



Consultation responses: Health and Social Care, Childcare and Playwork



November 2016

Consultation on the approach to be taken to develop a new suite of qualifications in Health and Social Care, Childcare and Playwork: A summary report on the findings

On 1 September 2016, Qualifications Wales launched a consultation on the development of a new suite of qualifications for the Health and Social Care sector. Further information about the proposals can be found in the consultation document on Qualifications Wales' website [here](#). Respondents were encouraged to complete an on-line survey before the consultation closed on 5 October 2016.

This summary report adopts the following guide to provide an indication of response numbers:

Most	More than 90%
Many	More than 70%
Majority	More than 60%
Around half	Between 40 – 60%
Minority	Less than 40%
Few	Less than 20%
Very few	Less than 10%

These descriptors are provided to give an indication of the relative level of response associated with each of the comments. All comments were taken into account by Qualifications Wales when making decisions regarding the consultation.

Qualifications Wales received 150 responses to the on-line survey, of which 75 were complete responses and 75 were partial responses. A further ten responses were received in an alternative format. One of these responses stated that the organisation took a neutral stance in relation to the decision to restrict some qualifications within the Health and Social Care sector and the other stated that they did not have a specific response to the consultation. Nine responses were received from awarding bodies or associates and 12 responses were received from sector bodies. Ten responses were received on behalf of learning providers and 11 responses were received from organisations who employ people within either the Health and Social Care or Childcare/ Playwork fields. Five responses were received from other stakeholders. A list of all organisations that responded can be found in Annex 1.

Do you agree that, of the options we have set out to deliver the outcomes of our review, the most effective in achieving those outcomes is option 3 (imposing a restriction on some qualifications in the Health and Social Care sector in Wales)?

One hundred and fifty-five responses were received in relation to this question.

Yes

Slightly over a third of respondents indicated support for the proposal to restrict some qualifications within the Health and Social Care sector. A minority of employers, few learning providers and few sector bodies that responded to the consultation agreed with the proposal to restrict without any reservations.

Thirty respondents took the opportunity to note their primary reasons for agreeing with the proposal to restrict some qualifications within the Health and Social Care sector:

1. Around half of these respondents stated that there is a need for a common platform in the sector to improve consistency and standardisation. Few respondents go further to say that this will add weight and value to the sector, improve the quality and standards of care, ensure the qualification is fit for purpose and improve confidence in the comparability of learner performance.
2. Few felt that it would lead to a reduction in confusion for learners and employers as they will be able to navigate through the sector more easily.
3. Very few stated that it will provide an opportunity to develop a clear and unambiguous approach for effective progression routes, and to develop robust and innovative assessment processes.
4. Very few stated that clearer and more robust quality assurance processes could be developed.
5. Very few stated that it could lead to a more transparent system for awarding.
6. Very few stated that simplification of the qualification structure would avoid nugatory competition.
7. Very few respondents noted that the option to restrict will provide the opportunity to develop a suite of qualifications that will support the vision and ambitions of the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014.

Although they stated that they agreed with option 3 without reservations, very few respondents did note some concerns, including:

1. The timing of the new qualifications in light of the new Regulation and Inspection of Social Care (Wales) Act 2016 impacting on the number of people requiring qualifications.
2. Splitting the content development on the one hand and then restricting the qualification on the other hand may not guarantee an effective outcome.
3. The potential monopolising effect and the associated reduction in competition.
4. A need for a stronger sense of what currently exists within the qualifications market.

Yes, but with reservations

Around half of respondents indicated that whilst they agree with the proposal to restrict some qualifications within the Health and Social Care sector, they have some reservations. Around half of employers, learning providers and sector bodies indicated support for the proposal but with reservations.

Forty-three respondents took the opportunity to note their key reservations with regards to option 3.

