatic solution which will ensure that AOs can effectively monitor the activity of the centre in relation to the SLC component.

Q19: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the monitoring arrangements we are proposing to put in place for the speaking, listening and communicating component?

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

Please provide any comments:

The alternative monitoring arrangements that are proposed offer a pragmatic solution which will ensure that AOs can effectively monitor the activity of the centre in relation to the SLC component.

Q20: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposal to produce guidance to clarify that the use of sign language is permitted as a reasonable adjustment in new FSQs in English?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation welcomes that sign language will be a permitted reasonable adjustment for FSQs in English. We believe that guidance from Ofqual in this area will be useful to support AOs to allow the correct adjustments and to aid consistency across AOs in relation to the adjustments that are allowed. Making reasonable adjustments is an important area of AO activity and it is important that these decisions are made in an informed way. Any support Ofqual can make available to AOs to underpin valid decisions in this area will add value.

Q21: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to the number of assessments in new FSQs in mathematics?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation agrees with the approach outlined in the consultation document and believes this will help to ensure that AOs approach the maths assessments in the similar ways.

Q22: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to the coverage of subject content in new FSQs in mathematics?

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

Please provide any comments:

The maths content is now more extensive so we agree that there will need to be some indication of how much of it should be covered in each set of assessments, without setting fixed percentages for coverage. Without this clarity, it is likely that AOs will sample the content to different extents and this will lead to inconsistency and a lack of comparability.

Q23: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to the weightings for calculator- and non-calculator based assessment?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation agrees that there should be fixed weightings for the calculator/non-calculator papers to ensure consistency of approach across all AOs. Individual members will comment on whether the proposed weightings are appropriate.

It would also be useful to clarify what type of items should be included in the non-calculator paper and whether these can be a mix of items where you would/would not expect a learner to need to use a calculator or whether all items should be of the nature that you would expect the average learner to need to use a calculator. This is currently not clear and may be interpreted differently by AOs.

Q24: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposed approach to the weightings for underpinning skills and problem solving?

- Strongly agree
- Agree

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Please provide any comments:

The Federation agrees that the weighting should be predominantly in favour of the assessment of problem solving questions or tasks.

Q25: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposals around the use of evidence to support standard setting?

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

Please provide any comments:

The Federation agrees with the use of evidence to support standard setting. It will be important to consider the specific types of evidence that will be available to support FSQ standard setting and not automatically map over GCSE evidence requirements. FSQs are taken by a wide range of learners and this group is far more varied than GCSE cohorts. It would therefore be more difficult to use prior attainment evidence consistently in this context.

Q26: To what extent do you agree or disagree with our proposals around the maintaining standards in reformed FSQs?

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

The Federation agrees that there needs to be activity to maintain standards in the reformed FSQs but the consultation provides no detailed proposals that we can consider.

We know from member feedback that there is some concern about the proposal that learners must achieve all three English components at the same level. Currently, each component is reported separately on the certificate at the level achieved. Where the three components are achieved at different levels the qualification is awarded at the lowest level achieved (i.e. there is no need to take the assessment at the lower level if the higher level has been achieved).

This arrangement was put in place to allow candidates who, because of a disability, could not demonstrate at a particular skill at a given level, to take the component at the level below and to still achieve the other components at higher levels. It is not clear what the rationale is for a move away from this arrangement and changes to this arrangement are likely to lead to an increase in the number of component exemptions granted so that learners can achieve other components at the highest level of their ability. This is also likely to limit and impede progression generally and particularly adversely impact on learners and achievements in the secure estate where a learner may not be able to progress to the same level for all three components in a limited time period.

Q27: Do you have any comments on our proposed rules and guidance for new FSQs in English?

The Federation has nothing further to add.

Q28: Do you have any comments on our proposed rules and guidance for new FSQs in mathematics?

The Federation has nothing further to add.

Q29: Are there any regulatory impacts that we have not identified arising from our proposals?

The Federation has nothing further to add.

Q30: Are there any additional steps we could take to minimise the regulatory impact of our proposals?

The Federation has nothing further to add.

Q31: Are there any costs or benefits associated with our proposals which we have not identified?

The Federation has nothing further to add. Individual members will be better placed to comment on the costs/benefits associated with the proposals.

Q32: Is there any additional information we should consider when evaluating the costs and benefits of our proposals?

The Federation has nothing further to add. Individual members will be better placed to comment on the costs/benefits associated with the proposals.

Q33: Do you have any comments on any ways in which our proposals will prevent innovation by awarding organisations?

The Federation has nothing further to add.

Q34: We have set out the ways in which our proposals could impact (positively or negatively) on learners who share a protected characteristic.¹ Are there any potential impacts that we have not identified?

Please see issues raised in response to Q26 above. In addition, it is not clear whether the new subject content was subjected to a review and analysis in terms of equality of opportunity, access and inclusion, prior to it being approved as the final content.

Q35: Are there any additional steps we could take to mitigate any negative impact, resulting from our proposals, on learners who share a protected characteristic?

The Federation has nothing further to add.

Q36: Do you have any other comments on the impacts of our proposals on learners who share a protected characteristic?

The Federation has nothing further to add.

¹ The term 'protected characteristics' is defined in the Equality Act 2010. Here, it means sex, disability, racial group, age, religion or belief, pregnancy or maternity, sexual orientation and gender reassignment.

About you

To evaluate responses properly, we need to know in what capacity you are responding to the consultation. We will only consider your response if you complete the following section. Questions marked with a * are required.

Organisation (if applicable): * Federation of Awarding Bodies

Is this a personal response or an official response on behalf of your organisation? *

Personal response (please answer the question 'If you ticked 'Personal response'')

Official response (please answer the question 'If you ticked 'Official response'')

If you ticked 'Official response', which of the following are you? *

Awarding organisation

Local authority

School or college (please answer the question 'School or college type' below)

Academy chain

Private training provider

University or other higher education institution

Employer

Other representative or interest group (please answer the question 'Type of representative group or interest group' below)

Type of representative group or interest group

Group of awarding organisations

Union

Employer or business representative group

Subject association or learned society

Equality organisation or group

School, college or teacher representative group

Other (please state below)

The Federation of Awarding Bodies is the trade association for vocational and technical awarding organisations (AOs) with over 125 organisations in full membership ranging from large generic AOs to those working in specific occupational areas, including professional bodies.

Nation*

England

Wales

Northern Ireland

Scotland

Other EU country: _____

Non-EU country: _____

How did you find out about this consultation?

Ofqual's newsletter

Ofqual's social media channels

Other social media channels

Ofqual's website

Internet search

Other: _____