7 April 1997

CIRCULAR

CONSULTATION ON RECORDING SCHEDULE 2(d) TO 2(g) COURSES AND CHANGES TO QUALIFICATION CODES

To

Principals of colleges
Heads of external institutions
Heads of higher education
institutions receiving Council
funding
Chief education officers
Awarding bodies

Circular type

Consultation

Summary

Proposals for recording schedule 2(d) to 2(g) courses and to withdraw some generic qualification codes from the 1997-98 teaching year. Responses are requested by 6 May 1997

Reference number: 97/14

Enquiries:
Gary Perkins
Research and Statistics
01203 863224

97/14

CONSULTATION ON RECORDING SCHEDULE 2(d) TO 2(g) COURSES AND CHANGES TO QUALIFICATION CODES

INTRODUCTION

1   This circular proposes revised arrangements for recording schedule 2(d) to 2(g) courses in the individualised student record (ISR) and the withdrawal of some generic qualification codes. The proposals would implement the policy stated in *Council News* No. 33 that, from the 1997-98 teaching year, institutions will be asked not to use generic codes for qualifications falling within schedules 2(d) to 2(g). Responses are requested by 6 May.

BACKGROUND

2   Annex A to this circular sets out the background to the proposals, explains in detail which generic codes the Council proposes withdrawing from 1997-98 and the proposed arrangements for continuously updating the qualifications database to replace the use of the withdrawn generic codes.

3   The proposals have been considered in detail by the schedule 2 qualifications group announced in *Council News* No. 37. They have also been considered by the data and software advisory group, also announced in *Council News* No. 37. Both groups supported the proposals, provided that the implementation was carefully planned and appropriately resourced.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED CHANGES

4   The Council proposes to:

- withdraw, from 1997-98, the 50 generic qualification codes which indicate only the cost-weighting factor (CWF) and programme area of a qualification. These are referred to as the general demand-led element (DLE) generic codes. More specific generic codes, such as those used for Business and Technology Education Council (BTEC) continuing education certificates and short course general certificates of secondary education (GCSEs) would continue to be available

- introduce specific codes for qualifications and courses which fall within schedules 2(d) to 2(g) of the *Further and Higher Education Act, 1992* (the Act).

5   The 50 generic codes proposed for withdrawal were used $^{1}/_{2}$ million times by institutions in 1995-96. This obscured the extent to which some qualifications were being studied. The Council requires information about individual qualifications, in order to extend the individual listing of qualifications in the funding tariff. The proposed withdrawal of the generic codes would facilitate this process. Where qualifications which fall within schedules 2(a) to 2(c) do not currently have a specific qualification code, then the Council would introduce one.

6   The Council wishes to introduce specific codes for qualifications and courses which fall within schedules 2(d) to 2(g) of the Act. This would be consistent with the approach for qualifications which fall within schedules 2(a) to 2(c) of the Act. At present, in the absence of specific codes, institutions correctly use the 50 generic codes. The withdrawal of these generic codes is a necessary step in the process of asking institutions to provide more specific information about schedule 2(d) to 2(g) courses and qualifications. This information would enable the Council to construct and maintain a set of specific codes which would apply to schedules 2(d) to 2(g). These, in turn, would be the basis for individually listing schedule 2(d) to 2(g) provision within the funding tariff.

7   Schedule 2(j) provision would be treated in a similar way to schedule 2(d) to 2(g) provision but from 1998-99 rather than 1997-98. This would give sufficient time to consider the outcomes of consultation on the recommendations of the committee on learning difficulties and/or disabilities (the Tomlinson committee).

IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTITUTIONS

8   Analysis of the ISR indicates that the majority of colleges and external institutions make little, if any, use of the general DLE generic codes for Council-funded provision. These are the codes which the Council proposes to withdraw. The proposed revised procedures would have no noticeable impact on most institutions.

9   About 125 institutions make significant use of the general DLE generic codes. They would be required to recode these qualifications using specific codes.

10   In practice, most institutions use fewer than 200 qualification codes, and very few more than 300, so that a single code might cover tens, or even hundreds, of occurrences of a qualification. Recoding 1,000 generic codes might therefore require the provision of 50 qualification codes or fewer.

11   The generic codes which the Council proposes to withdraw from 1997-98 would continue to be valid for 1996-97 and earlier years. Nevertheless, institutions would have to make some changes to the coding of qualifications which they give a generic code in 1996-97 and which the student continues to study in 1997-98, when the code would no longer be valid.

12   For example, if a student starts a two-year course in 1996-97, then the institution is able to code the qualification aim of the course using a generic code, and to return this in its 1996-97 ISR. In 1997-98, the student would be on the second year of the course. The qualification should be returned by the institution in its 1997-98 ISR, but the generic code used in its 1996-97 ISR returns would no longer be valid.

13   In this situation, the institution could return 1997-98 ISR data by either:

- showing, in its 1997-98 ISR, that the student had withdrawn at the end of 1996-97 from the generically coded qualification and transferred, from 1997-98, to a new, specifically coded qualification. The student would actually be continuing to study for the same qualification and only the qualification code would change; or
- showing the student as studying the same, specifically coded qualification from 1996-97. To achieve this, the institution might have to amend its student records used to generate the ISR.

14   Institutions are strongly recommended to choose the second option because it would ensure that:

- the DLE program was able to calculate the correct funding units, particularly for loadbanded qualifications
- in the case of colleges, their performance indicators would correctly reflect the withdrawal of students from qualifications as would information used by the inspectorate.

