



BCS' response to the Post-16 Level 3 and Below Pathways

A Government consultation from the Department for Education

January 2026

Compiled by Claire Penketh, BCS Senior Policy and Public Affairs Manager

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Q1. In taking this approach, are there any risks or issues DfE needs to be aware of?	3
Q2. Are there any particular issues for subjects or students as a result of not having medium sized V Levels?	6
Q3. Which subject areas are most appropriate for V Levels? Provide evidence of relevance to employment or further study.	6
Q4. How could current information, advice and guidance be improved or what new guidelines or measures should be developed to ensure that students are informed about V Level subject selection and combinations?	7
Q5. What factors should be considered when creating T Levels where no level 3 occupational standards currently exist?.....	8
Q6. How can the two pathways, and the two qualifications, be designed to make transitions as easy as possible for students who change their minds or move between pathways?	8
Q7. In proposing that all Foundation Certificates are 240 guided learning hours, are there any risks or issues we need to be aware of?.....	9

Q8. Should any additional criteria be considered when selecting subjects for Foundation Certificates? If yes, what are they and why?	9
Q9. Are there any other potential subjects you think should be considered for Foundation Certificates? If yes, what are they and why?	10
Q10. We expect the occupational pathway to last two years, in line with current legislation. However, we recognise that some learners may have legitimate reasons for leaving the pathway early, such as progressing to a work-based training programme or moving on to a level 3 qualification. Are there any other circumstances you believe would justify a learner stepping off the pathway before completing the full two years? Please provide examples and explain why these should be considered.....	10
Q11. We are proposing that DfE sets introductory core content for Occupational Certificates which is shared across multiple related qualifications. Do you agree with this approach?	11
Y/N Yes	11
Q12. Please give reasons for your answer.....	11
Q13. Challenges with variable sizes for Occupational Certificates (Y/N)	11
Q14. If so, what are they and how might they be overcome?	11
Q15. If so, what are they and how might they be overcome? We are proposing the size of the broad introductory core content should be proportionate and should be less than 50% of the overall GLH. Do you foresee any challenges with this approach?.....	12
Q16. If so, what are they and how might they be overcome?	12
Q17. What non-qualification activities do you think are successful at supporting vocational students to engage best in their course content in order to achieve in their course and progress to their stated destination?	12
Q18. We plan to roll out V Levels, Foundation Certificates, and Occupational Certificates together by route, to ensure coherence across levels and clear progression. Do you think this is the best approach?	13
Q19. What steps should we take to ensure the outline content for V Levels, Foundation Certificates and Occupational Certificates is high-quality across subjects and awarding organisations? Please give us your views:	13
Q20. We're proposing that there is no awarding organisation branding for V Levels, Foundation Certificate and Occupational Certificate titles to make qualifications easier to understand.	13
Do you foresee any problems with this?	13
Q21 Could any of the proposals have an impact – positive or negative – on people with any of the following protected characteristics?	14
Q22. What action could help reduce any negative impacts you identified in the previous question? Please give us your views:.....	14
Q23. Are there elements of V Levels or Foundation and Occupational Certificates that are required in your view to increase accessibility or	15
improve outcomes for those with SEND? Please give us your views:.....	15

Q24. Are there any other equality-related impacts you think we should consider?	
Please give us your views:.....	15
Who we are	15

BCS

The Chartered Institute for IT
 3 Newbridge House,
 Newbridge Square,
 Swindon SN1 1BY
 BCS is a registered charity: No 292786

Introduction

The Department for Education (DfE) sought feedback on the planned design and implementation of the new pathways for 16 to 19-year-olds announced in the Post-16 Education and Skills Strategy, including:

- A third, vocational pathway at level 3: creating V Level qualifications. V Levels will sit alongside A levels and T Levels and will offer a vocational alternative to these academic and technical routes.
- Two new pathways at level 2: simplifying the current offer and providing a clear line of sight to both further study at level 3 and skilled employment through the Further Study pathway and Occupational pathway.

