

**IMPROVING THE HIGHER EDUCATION
APPLICATIONS PROCESS:**

Summary of the Consultation Document

September 2005

THE CONTEXT FOR CHANGE

Background to the project

1. Over the past 40 years or so, the current system of applications to Higher Education (HE) and its predecessors have done a great deal to support and enhance fairness, transparency and accessibility to HE. However, there are signs that the applications system is not as efficient as it might be and that in some important respects is not as fair and flexible as it should be.
2. Concerns have been raised particularly over the use of predicted grades in the application process and how these may put some students at a disadvantage when looking to secure an HE place that best suits their abilities. One proposition that has come up consistently over the years is for the introduction of a system of post-qualification applications (PQA). Under PQA, applicants would know their final exam results before making binding decisions about whether and where to apply to HE, offering the prospect of fairer and more efficient admissions. This proposition has been supported by several influential and high profile groups including the National Committee of Inquiry, led by Sir Ron (now Lord) Dearing (appointed in 1996), the report of Sir Mike Tomlinson's Inquiry into A-Level Standards, in December 2002, and more recently the Admissions to Higher Education Review, chaired by Professor Steven Schwartz.
3. Charles Clarke, then Secretary of State for Education and Skills, announced on 14 September 2004 that he had asked for work to begin leading to the implementation of a system of PQA. Sir Alan Wilson, Director General of Higher Education, leads this work, supported by a small Working Group including senior officials from the Scottish Executive, the Welsh Assembly, the Department for Employment and Learning in Northern Ireland and the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). The project has drawn heavily on the help of a national consultation group, whose membership consists of a wide range of individuals from across the education sector and across the UK. This project was originally established to examine the options for implementing a system of PQA, however, it found that it was not desirable or possible to focus on PQA alone. Discussions have led to a number of proposals being developed that would enhance the current system, as well as paving the way for PQA.
4. The project focused initially on learners who apply to HE via the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS) in the year in which they take their final school sixth form or Further Education (FE) qualifications, paying particular attention to those students whose HE choice is dependent on the results of exams which they have not yet taken. However, as the project developed to examine other aspects of the application process, it naturally considered the needs of all prospective HE students, including those who already have the qualifications they need to enter HE, part-time students, post-graduates, those taking vocational qualifications which may not be designed to meet the HE entry timetable, and overseas non-EU students.

5. This document provides a brief introduction to the full consultation document. It gives an overview of the suggested improvements to the current applications system and two possible approaches to PQA.

The current system

6. The system already has many positive features that have evolved through experience gained in addressing the needs of students and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). It appears to meet students' needs in the majority of cases. In 2004, 75,375 applicants received unconditional offers, with 97% of them taking up those offers. 75% of students holding conditional offers go on to take up their first choice, whilst 8% take up their insurance choice. The system also allows different timetables for applications to study specialist subjects such as Medicine or Art and Design, and an earlier deadline for applications to Oxbridge. Similarly, the current system is able to handle applications from students with a range of circumstances and qualifications other than the traditional routes of A-levels in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, and Highers in Scotland.

7. However, some students may be placed at a disadvantage because the current system is based on applying to HEIs on the basis of predicted exam results, many of which turn out to be wrong. UCAS research showed that predicted grades are accurate in just 45% of cases. In nearly 9% of cases the predictions are too pessimistic whilst in nearly 47% of cases they are too optimistic. Those students who do better in their exams than predicted have little opportunity to change their applications to HE and seek a place that is better suited to their abilities. The starting point of this project was therefore how to make things fairer for students, without making the applications system more burdensome or inefficient for HEIs.

Our approach to reform

8. We took as our starting point consideration of a system of PQA. But during our discussions, a number of potentially free-standing improvements to the current applications system were also suggested to us, aiming to improve the information students have when making their HE choices and HEIs have when making their admissions decisions. We believe that the reforms we propose to the current arrangements would help pave the way for PQA. We also believe that, on their own, these proposals will improve fairness and efficiency.

The following pages give a brief overview of our consultation around:

- Information, advice and guidance for students
- Information about applicants
- Reforming application processes for 2008

We also go on to introduce the concept of PQA and provide an overview of two models for consideration.