IMPLICATIONS FOR AWARDING BODIES

15   An institution claims funding from the Council by making a claim for funding units. The Council compares the number of funding units being claimed by the institution against the number of units represented by the activity reported in the institution's ISR. This includes details of the students enrolled at the institution and the qualifications they are studying for.

16   Institutions identify a qualification in their ISR data by quoting the appropriate code from the Council's qualifications database. Each year, the Council seeks the assistance of awarding bodies in updating this database.

17   At present, if a qualification is missing from the database, then the institution may still claim funding units for providing the qualification by recording it in the ISR using a generic code. This will no longer be possible from 1997-98. Accordingly, if a qualification is missing from the qualifications database, then institutions will not be able to claim Council funding for offering this qualification to students.

18   Awarding bodies will wish to ensure that the Council's qualifications database is complete and accurate with respect to the qualifications they offer which are relevant to the further education sector. The Council proposes to enhance its updating system for the database, so that any errors and omissions would be addressed more quickly than at present. The Council would seek the cooperation of awarding bodies in operating this enhanced updating system, as described in annex A.

IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNCIL SUPPORT

19   The Council intends to enhance its support desk team with a dedicated qualifications support person for a period of up to 12 months. This person's role would be to answer queries from institutions in a timely way and to liaise with the external contractor responsible for updating the database.

RATIONALISING ISR GENERIC CODES

20   As part of the process of rationalising the generic codes, some improvements to the ISR generic codes are proposed. The current codes are shown in appendix 1 to annex A. These refer to non-Council-funded provision.

21   At present, some ISR generic codes cannot be assigned to programme areas. This is a problem for colleges when compiling their strategic plan projections, since ISR student numbers are the basis for student number projections by programme area. It is also a problem for the Council when analysing the ISR. The proposal set out in annex B would link ISR generic codes to programme areas and so facilitate the compilation of strategic plans and other analysis.

CONSULTATION ON MISSING SCHEDULE 2(a) TO 2(c) QUALIFICATION CODES

22   Institutions which currently use any of the generic codes, as set out in annex C, are asked to photocopy and complete the form at annex D and return it to the Council by 6 May.

CONSULTATION ON SCHEDULE 2(d) TO 2(g) COURSES

23   Institutions which currently offer provision under schedules 2(d) to 2(g) are asked to photocopy and complete the form at annex E and return it to the Council by 6 May.

NEXT STEPS

24   The results of this consultation will be considered by the schedule 2 qualifications group at a meeting in May. Subject to its comments, the Council will issue a provisional list of qualifications and/or course codes in respect of qualifications currently identified by institutions as falling within schedules 2(d) to 2(g), together with a list of schedule 2(a) to 2(c) qualifications to be added to the qualifications database.

25   The database will be issued in July, as normal, with the new codes incorporated and the generic codes withdrawn for 1997-98. They will still be available for use with 1996-97 data.

26   The support and updating arrangements described in annex A will be implemented in June or July, subject to the results of consultation.

27   Awarding bodies will be invited to a seminar to discuss the new arrangements.

CONSULTATION

28   Institutions are invited to comment on the proposals in this circular, using the form in annex F.

Responses should be sent to:

Gary Perkins
Research and Statistics
Further Education Funding Council
Cheylesmore House
Quinton Road
Coventry
CV1 2WT

and returned no later than 6 May 1997.

David Melville

BACKGROUND

Purpose of the Database

1   The qualifications database was initially developed to support the ISR. It was designed to contain details of every qualification offered by further education colleges in England. It had two key objectives:

- to provide a reference guide to available qualifications
- to reduce the amount of information input by a college and returned to the Council as part of the ISR.

2   The second objective was met as follows. The information required for the qualification aim dataset of the ISR was sorted into two groups, the first being information specific to the institution or the student studying the qualification, the second being standard information about the qualification itself. For example, the number of guided learning hours (glh) provided by the institution and whether the student was eligible for fee remission fell into the first group. The name of the awarding body offering the qualification fell into the second group.

3   Information in the first group constitutes the qualification aim dataset that is returned by an institution in respect of each qualification studied by a student in the institution. Information in the second group is stored for each qualification in the qualifications database. The database contains a unique reference code for each qualification and the institution simply includes this code within the qualification aim dataset, rather than returning all the information about the qualification held in the database.

4   Upon receipt of an institution's ISR return, the Council is able to use the qualification reference codes quoted by the institution in the qualification aim datasets to retrieve information about the qualifications. The amount of the ISR information returned by institutions to the Council is reduced by over 550 million items a year, because of the use of the database.

Updating Strategy

5   The database was planned from the start to be issued to institutions as a set of computer files, together with basic facilities to read these files.

6   At the time the database was designed, there was no reliable information on the frequency of changes to qualifications on which to base an updating strategy. The ISR specification is fixed for each teaching year and so it was decided to update the database around March of each year in time to issue the database in July, to be used for the teaching year starting in August. Given that the database had to be issued to over 900 institutions, it was judged to be impractical to reissue it more than once or twice each year, to take account of changes to qualification data.

Generic Codes

7   To allow for the possibility that there might be gaps in the information contained in the database, either through an oversight or because a qualification had been issued since the last release of the database, the Council provided as a paper list a set of generic codes. These could be used by institutions in their ISR returns if they could not find a suitable entry in the qualifications database. These are attached as appendix 1 to this annex.