1. A minority of respondents were concerned that restricting the number of awarding bodies that offer these qualifications will restrict provider and learner choice, as this would mean only a single awarding body's qualification would be permitted. If qualifications are unfit for purpose or do not meet a particular learner's needs, then they may be disadvantaged as a result. It is important that the qualification, including the assessment methodology, is suitable for all learners and can be taught in schools, further education institutions and work-based learning settings. Very few respondents also noted concerns that centres will have an awarding body imposed on them and may have costs associated with working with a new or multiple awarding bodies.
2. Few respondents were concerned about the portability of the proposed qualifications within England, Scotland, Ireland and the EU, with specific reservations about the ability to progress to University outside of Wales being raised.
3. Respondents from the Playwork sector noted that Playwork is a very distinct discipline, which is often side-lined when in fact it could be argued that it is the foundation on which all learning takes place. They were supportive of the proposal to include content on play as part of the core knowledge and understanding of an Early Years and Childcare qualification but were concerned that losing the bespoke pathway for Playwork is not conducive with the current trajectory of strategic development to develop qualifications that meet the needs of a largely seasonal, part-time workforce, and that recent investment in the development of bespoke qualifications may be wasted. Any new qualification must be developed with the involvement of the play sector and be based on the recently reviewed National Occupational Standards, which reflect Playwork principles.
4. Few respondents raised concerns about the potential disruption during the transition period and the risk associated with a major change.
5. Very few respondents noted concerns about the need for robust Continuing Professional Development (CPD) and quality assurance processes for trainers and

assessors, the need for the awarding body to be able to deliver bilingual resources and the viability of specialist qualifications that do not currently access public funding.

6. Very few respondents raised concerns about the risk of a market failure; if the awarding body offering the qualification cannot provide the service learners and providers need then there is no other option for provision.
7. Very few respondents raised concerns about the impact that a monopoly of the market by one awarding body may have on quality due to a lack of competition and the inability of awarding bodies to share innovation and best practice. Very few respondents also noted the need for considerable resource investment by awarding bodies to tender and raised concerns about the capacity of smaller awarding bodies to manage this.

No

Fewer than a quarter of respondents indicated that they did not support the proposal. Many awarding bodies and associates, around half of learning providers, a minority of sector bodies and very few employers did not support the proposal to restrict some qualifications within the Health and Social Care suite.

Twenty-five respondents took the opportunity to state the reasons for their view, raising the following concerns:

1. A minority of respondents outlined the risks associated with a single supply model including lack of incentive for innovation due to reduced competition, future choice of provision in the market and the inability for awarding bodies to maintain expertise within the sector, complacency around levels of service, the impact on learners and the market if an awarding body has to withdraw from offering the qualification during the contract period, the ability of an awarding body to continue to offer qualifications in another sector that currently benefit from cross-subsidisation and the increased burden on centres from having to work with a new awarding body.
2. Respondents from the Playwork sector again noted that option 3, imposing a restriction on some qualifications in the Health and Social Care sector in Wales, was not appropriate for Playwork. They would like to see Playwork included as part of the qualification but without restrictions placed on it. They raised concerns that the breadth of content required to meet the needs of the workforce will not be able to be fully covered as part of a wider qualification.
3. Very few respondents raised concerns about the ability of one qualification to meet the needs of all learners, the lack of choice that will be available to centres, the need to recognise current qualifications, the availability of resources in Welsh and

relevance to the needs of Welsh learners and employers if an awarding body based in England wins the contract and the portability of the qualification outside of Wales.

4. Few respondents felt that option 2 could operate more effectively in Wales and avoid some of the risks associated with creating a monopoly market.
5. Very few respondents outlined an alternative option of collaborative, multiple awarding body development of one version of each new qualification, which is overseen by Qualifications Wales.

Positive impacts that option 3 would (or might) have on respondents or their organisation, learners, employers, individuals in receipt of health and social care services or other stakeholders.