INFORMATION, ADVICE AND GUIDANCE FOR STUDENTS

Improving information for students

9. The information students currently have to inform their choice of HE can be variable. It is not always clear what the entry requirements for a course are. Neither is it always clear what financial support a student could get if they went to a particular HEI. It is crucial that students are able to get the best possible information to inform their choices, in order to allow them to target their applications most successfully. The current system handles more applications than it needs to, with each HE place handled by UCAS generating 5.6 applications. This means unnecessary effort for applicants and significant nugatory work for HEIs in considering a large volume of applications which are not the students' definite preferences.

10. We put forward a number of proposals designed to improve the information, advice and guidance available to students considering entering HE, with a view to enabling them to make better informed choices.

Entry Profiles

Proposal 1: UCAS to continue their work to encourage the provision of clear, comparable entry requirement information, with a view to moving toward 100% provision of information for students wishing to enter HE in 2008/09.

11. The provision of clear and comparative entry requirement information is vital to enable students to make better informed and more realistic choices. Many HEIs, through UCAS, already provide Entry Profiles for their courses. These profiles provide entry criteria, including the skills and attributes that a student will need to be successful on the course and the various routes onto the course, including vocational routes. This proposal seeks to ensure that by 2008/09 as many HEIs as possible provide this information.

Financial information

Proposal 2: Further consideration to be given to how to realise the principle of giving students researching their possible HE applications easy access to timely, accurate and reliable information, preferably in one place, about all the financial support they may receive whilst in HE.

12. Students need to know, as they are making their HE choices, what taking up a place in any given HEI will mean for them in monetary terms. The recently announced DfES end-to-end review of the current student finance delivery system in England will help shape ideas for improving this information.

Teaching Quality Information

Proposal 3: HEFCE to commission early research on how students and their advisers are using the information on the Teaching Quality Information (TQI) website, to ensure it is meeting the needs of students and their advisers and to inform its further development from 2006.

13. We note the development of the TQI website which has the potential to be an excellent source of information, both academic and non-academic, for students.

Feedback to students

Proposal 4: HEIs to develop more informative letters to feed back to students, detailing particularly why their applications have been rejected.

14. We were told that, too often, students were given little indication of the reasons why HEIs had rejected their application. This proposal recognises how important it is for students to understand the reasons for a rejection, in order to help them target any further applications realistically.

Information, Advice and Guidance

15. Pre-HE information, advice and guidance is currently available through schools, colleges, the Connexions service, and from Careers Wales and Careers Scotland. Adults may also seek advice and guidance through the 47 local partnerships managed through the Learning and Skills Council and through other sources. We understand that the availability of advice and guidance can be variable. Our proposals are based on the view that good quality advice and guidance is essential for making good quality applications.

16. We expect that the proposals in the Youth Green Paper, and actions taken as a result, will lead to improvements in the quality and consistency of information, advice and guidance for prospective HE students in schools, colleges and elsewhere. The Green Paper proposes clear minimum expectations of the information, advice and guidance that young people should receive, and will explore how quality standards could help ensure quality and impartiality.

INFORMATION ABOUT APPLICANTS

Removal of predicted grades

Proposal 5: Schools and colleges should not supply students' predicted exam results with their HE applications and these should play no part in HE admissions decisions.

Question 1: What other information could be supplied in their place?

16. We have considered the information that an HEI might use in order to make full and fair decisions on the applications before them, given the problems associated with the inaccuracy of predicted grades.

17. We appreciate that if the use of predicted grades were abolished, HEIs would need sufficient information on which to base their admissions decisions. We discuss a range of information which is available or could be available in the future.

Availability of academic records

18. We discuss the continuing use of students' existing academic records as one source of information; this could include existing GCSE grades and Higher results from Scottish students.

19. We also consider the incorporation of GCE/VCE AS and A-level unit information and grades into the UCAS applications process in light of the recent consultation exercise carried out by UCAS and the Joint Council for Qualifications.

Recording achievement

Proposal 6: The Delivery Partnership (discussed later) to keep in touch with developments in the e-portfolio and investigate its potential role in the HE applications process.

20. We also discuss the value of other forms of information including the use of Progress File and the development of transcripts and e-portfolios.

Testing potential for HE

21. We refer to a recommendation made by the Admissions to Higher Education Steering Group, to assess the idea of a single national test of potential as a possible further source of information about applicants in the future.