Link to the Funding Tariff

8   The qualifications database was first issued in June 1994. In the early part of 1995, it was decided that the ISR would become the auditable basis for funding unit claims. Funding units would be estimated from the ISR by means of the DLE program.

9   The DLE program drew on the qualifications database for information, in order to establish how many funding units were generated by each qualification. In particular, it used it to establish the cost-weighting factor (CWF) and whether the qualification fell within schedule 2 to the Act. This schedule sets out which qualifications are eligible to be studied by students enrolled on provision funded by the Council.

10   Since the existing ISR generic codes were issued as a paper list and were not on the database, they could not be accessed by the DLE program. In any case, the ISR generic codes were not linked to information such as the CWF of the qualification. Accordingly, qualifications coded using the ISR generic codes could not be assigned funding units by the DLE program.

DLE Generic Codes

11   The number of qualifications held on the qualifications database was several times bigger than originally expected. It became clear, during 1995, that there were gaps in the information. As a consequence, institutions might be unable to claim funding units to which they were entitled. The absence of information on these qualifications on the qualifications database meant that the DLE program could not assign any funding units.

12   In response to this difficulty, a series of DLE generic qualification records were added to the database. These had a unique reference number like other qualification records on the database. They also contained information required by the DLE program, such as the CWF.

13   Since mid-1995, the number of DLE generic qualification records has grown considerably. There are currently 1,400 in addition to the 16,000 qualifications on the database. Some example records are listed at appendix 2 to this annex.

14   As can be seen from appendix 2, some codes are very general. For example, the first set of codes shown (X900001A to X900010E) only specify the programme areas and CWF. In contrast, X9CE101A, the first 'class' generic code shown, refers to a BTEC continuing education certificate with a specified programme area and CWF. The distinction is that the BTEC code refers to a class of qualifications, whilst the general code gives no information about the qualification.

15   In practice, the ISR generic codes and the DLE generic qualification records are referred to collectively as 'the generic codes'. It is important to recognise that there are three different forms of generic code:

- a small number of ISR generic codes, which are only applicable to non-schedule 2 qualifications
- DLE generic codes applicable to specific classes of qualification, such as BTEC continuing education certificate units and Open College Network qualifications
- general DLE generic codes which convey no information at all about the qualification.

16   It is proposed to retain the first two types of code, at least for the short-term. It is the general DLE generic codes which would be withdrawn under the proposals in this circular.

GCSE and General Certificate of Education (GCE) A Level Hierarchy

17   In response to feedback, the database was modified in version 6, issued in late 1995 to include additional records in respect of GCSEs and GCE AS and A levels. Together with the existing qualification records, these provided a three-level hierarchy as follows:

- level 1; individual qualification records, to be used in the ISR for any purpose
- level 2; records at the board and subject level, also available to be used in the ISR for any purpose, as an alternative to the individual qualification records
- level 3; records at the subject level, only to be used to record qualifications on entry in the ISR and not to be used to record qualification aims.

18   The codes at the second and third level of this hierarchy are sometimes referred to as generic codes. They have a specific function, quite distinct from the ISR and DLE generic codes, and they are not considered further in this circular.

Recording Funding Information on the Database

19   There are two ways of recording funding information on the database. This reflects the structure of the funding tariff.

20   The great majority of qualifications, measured by the number of students who enrol to study them, are individually listed in the tariff. This means that an explicit number of basic on-programme units (BOPUs) is associated with each qualification. The BOPUs for a qualification are used, in conjunction with the CWF, to determine the on-programme units. They are used in conjunction with information about the student studying the qualification to determine the number of fee remission units that may be available for that student. BOPUs are held in the database for each individually listed qualification.

21   Other qualifications do not have explicit BOPUs associated with them. Instead, there are six loadbands expressed in terms of glh. Each loadband has a number of BOPUs associated with it. The number of BOPUs for one of these other qualifications is determined by selecting the loadband within which the annual glh for the qualification fall. For example, a qualification being

offered in 340 glh a year will fall within loadband 5 (330 to 449 glh per year) which has 43.6 BOPUs associated with it.

22   In contrast to individually listed qualifications, each of which each has a fixed number of BOPUs associated with it, the number of BOPUs for a loadbanded qualification will depend upon the glh provided by the institution. The glh, and hence the BOPUs, will vary from institution to institution. A further difference is that, for a loadbanded qualification, the BOPUs are expressed at an annual rate; the longer a student takes to achieve the qualification, the more BOPUs he or she generates. The BOPUs for an individually listed qualification are the total available for the qualification, regardless of how long a student takes to achieve it.

23   Qualifications are individually listed once there is sufficient ISR data to confirm the appropriate BOPUs for the qualification.

Schedules 2(d) to 2(j)

24   Schedule 2 to the Act is used by the Council to determine which courses are eligible for funding. It is divided into a series of sub-schedules (see appendix 3 to this annex). The most frequently used of these consist of explicit lists of qualifications which are acceptable as a course aim. For example, schedule 2(a) is a list of vocational qualifications, whilst 2(b) is all GCSEs and GCE A and AS levels. Such schedules can readily be incorporated in the qualifications database by identifying a qualification on the database and then including an item of information indicating which sub-schedule the qualification falls within.