Seventy-nine respondents took the opportunity to identify potential positive impacts of the option to restrict. These responses are summarised below:

1. A minority of respondents stated that the option to restrict would:
 - a. lead to more consistency and standardisation across the sector;
 - b. provide clearer progression pathways;
 - c. reduce the confusion for employers and learners, and ensure that the qualification is understood and recognised by all stakeholders;
2. A few respondents noted that the option to restrict would:
 - a. Improve the quality assurance and regulatory procedures of the qualification;
 - b. Enable the development of a qualification that attends more efficiently to the current needs of learners and employers in Wales;
3. Very few respondents stated that the option to restrict:
 - a. Has no benefits;
 - b. Ensure that skills can be transferred across the sector;
 - c. Improve the confidence that service users and employers have in a candidate's ability;
 - d. Improve a centre's ability to effectively network with the awarding body
 - e. Will ensure better standards of delivery;
 - f. Will better ensure the quality of the production of bilingual resources;
 - g. Enable an awarding body to develop a sustainable platform to support the sector.

Negative impacts that option 3 would (or might) have on respondents or their organisation, learners, employers, individuals in receipt of health and social care services or other stakeholders.

Seventy-five respondents took the opportunity to identify potential negative impacts of the option to restrict. These responses are summarised below.

Comments regarding awarding bodies:

Concerns were raised by very few respondents that the lack of competition that may arise from having one awarding body offering all the qualifications within the Health and Social Care suite may lead to complacency from the awarding bodies, a reduction in the quality of their customer service to centres, and fewer opportunities to share best practice and collaborate to develop innovative qualifications. Very few other respondents raised concerns that awarding bodies may not be able to retain their knowledge and expertise in the sector to bid in future years and small awarding bodies may not have the capacity to bid from the outset. There were very few concerns that there would be a lack of a contingency plan if the awarding body is unable to fulfil the requirements of the qualification mid-way through the licensing period. Finally, very few respondents expressed a concern about the consistency of qualifications across the 'lots', if they are awarded to different bodies.

Comments regarding centres:

Concerns were raised by a few respondents that the magnitude of change that is being proposed may be unmanageable for centres. They may experience high costs to re-train staff and assessors, a pressure on staff to develop new lesson plans and they may experience a skill shortage to deliver the new programmes. Very few respondents stated that a staged approach may be more appropriate. Very few respondents stated that this change may cause a decline in standards or progress during the transition phase.

Few respondents noted concerns regarding the potential strain on resources that centres may experience if they have to work with a new awarding body.

Comments regarding learner needs:

Few respondents raised concerns that learners will no longer have the option to choose which course they study. This will mean that there are fewer opportunities for specialisation and potential students may be discouraged from studying within the Health and Social Care sector if they have to complete modules in areas in which they have little interest.

Very few respondents noted that the qualification will need to account for individual candidate's learning styles and very few education centres raised concerns that they will no

longer be able to offer qualifications within Health and Social Care if there are requirements for aspects such as work placements, which they cannot facilitate. There is a need to ensure that the qualifications are suitable for all students, of all abilities and skill levels.

Very few respondents were concerned that currently qualified people may be at a disadvantage if they have different qualifications, which may lead to a lack of confidence in the sector. Very few others raised concerns that they may have to restudy for the new qualification.

Comments regarding portability:

Few respondents noted concerns that the option to restrict may lead to reduced opportunities for learners to progress into HE or work outside of Wales.

Comments regarding Playwork:

Very few respondents raised concerns regarding the possibility of a lull in qualification take-up whilst the new qualification is being embedded, concerns about who would deliver the new qualification, and the capability of assessors to cope with a new qualification. There were also very few concerns that playwork may lose its stand-alone qualification, which has been heavily invested in over recent years to ensure that it is fit for purpose. One respondent noted that a similar practice has occurred in England and Northern Ireland recently and has resulted in non-occupationally competent trainers and assessors.

Please outline any views you have on the list of qualifications we are suggesting should be restricted.

Fifty-six respondents took the opportunity to comment on the proposed list of qualifications that would be restricted under option 3.