REFORMING THE APPLICATION PROCESS

22. In making proposals for change, we have sought to achieve two goals. First, we want a system that does all it can to ensure that the maximum number of students have offers of HE places before they receive their exam results. Second, we want a system that actively seeks to create a better match between student demand and places on offer earlier in the application cycle. Our intention here is to tackle the difficulties associated with over and under-subscribed courses and those associated with Clearing. Although we do recognise that no applications system, on its own, can hope to avoid the over-subscription of some courses and the under-subscription of others.

Initial applications

Proposal 7: Students to submit initial applications between the beginning of September and the end of March, either together or separately. HEIs should seek to respond to applications as speedily as is practicable.

Question 2: Are you in favour of four or six initial applications?

23. We discuss the merits of proposing that students could initially submit up to four applications, rather than the current six. There is an argument that if students were better informed they would be more likely to make more accurately targeted applications, with a greater likelihood of success. Reducing the overall numbers of initial applications could avoid some unnecessary work and time for both students and HEIs. We would also propose further opportunities for students who received no offers from their initial applications, so that they would not be disadvantaged. We also discuss extending the period for making applications to the end of March, to give students more opportunity to research their options and to allow for the later submission of applications, when students are clearer about what direction they want to take in HE.

Proposal 8: Students who receive no offers from their initial applications to be able to submit an unlimited number of additional applications, one at a time, until they secure an offer, up to the end of June.

24. In order to not disadvantage those students who do not receive a conditional offer from their initial applications, we propose that additional applications could be made until a conditional offer is secured. This arrangement could be modelled on the existing UCAS Extra approach. Students could submit additional applications throughout the September to March phase, and on to the end of June.

Proposal 9: HEIs to publish monthly vacancy lists, from the end of March until the end of Clearing.

25. The publication of a monthly vacancy list will keep students fully informed of the places that remain available, thereby ensuring that applications can be targeted appropriately.

Exceptions to this timetable

Question 3: Should there be one single final date for the submission of applications, or should the current deadline of 15 October remain the same for the submission of applications for Oxbridge, Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Science courses?

26. We seek views on whether there should be a single submission date, or, as now, an earlier date for submission of applications for Oxbridge and Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Science courses.

Pre-qualified home and EU students

Proposal 10: HEIs to continue their work to ensure against unfair competition for places between pre-qualified and other home and EU students.

27. We heard no suggestion that the current arrangements for the admission of pre-qualified home and EU students are unfair and therefore propose no change to those arrangements.

Overseas non-EU students

Proposal 11: HEIs to continue to consider applications from pre-qualified overseas non-EU students as they do now and, where appropriate, offer them places on an unconditional basis.

28. As a rule, overseas students are considered separately from home students and there is generally no competition between the two. We propose no change to this arrangement.

Offers

Proposal 12: Students to continue to hold up to two offers.

Question 4: Should students who hold only one offer following their initial applications be allowed to submit additional applications until they gain a second offer?

29. We discuss the advantages and disadvantages of holding fewer or more offers than currently. We conclude that there is a case for maintaining the current approach of allowing students to hold up to two offers.

Ranking offers

Proposal 13: Students holding two offers to continue to rank them as first firm and insurance choices.

30. We visit the possibility of moving to a system where conditional offers are not ranked, but find that this would not be feasible.

Allowing students who out-perform their conditional offers to submit a new application

Proposal 14: Students who achieve higher grades than required by their conditional offers to be able to make a new application and have their original first firm conditional offer protected whilst they do so.

Proposal 15: A confirmation and new application round to be run ahead of Clearing.

Question 5: How long would it take to run the above process?

31. In order to realise one of the benefits of PQA, that is, allowing students who do better than anticipated to seek a place that better suits their capabilities, we look at ways of building into the current system the facility for students to improve their offers, once their exam results are known. We also look at the possibility of introducing a new 'Round' ahead of Clearing.

Simplifying arrangements for Art and Design

Proposal 16: The two-route application system for Art and Design to be replaced by a single admissions system, which retains sequential applications and an opening date for applications at the beginning of September and a closing date in late March.

32. Discussions on the current system of applying for Art and Design courses have centred on the complexity of the current two-route approach and the confusion that it causes for students and advisers. We have looked at ways of simplifying the current systems, with a view to bringing them more into line with mainstream application systems, whilst retaining the advantages of Route B.