25   Schedules 2(d) to 2(g) and 2(j) define only general types of course. They are not sufficiently precise on their own to enable the construction of lists of qualifications which would be acceptable outcomes. Indeed, it is not necessarily the case that courses eligible for funding under schedules 2(e), 2(f), 2(g) and 2(j) have an explicit qualification aim. Schedule 2(d) is defined to be courses which are designed to allow progression by the student onto a course with a qualification aim contained in sub-schedules (a) to (c). Schedule 2(j) courses are for students with learning difficulties, to enable them to progress to schedule 2(d) to 2(g) courses.

26   Schedule 2(d) qualifications must be externally accredited. In order to decide whether a course

qualification aim falls within schedule 2(d), and so is eligible to be funded by the Council, it is necessary to make an assessment of the way that the qualification is being provided by the college. The objective is to ascertain whether the college has made clear that the programme of study leading to the schedule 2(d) qualification is specifically intended to enable or entitle students to progress to courses with schedule 2(a) to 2(c) qualifications as the aim. Such an assessment cannot realistically be made in advance for each institution wishing to offer schedule 2(d) qualifications. The situation is similar for schedule 2(j) qualifications, where progression to schedule 2(d) to 2(g) qualifications has to be assessed.

27   Accordingly, whilst qualifications that fall within the other schedules, such as schedule 2(a), are labelled as such within the database, schedule 2(d) to 2(g) and 2(j) qualifications are not currently identified in the database.   Instead, they are labelled as not known to be within schedule 2, along with other qualifications that are outside schedule 2 altogether. Non-schedule 2 and schedule 2(d) to 2(g) and 2(j) qualifications cannot be differentiated on the database. In practice, schedule 2(d) to 2(g) and 2(j) qualifications are probably coded by institutions using general DLE generic codes.

28   With the present coding, it is difficult to identify schedule 2(d) courses. Accordingly, it is not feasible to undertake any analysis to establish whether students do actually progress from schedule 2(d) courses to schedule 2(a) to 2(c) courses. A similar situation exists for schedule 2(j).

THE CASE FOR WITHDRAWING DLE GENERIC CODES

29   The use of DLE generic codes gives rise to four major difficulties:

- it hampers the extension of individual listing to all qualifications
- it makes it harder to identify schedule 2(d) to 2(g) and 2(j) qualifications
- it could result in incorrect funding claims
- the Council may not detect inappropriate use of generic codes.

30   These difficulties are discussed in the following sections.

Difficulties with Extending Individual Listing

31   The Council always intended that the funding tariff would contain a value of BOPUs for every qualification, that is every qualification would be individually listed. The funding tariff was introduced in 1994-95, the same year that the ISR was introduced. Information available for previous years was only sufficient to individually list the more widely studied qualifications.

32   The tariff advisory committee (TAC) has, as an objective, the extension of individual listing to all qualifications and this is widely supported by the sector. TAC has successfully extended individual listing to the great majority of qualifications studied by students by making proposals based on the analysis of ISR data for 1994-95 and 1995-96.

33   The approach used is to take a loadbanded qualification and to analyse the distribution of enrolments across loadbands. The loadband at the centre of the distribution (the equivalent loadband) is identified. Providing that a significant proportion of enrolments, ideally a clear majority, fall within this equivalent loadband and other enrolments generally fall in neighbouring loadbands, then the qualification is selected for individual listing, with the number of BOPUs associated with the equivalent loadband.

34   If an institution has used a generic code then, by definition, it is impossible to identify which qualification is actually being studied, meaning that generically coded qualification aims cannot be used in analyses to support the extension of individual listing. Generically coded qualifications must inevitably remain within the loadbands.

Identification of Schedule 2(d) to 2(g) and 2(j) Qualifications

35   As explained above, schedule 2(d) to 2(g) and 2(j) qualifications cannot be readily identified from the information contained within schedule 2. Accordingly, only a very few of them are currently identified within the database. The remainder are generically coded by institutions. Because institutions are using general DLE generic codes, the Council cannot identify which qualifications institutions are including within schedules 2(a) and 2(g) and 2(j).   As a consequence, the Council does not have the information necessary to allow it to carry out analyses of ISR data in order to individually list schedule 2(d) to 2(g) and 2(j) qualifications.

Overuse of Generic Codes

36   The extent to which generic codes are used varies very substantially between different institutions. In rare cases, institutions have returned general DLE generic codes in excess of 30 per cent of total qualifications. Other large institutions have used none or only a very few general DLE generic codes. The evidence available to the Council suggests that the number of qualifications missing from the qualifications database is very small and so, on the face of it, it should not be necessary for an institution to use generic codes except in isolated cases. In the absence of any information about why generic codes are being used, it is not possible to test this line of argument fully, although the low level of use by the majority of institutions would appear to support it.

37   Inappropriate use of generic codes could be occurring in a number of ways:

- the institution has not identified the correct qualification code, even though this is present on the database. By using a generic code unnecessarily, the institution will be claiming BOPUs via the loadbands. If the qualification exists on the database and is individually listed, then there could be a mismatch between the number of BOPUs claimed through the loadbands and the individually listed value in the tariff

- an institution might disagree with the individually listed values for some qualifications and claim a higher rate of units by means of generic codes. The Council has no evidence that this is occurring in practice

- institutions might be claiming funding, by means of generic codes, for qualifications that fall outside schedule 2. Again, the Council has no evidence that this is actually occurring

- institutions may be claiming funding for part qualifications, by using generic codes. Currently, the Council only provides funding in respect of a whole qualification or for additional national vocational qualification (NVQ) and general national vocational qualification (GNVQ) units.