The government are proposing V Levels will be 360 GLH to enable students to combine them with other V Levels and A levels. Where larger subjects are needed, the government proposes that these are offered through T Levels.

Q1. In taking this approach, are there any risks or issues DfE needs to be aware of?

BCS, The Chartered Institute for IT has long argued for a richer curriculum that moves beyond pure computer science to include essential IT and digital literacy skills, crucial for all future jobs and full participation in society. Our recommendations include:

- Replacing the current, often theoretical, Computer Science GCSE with a new, broader Computing GCSE that reflects the full scope of digital skills, including AI and data.
- AI & Digital Literacy Integration: BCS advocates for embedding AI literacy, data skills, and critical thinking across the curriculum, not just in dedicated computing lessons, to prepare students for an AI-enabled world.

- Recent data shows strong demand for AI skills: in 2025, 695 UK-domiciled 18-year-olds began degrees in artificial intelligence—a 39% increase from the previous year, with overall AI enrolments up 42% across all ages. This trend underscores the urgency of embedding applied AI and data literacy within V Levels to align with learner interest and employer needs.
- Teacher Development: We emphasise the need for sustained investment in teacher training to build confidence and capacity in delivering effective computing education.
- Inclusion & Relevance: BCS pushes for making computing relatable and valuable for all students, especially girls, by showing its relevance to real-world problems.
- Gender representation in computing is improving but remains a challenge. The male-to-female ratio among UK 18-year-olds starting computing degrees narrowed from 5.5:1 in 2019/20 to 4:1 in 2025, while AI courses show a ratio of around 3.8:1. V Levels should leverage inclusive design and relatable contexts to accelerate this progress.

BCS supports the principle of simplification, but caution that collaboration and consultation are key to the success of the initiative. This means robust piloting, and meaningful engagement with schools, further education institutes, employers and universities to ensure recognition and value.

Crucially, BCS urges that digital skills be embedded across all V Levels, not only for those pursuing careers in the digital & technology roles but also for all roles in other sectors increasingly reliant on digital literacy, and for onwards study. The UK's growing demand for tech professionals makes this an urgent priority, and BCS advocates for V Levels to offer a strong focus on digital skills to support the large number of technologists needed in fields like AI or cyber security.

Regarding the positioning of V Levels at 360 Guided Learning Hours, the equivalent of one A-Level, the principal risk is capacity and quality, which can undermine consistency when a new qualification is introduced at scale. Computing teacher numbers have fallen (11,748 in 2010 to 8,435 in 2023), recruitment targets are unmet (~30%), and 44% of secondary computing teachers are non-specialists, which can undermine consistency when a new qualification is introduced at scale in schools, including sixth forms (**Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report**, workforce section; pp. 10–11).

Without dedicated CPD and leadership development for the post 16 sector, schools with lower prior attainment and SEND cohorts may experience weaker delivery, widening inequities (Consultation, pp.12–13; *Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report*, pp. 6–8). BCS recommends embedding applied digital literacy and AI competencies

in V Levels and making AI training a core part of Initial Teacher Training and National Professional Qualifications, alongside a requirement for school-published AI policies to set a safe baseline. Our definition of digital literacy and skills goes beyond the narrow instrumental view that sometimes characterises functional digital skills (BCS response to the Curriculum and Assessment Review - Call for Evidence November 2024). These actions reduce delivery risk, align content to industry's needs via occupational standards.