Reforming Clearing

Proposal 17: Clearing to operate on the basis of three consecutive application rounds in which students submit one application in each round.

33. The current Clearing system, which operates on a first-come, first-served basis, has many disadvantages, not least that students can be

matched to places that they would not necessarily choose. This has been cited as a main reason for drop-out in many instances.

34. A fairer alternative would be to introduce a system whereby all applications are considered alongside each other, at the same time and on the basis of the same information. Only students who had not achieved the grades of any of their conditional offers would enter this process. We have called this the 'gathered field'.

35. We envisage that the first-come, first-served system would be replaced by:

- a series of 3 consecutive rounds, where deadlines are set for students to submit their applications and for HEIs to respond to them;
- In each of the rounds, students would submit one application;
- HEIs would consider all the applications received in that round and make offers accordingly;
- Students offered places would take them up and HEIs would publish information on the places that remained available at the end of that round;
- Students who had failed to secure a place would then go through the process again, submitting a further single application to the next round;
- Students who remain unplaced after the third round would enter a fourth and final round that would be on a first-come, first-served basis, to ensure all places are filled.

Changing the time at which exam results are published

Proposal 18: The results of AS, A-levels, Highers and Advanced Highers to be published at least one week earlier than at present.

36. The reform of Clearing would require more time than is currently available between the publication of exam results and the start of the HE term. We believe that extra time could be introduced into the system by publishing exam results earlier. We believe that AS and A-level results could be published between 1 – 7 August. This could be achieved by:

- Awarding bodies publishing exam results to HEIs, exam centres and students simultaneously;
- The reduction of A-level units from six to four, as proposed in the 14-19 Education and Skills White Paper. This will reduce the burden of external assessment and make timetabling easier; it should also allow exams to be completed earlier.

Similarly, we believe that, in Scotland, Highers and Advanced Highers can be published earlier, as a result of results being notified electronically to exam centres and HEIs at the same time.

Proposal 19: Work to be undertaken to look at what might be done to inform those taking non-A level qualifications, whose timetables it is not feasible to bring in line with the HE admissions cycle, of the requirements of that cycle, with the aim of allowing them, where possible and appropriate, to timetable their learning and accreditation accordingly.

37. It is also vital that everything possible is done to ensure that those undertaking non-A level qualifications are kept fully informed of the HE applications process.

Proposal 20: Work to be started now with the express purpose of ensuring that, by 2008/09, the results of non A-level portfolio based qualifications are published earlier than they are at present.

38. Whilst these proposals would improve the speed with which A-level results are published, the same does not hold true for some other non A-level qualifications. In order to maintain parity between the different entry routes into HE work would need to be done to bring the publication date for other exam results forward wherever possible.

The start of the HE term

Question 6:

(a) Working on the assumption that exams are published earlier, as proposed: is there sufficient time to operate our proposed approach to Clearing, whilst maintaining the current HE term start date?

If not:

(b) How much later than at present could the HE term start?

39. Another way to make more time available for the allocation of places would be to move the start of the HE term. We do not believe this is feasible due to the impact on overseas students and loss of teaching time. Comments are invited as to the feasibility of operating the reformed changes between early August and the current start of the HE term.

Paving the way for PQA

40. While the above reforms could be adopted as free-standing improvements to the current applications system, we believe that, if adopted, they would also help pave the way for PQA. We now go on to discuss PQA.

INTRODUCTION TO PQA

What is PQA?

41. PQA is a system wherein applicants would know their final exam results before making binding decisions about whether and where to apply to higher education.

Why is PQA needed?

42. The current system serves many students well. 83% of students who receive a conditional offer go on to take up that offer. However, there are three groups of students who may be disadvantaged by the current system:

- those who receive higher exam results than required by their conditional offers;
- those whose exam results fall below those required by their conditional offers; and
- those who do not decide to apply to HE until after they have received their results.

How would PQA help these applicants?

43. PQA would help by introducing a system where students would apply for places after their exam results are known and therefore students would be considered alongside each other, and on the same basis, as part of a 'gathered field'.

How might PQA work?

We have considered two possible approaches to PQA and these are outlined below.

Single-Stage: where the entire process (applications, interviews, admissions tests etc) takes place after exam results are published.

44. The key attraction of this approach is that all applications are made at the same time and contain equivalent information, including actual exam results. All applications would be considered alongside each other and on the same basis.