Inability to Detect Inappropriate Use of Generic Codes

38   As indicated in the discussion above, if an institution uses a generic code within the ISR, the Council is unable to establish from the information contained within the ISR why this generic code is being used. The only way of establishing this would be to raise queries with institutions in respect of individual students. This would be a very labour-intensive and time-consuming process for both the Council and institutions and, so far, has not been attempted on a systematic basis.

THE NEED TO HAVE AN ALTERNATIVE TO GENERIC CODES

39   In order to claim funding in respect of a qualification, an institution must be able to identify that qualification within its ISR return, in such a way that the DLE program can calculate the correct funding units. This leads to a requirement, from the institution's point of view, that the qualifications database will always contain a record for any qualification for which the institution can validly claim Council funding.

40   From the Council's point of view, the database was designed to be updated annually, which was sufficient to meet the requirements of the ISR as a statistical return. The initial estimates of the number of qualifications to be included in the database, and the number of awarding bodies associated with them, although based on the best available evidence, proved to be far too low. This has made it impossible to increase the frequency of updating the database without incurring very significant costs.

41   There remains a fundamental mismatch between the requirement of institutions to have a database which is always comprehensive and totally accurate, and the inability of the Council to deliver this to all institutions all the time without massive costs. The collective costs to the Council and institutions of a monthly update process is estimated to be in the order of £1 million a year. The generic codes provide a mechanism for reconciling these two requirements and so they cannot be withdrawn without an alternative mechanism being put in place.

AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH

42   The Council stated in *Council News* No. 33 that, from 1997-98, colleges will be asked to identify

schedule 2(d) to 2(g) qualifications in the ISR and not to use generic codes. Proposals for schedule 2(j) would take effect from 1998-99. The proposals set out below are designed to remove the need for generic codes for any purpose, including 2(d) to 2(j) qualifications. The justification for this wider approach is that dealing with schedule 2(d) to 2(j) qualifications in isolation would be difficult. If institutions continued to use general DLE generic codes for schedule 2(d) to 2(j) qualifications, the Council would not be able to detect this.

Continuous Maintenance of the Database

43   It is proposed to change from having a single, annual update of the database to a policy of continuous maintenance. This would be achieved by negotiating with an outside contractor to develop systems for updating the Council's version of the database whenever qualifications changed or new qualifications were introduced.

44   This would require the contractor to develop computer system links with at least the major awarding bodies to develop a more sophisticated system for reporting changes to the Council. In particular, if changes were to be made on a continuous basis, then it would be vitally important to maintain a full audit trail of changes and to make regular checks on the database. From experience, without such sophisticated checking and control systems, it is highly likely that over time the database would become corrupted.

Separating Maintenance and Issue Policy

45   In the absence of generic codes, an institution would require to receive an updated version of the database whenever a missing or new qualification was identified. On the basis of the current volume of queries about qualifications on the database, it is estimated that the database would have to be reissued at least monthly to all institutions. This would be an enormous task for the Council since it would involve issuing over 20,000 disks every year. It would also be unnecessarily expensive and disruptive for most institutions. They would be required to load a new version of the database each month, even though it is likely that the great majority of them would have no interest in the changes made since the last version.

46   It is proposed to retain the current policy of issuing the database to all institutions twice a year.

This policy ensures that institutions have an up-to-date version of the database just before the start of the teaching year, and that they receive a preliminary version of the forthcoming year's tariff in the preceding January or February, which allows them to plan their curriculum offering for the forthcoming teaching year.

47 To make updates available to institutions in a timely way, it is proposed to make the Council version of the qualifications database available via the Internet. This Council version of the database would be continuously updated. There would also be a chronological list of any changes to qualifications made in the current teaching year. That would make it quick and convenient for an institution to identify recent changes. The database would also be accessible by electronic interchange, subject to this being feasible. There would be interim arrangements for institutions not yet able to access the Internet.

48 This proposal would meet the requirement for institutions to have access to the latest version of the database, whilst also meeting the Council's requirement that it did not incur disproportionate costs in making this available to institutions.

Use of Changes by Institutions

49 Under the proposal to make the current version of the database available on the Internet, it would be necessary for institutions to be able to make use of the new or changed information in the database for three purposes:

- to update their own student record and other information systems
- to update the ISR validation software provided by the Council
- to update the list of qualifications known to the DLE program.

50 There are a number of possible approaches to achieving this and these are set out below. Respondents are asked to indicate which approaches should be developed further.

a. Download the database

The first approach would be for the institution to download the revised database in its entirety, from the Internet, to replace the existing database supplied by the Council on diskette. This approach has the merit of not requiring any changes to the DLE program. It

might have implications for student record systems supplied by commercial software suppliers.

The ISR validation software would have to be amended, so that the institution could replace the version of the database contained within the validation software with the new version. This is not straightforward, since the database is currently embedded within the validation software, to increase the speed at which it runs.

This option is not seen as sufficient on its own because, in the short-term at least, some institutions would not have access to the Internet or electronic interchange. Even if they did, they may not have sufficient technical knowledge and facilities to download the entire database in a reasonable time. The Council, for its part, would wish to pilot this approach with some institutions before adopting it as the sole option;

b. Download changes to the database

A second approach would be to hold any changes to the database as a separate file. This much smaller file could then be downloaded by institutions. The Council would have to provide facilities within the qualifications database for institutions to update their copy of the database using the downloaded file. It would be necessary for such a facility to be very robust, to avoid the difficulty of an individual institution's database becoming corrupted if the update process failed. A similar facility would be required to update the validation software.