1. A minority of respondents were supportive of the list of qualifications, noting that there is a good range of qualifications across the sector. Very few respondents were pleased that Level 4 qualifications and an aspect of Playwork have been included and very few noted that the progression for both academic and work-based learning routes appears sound.
2. Very few respondents requested further clarity on the content of the proposed qualifications and the progression pathways, and would appreciate being consulted on this during the development phase.
3. Very few respondents were concerned that the current list requires students to decide whether or not to follow a vocational or academic pathway at an early stage, which could deter some students from fully considering or being able to study at Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the future. They noted the need to align the

content of academic and work-based qualifications to enable learners to progress from one to another.

4. Very few respondents expressed concerns about the proposed titles of the qualifications, including the use of the term 'practitioner'.
5. Very few respondents noted that the proposed level 5 qualification should have more focus on management duties and responsibilities
6. Very few respondents were concerned about either the loss of a specific Child Development qualification or the lack of consideration given to apprenticeship pathways in the consultation.
7. One respondent noted that it is vital for the list to remain flexible to ensure it can respond to legislative changes, such as those associated with the regulation and registration of staff.

Would you like to comment on whether playwork should be included within the qualifications at levels 2 and 3 that would be restricted?

Sixty respondents indicated that they would like to comment on the inclusion of Playwork within the list of restricted qualifications. Around a third of these respondents indicated that they were fully supportive of the suggestion to include Playwork. No sector bodies were fully supportive of the suggestion.

Around a third of respondents to this section of the consultation were supportive of the suggestion but had some reservations. The reservations raised included:

1. Playwork is a very distinct discipline that often gets overlooked, diluted and misunderstood. There is a risk that the lack of a separate qualification will mean this becomes reality.
2. The recently developed, bespoke Playwork qualifications are fit for purpose. There were concerns that if playwork becomes part of a wider qualification, there will not be enough time for the required content to be delivered. Any new qualification must be aligned to the National Occupational Standards and Playwork Principles, and be fit for purpose for any registration or regulatory purposes.
3. A minority of respondents who commented in this section agreed with the inclusion of Playwork in the Children's Care, Learning and Development module as it is a fundamental aspect of work for many people within the sector but were concerned that it appears to be the only access route into the profession and there is no clear progression route for further study for those who want to progress in the playwork field. It would be very difficult to develop a qualification that delivers enough content

for those wishing to work in the field, and to provide a background for those working in related fields.

4. Playwork as part of a wider qualification may discourage learners who only have interest in Playwork or don't have the time to complete full-time qualifications.

Around a third of respondents to this section of the consultation were not supportive of the proposal to include Playwork in the list of restricted qualifications, including many respondents from the Playwork sector. These respondents felt that the restriction of Playwork qualifications would mean that the restricted qualification is the only funded qualification route and would impact negatively on the current strategic direction in which Playwork qualifications are being developed for a number of reasons:

1. Historically, when Playwork has been incorporated into other qualifications, it has been marginalised. Playwork is a highly nuanced approach to working with children and recent steps to professionalise and raise the profile of Playwork is at risk if it is incorporated into a more generic qualification that may be overly influenced by larger sectors of early years and childcare.
2. Playwork qualifications are developed very differently to early years and childcare qualifications.
3. There are significant differences between the National Occupational Standards for Children's Care, Learning and Development and the National Occupational Standards for Playwork. It is essential that all the Playwork principles are embedded in all courses.
4. There has been recent significant funding invested in Playwork qualification development that has supported the development of bespoke units, which meet the needs of the workforce.
5. Feedback from learners, employers, tutors and assessors demonstrates that the awarding bodies currently delivering Playwork qualifications, other than the new bespoke qualification, struggle to evidence that they are employing occupationally competent Playwork tutors and assessors.
6. The recent changes in England and Northern Ireland, may mean that the restricted Early Years, Childcare and Playwork qualification being considered may be the only route in the UK.

Are you supportive of the suggestion that the Occupational Therapist Support Worker pathway should be included within the qualifications at Level 3 that would be restricted?

Thirty-one respondents indicated that they would like to comment on the inclusion of the Occupational Therapist Support Worker Pathway within the restricted qualifications. Around half of the respondents that commented on this section of the consultation were fully supportive of the suggestion.