45. The key drawback of this approach is that HEIs would be required to assess and take decisions on all the applications they received in a very short space of time. This would require the acceleration of admissions work, which would raise the risk that the work would be undertaken in a mechanistic manner. An alternative would be for a very significant shift in the timing of exam publication and the start of the HE term, which would impact on teaching time in schools/colleges or HE or both.

Two-Stage: much of the administration (students supplying personal information, HEIs feedback on applications, applications for student support, interviews, open days etc) takes place at a *Registration Phase* ahead of exam results, the formal *Application Phase* takes place after exam results are known.

46. The key attraction of this approach is that HEIs would be able to undertake much of the administrative process prior to exam results being published, e.g. interviews, tests etc. This would be followed by an Application Phase where all applications are made at the same time and contain equivalent information, including actual exam results. All applications would be considered alongside each other and on the same basis. This approach significantly reduces the burden of the post-results phase, by allowing much of the preparatory work to be undertaken before results are published.

47. We concluded that the two-stage approach is preferable. We go on to offer two models of PQA for consideration.

PQA OPTION A

All students apply for HE places on a PQA basis. No binding offers are made in advance of exam results (except pre-qualified students).

Key features of the Registration Phase

- Students submit up to 4 initial expressions of interest via UCAS by 31 March
- Opportunities to attend open days and interviews
- No offers are made; HEIs respond to expressions of interest indicating the likelihood of students gaining a place post-results
- Students who receive no encouraging responses may submit further expressions of interest, one at a time, on a rolling basis.

Key features of the Application Phase

- Students submit three ranked applications to UCAS
- Three consecutive, time-limited application rounds
- UCAS enter first choices into first application round and, where unsuccessful and according to availability of places, second and third choices in the two subsequent rounds.
- Where chosen places no longer remain available students review their choices and make fresh applications.
- Students without a place after Round 3 may enter further single applications, on a rolling basis, up to or even beyond the start of term.

Advantages of Option A

48. The key advantage of Option A is that all students would apply once their results were known, therefore giving all students the opportunity to apply for places that best suit their abilities and desires. It is also a relatively straightforward process that should be easily understood by all those involved in it and relatively easy to administer.

Drawbacks of Option A

49. The key drawbacks would be the volume of work that HEIs would be required to administer in the early stages of the Application Phase coupled with the possibility that students would have to review their choices in the second and third rounds should courses become filled during Round 1. Further, students who wished to lodge a Results Enquiry against disputed grades would not have the advantage of holding a conditional offer open whilst that process was ongoing. We believe that this potential difficulty affects a very small number of students and suggest some ways of mitigating such disadvantage.

50. We ask a number of questions that relate specifically to Option A:

Question 7:

How might HEIs feed back to students' expressions of interest under Option A?

Question 8:

Under Option A, should students questioning their exam results be able to accept an offer of a place based on their results, but re-enter the Application Phase unbound by that offer, if their Result Enquiry changes their grades?

Question 9:

Do you support Option A?

PQA OPTION B

Some places would be offered at Application Phase 1, but HEIs would reserve a proportion of places for Application Phase 2.

Key features of Application Phase 1

- Students submit up to 4 initial expressions of interest via UCAS by 31 March
- Opportunities to attend open days and interviews
- HEIs respond by either:
 - Making a conditional or unconditional offer, or
 - Flagging that the student is free to apply for places that will be reserved for Phase 2.
- Students who receive no offer may submit further expressions of interest, one at a time, on a rolling basis
- Students receiving multiple conditional offers choose one to hold open

Key features of Application Phase 2

- HEIs reserve a proportion of places for students who wish to change their existing applications, post-results, or students who apply for the first time after they receive their exam results
- Three consecutive, time-limited application rounds
- Students may either confirm their conditional offer or submit three new ranked applications to UCAS
- Students who achieve or exceed their expected grades and wish to try a new application may have their chosen conditional offer held open during the first application round; they must then choose to accept or reject it
- UCAS enter first choices into first application round and, where unsuccessful and according to availability of places, second and third choices in the two subsequent rounds
- Where chosen places no longer remain available students review their choices and make fresh applications
- Students without a place after Round 3 may enter further single applications, on a rolling basis, up to or even beyond the start of term

Advantages of Option B

51. A key advantage of Option B is that it retains the benefits of the current system insofar as the majority of students would still have the opportunity of building up a relationship with their chosen HEI and have the security of a conditional offer. As well as retaining that security for many students, Option B also has the facility to allow students who wish to change their minds the opportunity to do so, alongside students who only decide to apply to HE after exam results are known. The disadvantages associated with Clearing would also be removed for the majority of students. By introducing a number of application rounds it is envisaged that the majority of students will secure a place that better matches their abilities earlier on in the process.