The implications for commercial software would need to be explored with the suppliers. Initial discussions suggest that this approach is feasible.

The technical feasibility would need to be confirmed but, assuming that it was feasible, then this is proposed as the main approach in the short-term, in parallel with piloting the first approach;

c. Make changes available on disk

In order to familiarise institutions with the new procedures, another approach would be to distribute the file of changes on disk. This would be extremely unattractive from the Council's point of view, because it would still involve a distribution to 900 institutions and

the distribution costs for the Council are almost unrelated to the size of the file being distributed. From the Council's point of view, therefore, this option would be almost equivalent to reissuing the database in its entirety. This is regarded as unacceptable from the Council's point of view and it is therefore not proposed to adopt this approach;

d. Telephone and fax answering system

As an interim proposal, the Council could set up a telephone and fax answering system which institutions could ring and hear a recorded message, or receive a fax, giving details of any changes over, say, the previous month. The feasibility of this would depend upon the scale of changes. If an institution rang the telephone line and identified a change which was potentially of interest to it, it could request an update disk from the Council. This service would be subject to restrictions on the total number of update disks that could be provided each month and the frequency with which update disks could be supplied to an individual institution.

It is proposed that this option would be offered for a limited period of, say, up to two years to allow those institutions not currently connected to the Internet time to make a connection.

Identification and Validation of Changes

51 It is proposed that, where an institution is unable to identify a qualification on the database, it would send a fax to the research and statistics support desk. This would be instead of using a generic code. The institution would be expected, as a minimum, to provide a title for the qualification, the awarding body and whether or not the qualification was thought to be an NVQ, GNVQ, GCSE, or GCE A or AS level. It would also be asked to fax some documentary evidence to confirm the existence of the qualification.

52 Once the Council had received the minimum information necessary to make a search, it would then try and identify the qualification itself on the database and notify the institution within 48 hours if it was able to do so. If not, it would then issue the institution with an interim code which the institution could use on a temporary basis, to allow the institution to input the qualification to the ISR and the DLE program. A CWF of A would be assumed.

53 The Council would undertake to provide a definitive solution within, say, 20 working days in 90 per cent of cases.

54 The Council would then ask the database maintenance contractor to undertake further investigation which would normally involve contacting the awarding body and seeking their confirmation of the existence of the qualification. If the qualification was identified, and was already included in the database, the institution would be advised of the correct code. If the qualification existed, and was new to the database, then the institution would be advised of the permanent code to replace the interim code.

55 If the awarding body was unable to identify the qualification, then the institution would be notified accordingly and invited to give more information. The interim code would continue to be available until the December ISR return for the year.

ADVANTAGES OF THE PROPOSAL

56 The proposal meets the objective that institutions should have access to a code for every qualification for which they can validly claim Council funding, whilst at the same time avoiding disproportionate costs for the Council.

57 In the case of schedule 2(d) to 2(g) qualifications, institutions would be asked to identify the qualification as such when they requested a new code. It should therefore be possible to rapidly build up a list of qualifications which were considered by institutions as eligible under schedules 2(d) to 2(g). This list would be shared with all institutions using the proposed updating mechanism.

58 Once there were lists of schedule 2(d) to 2(g) qualifications, it would then be possible to apply the usual audit and other checking procedures to these qualifications in the same way as applies to qualifications that fall under different parts of schedule 2.

59 If a course under schedules 2(e) to 2(g) did not have a specific qualification aim, then it would be necessary to have the option to use a suitable pseudo-qualification code, indicating the nature of the student's course, rather then identifying a specific qualification aim.

60 As reported in *Council News* No. 33, courses under schedule 2(j) are not required to have externally accredited qualification aims until

1998-99. It would, therefore, be necessary to include transitional codes, similar to pseudo-codes for 2(e) to 2(g), for 1997-98.

Incentive to Report Missing Qualifications

61   Under the present arrangements, it may be more convenient for an institution to use a generic code, rather than involve itself in the time and trouble required to notify the Council of an apparent problem with the qualifications database. In any case, the institution has no guarantee that it will be provided with a valid non-generic code within a reasonable time.

62   Under the revised arrangements, there would be a positive incentive for all institutions to identify qualifications correctly on the database in the first place. This would allow the institution to claim the correct funding units. This would be easier than sending details of an apparently missing qualification to the Council. Where there were genuinely missing or new qualifications, then all institutions would be contributing to their identification and all institutions would have speedy access to any revisions or new information. The quality of the information on the database should therefore quickly be substantially enhanced, leading to far fewer queries in future.

Involvement of Awarding Bodies

63   If the database maintenance contractor, on behalf of the Council, were contacting awarding bodies regularly to check on apparently missing or new qualifications, this would highlight to the awarding bodies the importance of providing correct information in the first place. They would be reminded that, if their qualifications were not on the qualifications database, then institutions would not be able to claim Council funding for offering these qualifications, so there would be a very clear incentive to the awarding bodies to provide accurate and up-to-date information. At present, some awarding bodies fail to provide comprehensive, accurate information.

