A Policy and Technical Consultation on Regulating Processes for Endorsement of Textbooks and other Support Material Run by Awarding Organisations

Information pages

About you*

Your details:

Name:	Professor F A Rogers
Position:	Education Secretary
Name of organisation or group (if applicable):	London Mathematical Society
Address:	De Morgan House 57-58 Russell Square London WC1B 4HS
Email:	education@lms.ac.uk
Telephone number:	020 7927 0801

Would you lik

A Policy and Technical Consultation on Regulating Processes for Endorsement of Textbooks and other Support Material Run by Awarding Organisations

Type of representative group/interest group

- () Group of awarding organisations
- () Publisher
- () Employer/business representative group
- () Subject association/learned society
- () Equality organisation/group
- () School/college or teacher representative group

None of the above

Ofqual 2014

May we contact you for more information?

() Yes

() No

*Denotes mandatory fields

Questions

This response relates to Mathematics.

Before answering the specific questions we would like to make some general points.

We were pleased to see that the consultation document sets down quite clearly many of the difficulties and disadvantages which attach to endorsement of resources by awarding bodies. However we were surprised and disappointed to see that it is being proposed that endorsement be allowed to continue, despite these clear problems. We do not believe that the problems can be removed by regulation.

We remain opposed to the endorsement of resources in Mathematics by awarding bodies. Our position on this and some related matters is set down in the <u>LMS</u> <u>Statement on Exam Boards and Textbooks</u>

A. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the endorsement of resources by awarding organisations for the teaching and learning of qualifications should be allowed.

() Strongly agree

- () Agree
- () Disagree
- () Strongly disagree
- () Don now/no opinion

Please provide comments or evidence to support your answer

We believe that endorsement is damaging in mathematics, for the reasons set down in the consultation document.

() Don now/no opinion

Please provide comments or evidence to support your answer

The guidelines are not strong enough. No Senior Examiner should produce resources

generally arise.

E To what extent do you agree or disagree that the draft new guidance in relation to Condition G4, about maintaining confidentiality of assessment material, is appropriate?

- () Strongly agree
- () Agree
- () Disagree
- () Strongly disagree
- () Don now/no opinion

Please provide comments or evidence to support your answer

Confidentiality of assessment material is clearly a fundamental issue for awarding bodies. The possibilities which endorsement opens up of breaching such confidentiality, whether intentionally or accidentally, are a further reason for prohibiting endorsement by awarding bodies.

F To what extent do you agree or disagree that the draft new guidance in relation to Condition F2, about packaging qualifications and resources together, is appropriate?

- () Strongly agree
- () Agree
- () Disagree

() Disagree

- () Strongly disagree
- () Don now/no opinion

Please provide comments or evidence to support your answer

No endorsement by awarding bodies should be allowed. The proposed conditions do not effectively mitigate the damage caused by endorsement, it is hard to see that any conditions other than simple prohibition could do this.

H. To what extent do you agree or disagree that public confidence in these arrangements will be improved as a result of the proposals.

- () Strongly agree
- () Agree
- () Disagree
- () Strongly disagree
- () Don now/no opinion

Please provide comments or evidence to support your answer

s

s

I. Are there any other alternatives to introducing regulatory controls that we should be considering for endorsement processes?

It is our opinion that endorsement by awarding bodies should simply not be allowed in *Mathematics*.

Johz hat miteria for engristing the property of the second second

We do not believe that any resources should be endorsed by awarding bodies

Equality impact assessment

We have not identified any aspects of the proposed changes to our Conditions or MEMBET& 0 EguBate 0 0 1 220.4912924(TmBET& 0 cETBT1 0 0 1 254512937mBET& 0 0 1 9[s)]TJETBT2924 TmBET& Are there any specific positive or negative imp

v