BCS, The Chartered Institute for IT, have supported officials to develop a working definition of the term digital literacy, as follows: *"The knowledge and skills that young people need to flourish as well-informed participants in a digital world, including the knowledge, skills and behaviours needed to: (i) make confident, creative, and effective use of technologies and systems, and (ii) make well-informed critical judgements about the implications and impact of how digital technology is used."*

In FE Colleges there are similar concerns over the availability of computing and digital skills teaching staff. Across the FE sector there is clear evidence of persistent staffing shortages across all subjects. In the 2023/24 academic year, the vacancy rate across all teaching posts in FE colleges stood at 3.9 per 100 positions (AOC, Worst staffing crisis in two decades in England's colleges, (March 2022) <https://www.aoc.co.uk/news-campaigns-parliament/aoc-newsroom/worst-staffing-crisis-in-two-decades-in-englands-colleges>).

We agree with the analysis by the Royal Academy of Engineering in their response to this consultation that the continued contraction of the FE teaching workforce significantly limits capacity to deliver high-demand, resource-intensive programmes in, digital, STEM, engineering construction, and the built environment—creating systemic risks to quality, consistency, and equitable access.

Half of all students entering computing degrees in 2025 came from the two most deprived IMD quintiles, compared to 41% across all subjects. This highlights the importance of equitable access to digital pathways and targeted CPD for providers in underserved regions.

Also there is the potential for T Levels to overlap with V Levels and this should be carefully considered. The implementation of V Levels must be underpinned by clear, published progression maps for each subject, ensuring transparency for learners and employers. Teaching content should be designed to avoid duplication with T Levels while making progression routes explicit. The qualification framework must support mixed programmes and guarantee recognition for further study.

Alignment to pathways to apprenticeships at Level 4 and above and to higher education must also be considered in the development of the course structure of V levels to prevent reduced access these routes.

There needs to be a clear differentiation between V Levels and T Levels in order to avoid confusion as to the purpose and aims of the new qualification. Without this clarity, there is both operational and reputational risk across the education and skills system, which

could impact take-up. In this we are aligned with both the Royal Academy of Engineering's response and the Federation of Awarding Bodies response to this consultation.

Q2. Are there any particular issues for subjects or students as a result of not having medium sized V Levels?

DfE's rationale is to simplify and encourage breadth by avoiding medium-sized qualifications (Consultation, p.17). However, some sectors (e.g., Digital, Media Tech) benefit from more depth than 360 GLH without the full commitment of a T Level; removing medium sizes could force students into premature specialisation or thinly spread breadth (Consultation, pp.18–19). The problem with a lack of medium sized V Levels – between short 240-360 GLH and a large Tech T Level which is around 1,500 GLH, is that technology, like engineering and allied subjects, requires more applied learning and in depth technical knowledge than might not be available within the current size options.

Therefore there would be a missing mid- tier which is currently supplied by qualifications such as AGQs/BTECs/Cambridge Technicals, which currently provide incremental scaffolding to pupils and routes to progression. These medium sized qualifications have historically provided a stepping stone to, for instance, apprenticeships and HE. By narrowing the mid-tier offer, it could reduce viable combinations and restrict routes into HE for learners who aren't keen to commit to a specialised T Level.

Another factor is that a reduction in mid-tier qualifications could affect disadvantaged or SEND students who often rely on stepping stones to academic achievement. There could be a risk of potential dropouts as the learning curve to a fully specialist qualification could be too steep, with a knock on effect on student's confidence, and willingness to stay on the course.

BCS suggests credit-bearing extensions (applied AI/data or cyber projects) attached to the 360-GLH spine, preserving navigability while enabling authentic practice (BCS Curriculum & Assessment Review Response, Sections 2.4–2.9). This approach also supports equity: learners in schools with limited KS4 computing offers (94% of girls drop computing at 14 per BCS evidence cited in policy commentary) can build confidence through structured enrichment and recognised digital literacy components (Curriculum Response, pp. 2–3; Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report, pp. 6–8). By signalling clear progression currency to HE/apprenticeships, these extensions avoid qualification proliferation while addressing sectoral depth needs (Consultation, pp.20–21).

Q3. Which subject areas are most appropriate for V Levels? Provide evidence of relevance to employment or further study.