ISR GENERIC CODES

55555555   Vocational study not leading to a recognised qualification aim, but one or more module delivery datasets

66666666   Vocational study not leading to a recognised qualification aim and no module delivery datasets

77777777   Complementary studies for students studying GCE A levels, AS levels, GCSEs and short course GCSEs

88888888   Studies for students with learning difficulties and/or disabilities (such as life skills) leading to no recognised qualification aim

99999000   Physical education/sport/fitness

99999111   Practical crafts/skills

99999222   Role education

99999333   Modern foreign languages

99999999   All other adult education/leisure-type course

DLE AND CLASS GENERIC CODES

DLE Generic Codes

X900001A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X900001B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X900001C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X900001D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X900001E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X900002A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X900002B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X900002C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X900002D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X900002E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X900003A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X900003B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X900003C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X900003D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X900003E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X900004A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X900004B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X900004C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X900004D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X900004E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X900005A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X900005B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 5 (Business

X900005C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X900005D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X900005E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X900006A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X900006B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X900006C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X900006D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X900006E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X900007A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X900007B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X900007C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X900007D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X900007E Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X900008A Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X900008B Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X900008C Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X900008D Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X900008E Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X900009A Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X900009B Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X900009C Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X900009D Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X900009E Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X900010A Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X900010B Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X900010C Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X900010D Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X900010E Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

Examples of Class Generic Codes

X9CE101A BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF A, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9CE101B BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF B, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9CE101C BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF C, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9CE101D BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF D, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9CE101E BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF E, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9CE102A BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF A, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9CE102B BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF B, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9CE102C BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF C, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9CE102D BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF D, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9CE102E BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF E, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9CE103A BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF A, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X9CE103B BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 1, CWF B, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X9CE208B BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF B, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X9CE208C BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF C, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X9CE208D BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF D, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X9CE208E BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF E, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X9CE209A BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF A, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X9CE209B BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF B, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X9CE209C BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF C, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X9CE209D BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF D, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X9CE209E BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF E, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X9CE210A BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF A, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X9CE210B BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF B, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X9CE210C BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF C, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X9CE210D BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF D, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X9CE210E BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 2, CWF E, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X9CE301A BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 3, CWF A, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9CE301B BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 3, CWF B, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9CE301C BTEC Continuing Education Certificate units 3, CWF C, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9G3S02A Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF A, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9G3S02B Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF B, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9G3S03A Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF A, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X9G3S03B Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF B, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X9G3S04A Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF A, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X9G3S04B Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF B, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X9G3S05A Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF A, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X9G3S05B Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF B, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X9G3S06A Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF A, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X9G3S06B Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF B, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X9G3S07A Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF A, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X9G3S07B Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF B, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X9G3S08A Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF A, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X9G3S08B Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF B, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X9G3S09A Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF A, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X9G3S09B Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF B, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X9G3S10A Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF A, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X9G3S10B Generic : Short course GCSE, CWF B, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X9GQ101A Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF A, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9GQ101B Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF B, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9GQ101C Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF C, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9GQ101D Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF D, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9GQ101E Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF E, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X9GQ102A Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF A, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9GQ102B Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF B, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9GQ102C Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF C, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9GQ102D Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF D, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9GQ102E Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF E, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X9GQ103A   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF A, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X9GQ103B   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF B, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X9GQ103C   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF C, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X9GQ103D   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF D, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X9GQ103E   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF E, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X9GQ104A   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF A, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X9GQ104B   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF B, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X9GQ104C   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF C, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X9GQ104D   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF D, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X9GQ104E   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF E, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X9GQ105A   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF A, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X9GQ105B   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF B, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X9GQ105C   Generic : GNVQ Level 1, CWF C, Programme Area 5 (Business)

SCHEDULE 2 TO THE FURTHER AND HIGHER EDUCATION ACT 1992 AND THE COUNCIL'S ASSOCIATED CRITERIA

Schedule 2 paragraph reference	*Summary description of course*	*Criteria for eligibility for funding by FEFC*
a.	vocational qualification	approved by the secretary of state
b.	GCSE or GCE A/AS level	leads to an examination by one of the GCE/GCSE examining boards
c.	'access' course preparing students for entry to a course of higher education	approved by the secretary of state
d.	course which prepares students for entry to courses listed in (a) to (c) above	i. primary course objective is progression to a vocational course GCSE, GCE A/AS level or an access course as outlined above; and ii. course includes external accreditation which entitles students to progress to courses (a) to (c)
e.	basic literacy in English	provides students with basic literacy skills
f.	teaching English to students where English is not the language spoken at home	improves the knowledge of English for those for whom English is not the language spoken at home
g.	basic principles of mathematics	course designed to teach the basic principles of mathematics
h.	courses under this part of schedule 2 (courses for proficiency of literacy in Welsh) will be the responsibility of the Welsh Funding Council	
j.	independent living and communication for those with learning difficulties which prepare them for entry to courses listed in (d) to (g) above	i. primary course objective is progression to a course which prepares students for entry to courses listed in sections (d) to (g) above; and ii. courses includes college accreditation which enables the student to progress to courses (d) to (g); or iii. evidence of progression to courses (d) to (g) can be provided to the Council

Notes

The following notes may be of assistance in determining whether or not a course falls within the scope of schedule 2.