A minority of respondents were supportive but had some reservations. These respondents generally raised queries and uncertainties as opposed to definite reservations, including a need for clarification regarding the demand for this qualification and the identification of this as a specialist pathway over other specialised routes.

Few respondents that commented on this section of the consultation were not supportive of the suggestion to include the Occupational Therapist Support Worker pathway within the restricted qualifications. Around half of these respondents indicated that they were not supportive of the suggestion because they were not supportive of the option to restrict overall. Very few other respondents questioned the need to change a qualification that is currently fit for purpose.

Are you supportive of the suggestion that the level 4: Social Care Advanced Practitioner with potential specialist pathways and Level 4: Children's care, Learning, Development and Playwork Advanced Practitioner with potential for specialist pathways should be included within the qualifications that would be restricted?

Forty-nine respondents indicated that they would like to comment on this section of the consultation. Around half of these respondents were fully supportive of the suggestion. One of these respondents expanded on their response by stating that these level 4 qualifications are required to ensure that service users with complex needs get a specialised service and to meet the requirements of the Social Services and Wellbeing (Wales) Act 2014.

A minority of respondents were supportive of the suggestion but with reservations. These respondents expressed a range of reservations, including:

1. Respondents from the Playwork field reiterated that Playwork may get lost as a distinct discipline when included with Childcare and Early Years, and should not be included in the list of restricted qualifications. However, very few supported the addition of a level 4 qualification to support progression of learners.
2. Very few respondents were concerned that introducing a level 4 qualification for Childcare may cause confusion when it was taken away recently.

3. Very few respondents noted that any new qualifications need to be aligned to Social Care Wales' rules on registration and must prepare learners for the level 5 qualifications to bridge the current gap.
4. Very few respondents queried the demand for the qualification, how it would be funded and how portable it would be outside of Wales.
5. Very few respondents raised concerns about the potential loss of current qualifications, which they perceive to be valuable.
6. One respondent was mindful that any specialist pathway will require specialist knowledge, which may cause specific issues when commissioning or developing.

Few respondents that commented on the inclusion of these two level 4 qualifications were not supportive, and raised the following concerns:

1. Very few respondents were concerned about the terminology used in the titles of the proposed courses.
2. Very few respondents were concerned about the feasibility for awarding bodies to bid for and deliver this qualification due to the potentially low learner numbers.
3. Very few respondents reiterated concerns about reduced learner choice, reduced portability across the UK, risk of complacency from awarding bodies and the risk of a single point of failure.

What is your view, if any, on the 'lots' of qualifications that we are suggesting should be included in the commissioning process?

Forty-seven respondents commented on the 'lots' of qualifications that were proposed in the consultation document.

A minority of respondents commented that the division into 'lots' appears to be pragmatic and will support the development of the learner, with specialist pathways embedded around a strong, common core.

Respondents raised the following reservations about the proposed 'lots' of qualifications.

Reservations

1. Progression across Levels – very few respondents noted that the allocation of 'lots' repeats many of the current problems surrounding progression. Different awarding bodies, and potentially assessment approaches, for each of the 'lots' will be a challenge for learners and tutors.
2. Specialist Pathways – very few respondents advocated for core modules and then specialisms, rather than a repeat of the stratified duplication that currently exists.

Very few respondents noted that specialist pathways should be considered for areas such as Mental Health.