Digital skills are vital to today's workforce and society and so a Tech V Level would be a welcome addition. The V Level could support foundational technical knowledge and applied learning.

Computing remains a high-demand discipline: 16,865 UK-domiciled 18-year-olds commenced computing degrees in 2025—the third-highest on record—within an overall intake of 31,670 students. The most popular specialisms were Computer Science, Games & Animation, and Software Engineering, together accounting for nearly 90% of entrants. V Levels should reflect these sector priorities while offering applied learning routes.

BCS welcomes the stated objective in the consultation that the V Level subjects offered will relate to priority areas of the economy, as outlined in the Industrial Strategy. These sectors, such as advanced manufacturing, clean energy industries, creative industries, defence etc, will require a significant proportion of digital and tech capabilities. The indicative list (Digital; Media/Broadcast & Production; Animation/Games/VFX; Business/Admin; Legal; Protective Services; Science; Health, etc.) matches BCS's view that V Levels should be broad sector-based with strong applied content (Consultation, p.19).

If digital skills are embedded in all V levels, then they have the potential to give candidates a bridge into a digital apprenticeship at Level 4 or 5, or to traditional Higher Education pathways to study computing and allied subjects.

Media/Animation/Games/VFX can integrate AI/data literacy and creative technology practice to meet employer expectations while providing routes to HE (Curriculum Response, Sections 4–5).

Business/Admin/Management and Legal Services should embed digital literacy/AI ethics to reflect cross-sector digital transformation (Curriculum Response, Sections 2.4, 4; AI Paper, Recommendations). These subject choices enable coherent pathways from Foundation Certificates to V Levels and onwards to HE/apprenticeships while complementing T Levels, and potentially V Levels in large occupational areas (Consultation, pp.12, 20–21).

There is a demand for post Level 3 tech qualifications that aren't either as specialised as A Level Computing, or as purely sector specific vocational as T Levels or apprenticeships. BCS is currently supporting the government with its revised digital curriculum.

We have noted that Computing at School - BCS' peer-peer network of computing teachers - has contributed to a 370% rise in Computer Science GCSE entries since 2014, with those with CAS teachers entering 18% more candidates and achieving +0.2 grade uplift—evidence of demand and progression potential (Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report, pp. 6–8).

Q4. How could current information, advice and guidance be improved or what new guidelines or measures should be developed to ensure that students are informed about V Level subject selection and combinations?

DfE recognises that students need clear guidance on coherent combinations and progression (Consultation, p.22). BCS recommends publishing national ‘rules of combination’ and exemplar study-programme models (e.g., V Level Digital + A level Maths + English resit) to prevent duplication and ensure HE currency (Curriculum Response, Sections 2.4–2.9).

When it comes to tech careers, CAS communities (10,000+ members; >4,400 event bookings; avg 4.6/5 rating) can underpin regional IAG events and parent briefings, strengthening understanding of applied computing and progression routes (Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report, pp. 7–9, 17–18).

In addition BCS has produced resources as part of its My Digital Future initiative <https://www.mydigitalfuture.co.uk/>) to help guide students in their tech career choices. These measures give students transparent pathways while supporting providers to design coherent programmes (Consultation, pp.22–24).

Q5. What factors should be considered when creating T Levels where no level 3 occupational standards currently exist?

The consultation proposes developing new T Levels in areas without L3 standards. There are already L3 standards applied to many fields of technology, as can be seen from this list (<https://www.bcs.org/it-careers/apprenticeships/>)

In general BCS advises co-designing standards with employers and HE to include applied AI/skills and data literacy ‘as a practice’- aligning curricula with contemporary development methods (Curriculum Response, Sections 4–5).

We agree that in general, placement feasibility and assessment balance should be piloted to maintain rigour while ensuring manageability at scale, reflecting lessons from refreshed T Levels (Consultation, p.25). This approach will build credible progression options, strengthens employer currency, and safeguard quality during expansion into new subjects (Consultation, pp.26–27).