Drawbacks of Option B

52. A disadvantage of Option B is that there would be a reduced number of places 'reserved' in Phase 2, thereby increasing competition for those places. Further, this option raises issues about how HEIs would manage their places, with unconditional, conditional and reserved places being held open at various stages of the process.

Removing the 'insurance' offer

53. Option B raises the question of whether it is feasible to maintain the 'insurance' choice that exists under the current system, or whether the increased uncertainty and workload would be unsustainable.

Allowing students to change their applications

54. One of the primary purposes of PQA is to allow students the opportunity to change their applications, once they know their exam results. We discuss how it is possible to allow students the freedom of changing their applications, without forfeiting a conditional offer that they already hold.

Reserving places for Phase 2

55. We go to seek views of how best to manage reserving places for Phase 2 and what proportion of places would be appropriate.

Results enquiries under Option B

56. A system of PQA could place some students who wish to query their final marks in a difficult position. We look at ways of mitigating such difficulties.

57. We go on to ask a number of questions that specifically relate to Option B:

Question 10:

Do you support the proposal that Option B should not involve an insurance offer?

Question 11:

(a) Should conditional offers be protected if students wish to change their applications?

If yes: (b) Should this protection apply whilst the student changes their application once only?

Question 12:

(a) Should all HEIs reserve a minimum proportion of places for Phase 2 of Option B?

(b) How might HEIs determine what proportion of places to allocate at Phase 1 and what proportion to reserve for Phase 2 of Option B?

(c) Should the same proportion of places be reserved on all courses?

Question 13:

What proportion of places should be reserved for Option B Phase 2?

Question 14:

(a) Under Option B, should students questioning their exam results be able to hold open the original offers they were made, whilst their results enquiry runs its course, and take up one of those offers if the results enquiry results in their grades changing?

(b) Should students be able to seek an alternative place during this time, on the basis of the grades they are questioning, and take up this place if their results enquiry does not change their grades?

Question 15:

Under Option B, thinking about students who hold no conditional offers at the start of Phase 2 and are questioning their results: should these students be able to gain an offer on the basis of the grades they are questioning, seek an alternative place should their results enquiry improve their grades, but still be able to take up their original place should they choose?

Question 16:

Do you support Option B?

IMPLEMENTING CHANGE

Leading Change

58. The development and implementation of the proposals and ideas set out in this document requires co-operation and collaboration between the key stakeholders throughout the education system. It is not Government's role to impose or be primarily responsible for implementing such changes.

59. We therefore recommend that the sector establishes a Delivery Partnership to direct and oversee such development and implementation. We believe that the partnership should be led by UCAS. UCAS represents, and is respected in, the HE sector. It also has unrivalled expertise in the field of applications administration and a track record of delivery.

60. The Delivery Partnership would be, by necessity, a small, tightly-focused group. We therefore suggest that the Delivery Partnership is supported by a Stakeholder Advisory Forum, which would be a much larger group than the Delivery Partnership with a wider membership. The role of the Stakeholder Advisory Forum would be to act as a sounding-board for the Delivery Partnership and to provide expert advice when appropriate.

Proposals for change by 2008/09

61. We suggest that the proposals to improve the applications system should be implemented for the admissions round that will lead to students taking up places in September and October 2008. To achieve this we believe that the Delivery Partnership and the Stakeholder Advisory Forum need to be established in early 2006.

Question 17: Do you support the proposals for a Delivery Partnership to lead implementation of reform to the applications system, supported by a Stakeholders Advisory Forum.

HOW TO RESPOND

A full consultation document, detailing the background to this project and the full proposals are available at: www.dfes.gov.uk/consultations/

A consultation response form is also available on-line. Hard copies are also available on request and can be ordered from pqa.consultation@dfes.gsi.gov.uk or by calling 0114 2593548.

Notes