Sections (a) and (c)   *An updated list for 1997-98 of the vocational qualifications and access courses approved by the secretary of state is available from the Department for Education and Employment. Copies have been sent to chief education officers.*

Section (d)   *Only qualifications which are externally accredited are recognised for funding purposes in 1997-98.*

Section (j)   *The Council will expect evidence of assessment procedures to be available; acceptable evidence of a course ensuring a progression route to courses which fall under sections (d) to (g) includes student destination data or the student's achievement of a qualification which enables progression.*

Section (f)   *The Council's duty extends to the home population of England.*

RATIONALISING ISR GENERIC CODES

1   The codes affected by the proposal to rationalise ISR generic codes are:

66666666:   vocational study not leading to a recognised qualification

99999111:   practical skills/crafts

99999999:   all other adult education/leisure type courses

2   It is proposed to replace these three codes with 10 new codes, one for each programme area:

99999901:   sciences

99999902:   agriculture

and so on to:

99999910:   basic education

3   It is proposed to introduce the new codes on a voluntary basis for 1997-98 and withdraw the three existing codes in favour of the new codes for 1998-99, plus code 55555555, which is used in only a handful of cases.

4   It would be possible to extend the codes to include sub-programme areas as well. This would mean a total of 50 new codes, but colleges might find it easier to use them. For example, science would become:

9999901A: physics

9999901B: chemistry

9999901C: biology

9999901D: mathematics

9999901E: computing

9999901F: other

GENERIC CODES TO BE WITHDRAWN FOR 1997-98

X900001A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X900001B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X900001C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X900001D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X900001E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 1 (Sciences)

X900002A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X900002B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X900002C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X900002D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X900002E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 2 (Agriculture)

X900003A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X900003B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X900003C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X900003D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X900003E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 3 (Construction)

X900004A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X900004B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X900004C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X900004D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X900004E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 4 (Engineering)

X900005A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X900005B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X900005C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X900005D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X900005E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 5 (Business)

X900006A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X900006B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X900006C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X900006D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X900006E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 6 (Hotel & catering)

X900007A   Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X900007B   Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X900007C   Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X900007D   Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X900007E   Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 7 (Health & community care)

X900008A Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X900008B Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X900008C Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X900008D Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X900008E Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 8 (Art & design)

X900009A Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X900009B Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X900009C Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X900009D Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X900009E Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 9 (Humanities)

X900010A Generic : CWF A, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X900010B Generic : CWF B, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X900010C Generic : CWF C, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X900010D Generic : CWF D, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

X900010E Generic : CWF E, Programme Area 10 (Basic education)

CONSULTATION ON MISSING SCHEDULE 2(a) TO 2(c) QUALIFICATION CODES

(Reference Circular 97/14)

Please photocopy, complete and return this form, no later than 6 May 1997, to Gary Perkins at the Council's Coventry office.

THE FURTHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL

Cheylesmore House
Quinton Road
Coventry CV1 2WT

Telephone 01203 863000
Fax 01203 863100

Name of FEFC-funded institution

FEFC code _____ Contact name (please print) _____

Signature _____ Telephone no. _____

Please provide full details for each schedule 2(a) to 2(c) qualification, where the institution is currently using a DLE generic code (see annex C), including a photocopy of documentary evidence that the qualification exists. Without full information, the Council may not be able to identify the qualification.

Name of qualification for which a DLE generic code is being used (see annex C)	Name of awarding body	Indicate whether it is an NVQ, GNVQ, GCSE, GCE A or AS level or other	Documentary evidence attached (Y/N) Without this, the Council may not be able to identify the qualification	
			Yes	No
			❑	❑
			❑	❑
			❑	❑
			❑	❑
			❑	❑
			❑	❑
			❑	❑
			❑	❑

CONSULTATION ON SCHEDULE 2(d) TO 2(g) CODES

(Reference Circular 97/14)

Please photocopy, complete and return this form, no later than 6 May 1997, to Gary Perkins at the Council's Coventry office.

Name of FEFC-funded institution

Contact name (please print)

FEFC code

Signature

Telephone no.

Please provide details of the courses/qualifications your institution offers under schedules 2(d) to 2(g).
Institutions may also provide details under schedule 2(j) if they wish. Please note that schedule 2(d)
provision must include external accreditation.

Name of course	Please indicate the schedule/section (2(d) to 2(g); or 2(j))	Qualification name (if applicable)	Awarding body (if applicable)	Nature of external accreditation (required for schedule 2(d); may be applicable to 2(e) to 2(g) and 2(j))

CONSULTATION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CHANGES TO THE RECORDING OF SCHEDULE 2(d) TO 2(g) QUALIFICATIONS/COURSES AND THE WITHDRAWAL OF GENERIC CODES

THE FURTHER EDUCATION FUNDING COUNCIL

(Reference Circular 97/14)

Please photocopy, complete and return this form, no later than 6 May 1997, to Gary Perkins at the Council's Coventry office.

Cheylesmore House
Quinton Road
Coventry CV1 2WT

Telephone 01203 863000
Fax 01203 863100

Name of FEFC-funded institution

FEFC code

Contact name *(please print)*

Signature

Telephone no.

UPDATING THE QUALIFICATIONS DATABASE

1	**Do you support**	*Yes*	*No*
	Downloading the database as a whole	❏	❏
	Downloading changes to the database	❏	❏
	A telephone answering system	❏	❏
	A fax answering system	❏	❏

Do you have any other suggestions for making changes to the database known to institutions?

2   Do you support the proposed method for assigning new codes?

	Yes	*No*
	❏	❏

If no, please explain how you would prefer to see it operate.

3   Do you support the proposal to rationalise the ISR generic codes?

	Yes	*No*
	❏	❏

If yes, would you prefer the 10 programme codes or the 50 sub-programme codes?

❏ 10 programme codes   ❏ 50 sub-programme codes

4   Any other comments