3. Collaboration between awarding bodies - very few respondents noted that if different awarding bodies are awarded different lots, it is crucial that they collaborate together effectively to ensure content, delivery methods and assessment methodologies are aligned.
4. Alternative suggestions for lots
 - Very few respondents suggested grouping knowledge-based qualifications in one lot and practitioner qualifications in a different lot at levels 2 and 3. The approval criteria, subject content and approval process should ensure there is significant alignment between them.
 - Very few respondents noted that lot 2 is quite large and suggested having four 'lots' with lot 2 either being divided into Health and Social Care and Childcare or by level of qualification.
 - Very few respondents commented that child development and the Work with Parents award have been overlooked.
 - Very few respondents suggested that lot 1 should be a level 1 qualification, and that completion of knowledge based courses in 'lots' 2 and 3 should be compulsory before acceptance onto practical courses.
5. Other
 - Very few respondents raised concerns that the failure to win one lot may impact on an awarding body's ability or willingness to deliver a lot which it successfully wins. Most awarding bodies will want to deliver all lots to ensure progression and ensure financial viability.
 - Very few respondents were concerned about the potential cost for centres if they are delivering qualifications in all 'lots' and having to work with multiple awarding bodies.

In your view, would the suggested five-year period of restriction be reasonable for awarding bodies to recoup development costs?

Of the 83 respondents who commented on this section, a minority indicated that five years was reasonable, a few noted that it was too short and very few noted that it was too long. The remainder noted that they did not know. Very few commented that it is not possible to predict the length of time that will be required for awarding bodies to recoup development costs until the shape of requirements are outlined in more detail.

Reasons as to why five years is too short

Eleven respondents commented on why they felt five years was too short.

1. Very few respondents expressed concerns about repeated changes to qualifications and the time it takes for new courses to embed and show their effectiveness. However, they noted that interim reviews should happen at least every five years. One respondent noted that it takes at least two years for a qualification to embed within the system and longer to evaluate whether they are effective. Recent reviews of the sector every four to five years have been very costly and destabilising for the sector.
2. Very few respondents noted that regular changes may impact on the competency of assessors and undermine the value of the awards.
3. Very few respondents felt that the cost of developing such a diverse suite of qualifications would be too high to recoup within five years.
4. Although they felt that five years is too short, very few respondents did recommend that a review should take place at least every five years.

Reasons as to why five years is too long

Five respondents commented on why they felt five years was too long.

1. Very few respondents noted that awarding bodies may struggle to retain their expertise and knowledge within the sector for five years to be able to tender for later contracts.
2. One respondent considered that with no competition to limit prices, awarding bodies could recoup costs very quickly. If a contract term is too long, there is potential for a greater loss of occupational competence.

Comments on Qualifications Wales' analysis of the three different options.

Thirty-four respondents provided comments in this section. A minority of these stated that they felt the analysis was comprehensive and provided a useful guide for considering the consultation questions.

Very few respondents expressed a concern that the consultation appeared to be geared towards establishing whether option 3 is supported, rather than gathering information on which option is favoured. There was some uncertainty as to how the preference for option 3 was reached and the range of analysis that was completed to reject options 1 and 2. Very few respondents noted that it would have been useful for options 1 and 2 to have been explored in as much detail as option 3. There were also very few responses that expressed an uncertainty as to how option 3 will address the issues identified in the review, including assessment inconsistencies by training providers. Very few respondents felt that more

consideration needed to be given to the portability of qualifications within the consultation document.

Very few respondents noted that they did not agree with the disadvantages of option 2 stated in sections 28 and 29 of the consultation document. Very few respondents noted that the potential disadvantages of option 2 could be overcome by awarding bodies collaborating to develop and offer the qualifications, as was the approach for the delivery of Essential Skills. This would also enable them to use the expertise they already have in place.

Very few respondents suggested disadvantages of option 3 that had not been considered within the consultation document. These included protecting the interests of learners if a significant issue arose with the sole awarding organisation during the period of restriction and the potential waste in resource for re-designing new qualifications in subjects where it may not be required.

These concerns were reported to the project team in detail and taken into account when considering the outcomes of the consultation.

Comments on the grounds for imposing a restriction

Thirty-two respondents commented on this section of the consultation. All comments made reiterate what has been outlined previously throughout the report but were considered by the project team in detail when discussing the findings from the consultation.

Comments on considerations for selecting an awarding body to develop new qualifications

Thirty-six respondents commented on this section of the consultation.

Few of these respondents stated that they require more detail to be able to comment and very few respondents noted the importance of robust quality assurance within the process.