Q6. How can the two pathways, and the two qualifications, be designed to make transitions as easy as possible for students who change their minds or move between pathways?

Transitions are helped by shared core units and transparent credit recognition. BCS recommends common digital literacy, computational thinking, and entry-level programming units across both pathways so learners can move mid-course with recognised learning (BCS Curriculum Response, Sections 2.4–2.9). Early diagnostics in maths and structured ‘Maths for CS’ support reduce non-continuation and enable upward

movement to Level 3 (BCS/CPHC Retention Report, Key Recommendations; Insights on maths/programming foundations).

Providers should schedule level-3 tasters (as DfE proposes) and use CAS resources to scaffold changes in programme while maintaining engagement (Consultation, pp.33–34; Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report, pp. 6–9).

A standardised transfer protocol/credit transcript, IAG counselling, and HE/apprenticeship alignment makes transitions predictable and fair, especially for SEND and disadvantaged learners (Consultation, pp.28–33; Retention Report, EDI insights).

Age diversity in computing pathways is significant: in Scotland, 60% of new computing undergraduates were aged 19+, compared to 45% in England. This reinforces the need for V Levels to accommodate both school-leavers and later entrants through flexible structures and progression routes.

Q7. In proposing that all Foundation Certificates are 240 guided learning hours, are there any risks or issues we need to be aware of?

A consistent 240 GLH supports deliverability alongside English/maths and enrichment (Consultation, p.30–31). The risk is insufficient breadth and time for authentic applied tasks in some sectors. DfE's proposal to include L3 exposure mitigates this (Consultation, pp.33–34), but BCS recommends explicitly allocating hours to recognised digital literacy/AI activities so students develop cross-sector skills valued by employers and HE (BCS Curriculum Response, Sections 2.4, 4). Staffing pressures (shortages and non-specialists) could compromise quality without CPD (see above).

Q8. Should any additional criteria be considered when selecting subjects for Foundation Certificates? If yes, what are they and why?

Yes. Subjects should be driven by purpose and progression – there should be a relevant Level 3 route into V, T or A Levels with (a) clear alignment (b) embedded applied digital literacy/AI components relevant across sectors, and (c) feasible delivery with current equipment and CPD support (BCS Curriculum Response, Sections 2.4–2.9).

Tech courses should demonstrably strengthen maths/programming foundations to reduce later non-continuation at HE (Retention Report, Key Recommendations; Maths & Programming sections). Demand evidence should include regional equity considerations so provision reaches underserved areas, supported by CAS communities (Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report, pp. 8–10, 17–18). This keeps the Foundation Certificate purposeful and inclusive.

Q9. Are there any other potential subjects you think should be considered for Foundation Certificates? If yes, what are they and why?

BCS suggests ‘Data Literacy & Responsible AI Foundations’—a cross-sector subject covering data handling, AI ethics/safety, and applied problem-solving, responding to policy and training gaps seen in the AI survey (AI Paper, pp. 3–5; BCS Curriculum Response, Sections 2.4, 4).

‘Cyber Hygiene & Digital Safety’ would strengthen privacy, security, and misinformation resilience, aligning with employer expectations across Protective Services, Health, Legal, and Business (BCS Curriculum Response, Sections 4–5). Both are feasible within 240 GLH with project-based assessment, build coherent pathways to V/T/A levels, and support SEND accessibility via multimodal tasks (Consultation, pp.32–34).

Q10. We expect the occupational pathway to last two years, in line with current legislation. However, we recognise that some learners may have legitimate reasons for leaving the pathway early, such as progressing to a work-based training programme or moving on to a level 3 qualification. Are there any other circumstances you believe would justify a learner stepping off the pathway before completing the full two years? Please provide examples and explain why these should be considered.

As a member of the National Engineering Policy Centre, we are in agreement that an occupational pathway should be ‘flexible, fair and progression orientated’. We also agree with the NEPC that there are legitimate circumstances to leave an occupational pathway early without penalty, provided learning has been recognised and a clear re-entry route exists.