Very few respondents made each of the following comments:

1. Consideration should be given to including stakeholders in the selection process;
2. Consideration should be given to adopting a consortium approach;
3. Consideration should be given to including the following in the criteria:
 - a. A requirement for awarding bodies to be able to i) develop and submit qualifications and high quality supporting materials in Welsh, ii) ensure trainers, assessors and verifiers can work through the medium of Welsh, iii) provide administrative support through Welsh and iv) have a Welsh language website.
 - b. A commitment to take appropriate action when compliance is breached

- c. A commitment to facilitate collaboration and engagement between centres and stakeholders.
4. Clarification would be welcome on the deployment of Welsh assessors, what is meant by a 'successful track record' and 'innovative, holistic, effective and flexible assessment', what are deemed to be innovative resources, how the capacity and capability of awarding bodies will be assessed, what the timescales will be for the development of the qualifications and support materials and what extent of collaboration will be required with other awarding bodies offering other 'lots'.
5. Assurance was sought that when evaluating cost-effectiveness of bids, emphasis will be placed on quality.

Are there any other points you would like to make about this consultation?

Forty-eight respondents commented on this section of the consultation. Many of these responses summarised what has previously been outlined in the report but the following additional points were raised:

1. One respondent noted that the questions in the survey were not always clear and another felt that the report has a number of inaccuracies.
2. Very few respondents noted that the consultation should have been more open to suggestions, with one stating that the consultation felt like the decision to restrict the market has already been taken. Another respondent stated that there is a need to explore and discuss the evidence needed to identify more clearly why and how the options offered are the most appropriate.
3. Very few respondents queried the role of the Welsh Language and the production of bilingual resources, including the demand, funding streams and the timescales for completing the resources.
4. Very few respondents raised concerns regarding the portability of the new qualification.
5. Very few respondents noted that the training of assessors and tutors will be key to effective change.
6. Very few respondents noted that consideration should be given to whether current qualifications can be converted.
7. Very few respondents requested clarification on the content of the proposed qualifications, including how skills elements of academic qualifications will align to the skills based qualifications and how legislative requirements, such as those in the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act 2014 will be covered.
8. Very few respondents noted that qualifications within the health remit have not been given as much consideration as those with the care remit. Another respondent was

concerned about the minimal level of involvement that care providers seemingly had in the review.

9. One respondent raised a concern about provision until 2019 as there is a risk of awarding bodies withdrawing the current qualification before restriction.

Annex 1 – Responses to the consultation on behalf of organisations

Agored Cymru

BIIAB

Bishopston Play Association

Blaenau Gwent and Caerphilly local authorities

Brecknock Play Network

Care Council Wales

Care Forum Wales

Ceredigion County Council

City and County of Swansea Social Services

City and Guilds

City of Cardiff Social Care Assessment Centre

Clybiau Plant Cymru Kids' clubs

Coleg y Cymoedd

Coleg Gwent

Colegau Cymru

Cwm Taf Social Care Workforce Development Service

Elliot's Hill

Estyn

Federation of Awarding Bodies (FAB)

Flintshire Parenting Strategy

Gŵrp Llandrillo Menai

Monmouthshire County Council

Mudiad Meithrin

Neath Port Talbot Centre for Professional Development

NHS Wales Shared Services Partnership, Workforce Education and Development Services (WEDS)

NCFE

NOCN

Oaklands Residential Home

PACEY Cymru

Pearson

Penyrheol Comprehensive school

Playboard Northern Ireland

Playwork Education and Training Council for Wales (PETC Wales)

Play Wales

Public Health Dieticians in Wales

Public Health Wales, Screening Division

RAY Ceredigion

SFJ Awards

The Playwork Foundation

UK Children's Play Policy Forum

UK Homecare Association

University of South Wales (USW)

Wales Pre-school Providers' Association

WEA YMCA Wales Community college

WJEC

Ysgol Ardudwy

Ysgol Gyfun Gŵyr