Beyond progression to apprenticeships or Level 3 (Consultation, p.35), justified circumstances include: securing relevant employment, significant health/SEND changes requiring a pathway switch, caring responsibilities, relocation, or provider-approved transfer based on improved diagnostics (Retention Report, EDI and progression insights).

A formal exit award with a credit transcript for completed core units and occupational content prevents lost learning and supports re-entry later (Consultation, pp.34–41).

Providers should offer IAG meetings during exits to maintain engagement. Data on exits should be monitored for equity impacts to refine support (Retention Report, Enhanced Data Sharing).

Q11. We are proposing that DfE sets introductory core content for Occupational Certificates which is shared across multiple related qualifications. Do you agree with this approach?

Y/N Yes

Q12. Please give reasons for your answer.

Centralised introductory core content improves consistency, comparability, and transferability across related qualifications (Consultation, p.35–36). It mirrors the approach proposed for V Levels/Foundation Certificates and helps employers and HE interpret achievements. BCS recommends that this core explicitly includes digital literacy, computational thinking, and AI safety to future-proof skills (BCS Curriculum Response, Sections 2.4, 4; Secondary School Teachers and AI Paper, Recommendations). This reduces duplication, simplifies IAG, and supports high-quality delivery across providers (Consultation, pp.35–41).

Common core content enables shared diagnostics, credit portability, and coherent enrichment/work experience planning (Consultation, pp.35–42). By embedding transferable digital/AI competencies and computational thinking, the core reflects modern workplace expectations and supports progression to Level 3 (BCS Curriculum Response, Sections 4–5; AI Paper, pp. 3–5). It also eases CPD demands: providers can focus on occupational specifics while drawing on national resources and CAS practice-sharing (Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report, pp. 8–10, 17–18). This balance enhances quality and parity across awarding organisations.

Q13. Challenges with variable sizes for Occupational Certificates (Y/N)

Yes. Variable GLH complicates timetabling, funding parity, and performance table comparability (Consultation, pp.40–41). It may burden Ofqual/AOs with QA variations and confuse employers regarding attainment equivalence. BCS suggests GLH bands with published credit equivalences and a move towards consistent grading scales, supported by route-specific pilots to test deliverability (Consultation, p.41; BCS Curriculum Response, Sections 2.4–2.9).

Shared practice repositories via HE partners can smooth implementation (Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report, pp. 17–18).

Q14. If so, what are they and how might they be overcome?

Challenges include scheduling non-qualification activity consistently, aligning English/maths resit hours, and ensuring employer clarity on certificate ‘size’. Overcome by

publishing GLH bands (e.g., small/medium/large within route), credit equivalences, and standardised grading scales; provide clear funding rates per band and pilot in selected routes before national roll-out (Consultation, p.41).

Build provider capacity through CPD and exemplars, and share data on delivery impact and learner outcomes (Retention Report, Enhanced Data Sharing; Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report, pp. 8–10).

Q15. If so, what are they and how might they be overcome? We are proposing the size of the broad introductory core content should be proportionate and should be less than 50% of the overall GLH. Do you foresee any challenges with this approach?

In some sectors, a smaller core may under-develop transferable skills; in others, a larger core could constrain occupational depth (Consultation, p.41). BCS recommends sector-specific core ranges within the <50% ceiling (e.g., 30–45%) and applied project components—including data/AI tasks—to ensure practical competence alongside breadth (BCS Curriculum Response, Sections 4–5).

Pilots with employer/HE panels should review outcomes for accessibility, SEND adjustments, and progression efficacy (Consultation, p.45–46).

Q16. If so, what are they and how might they be overcome?

Publish sector-specific guidance on core proportion, require at least one applied project evidencing digital literacy/AI safety, and quality-assure provider-marked assessment with awarding-organisation moderation (Consultation, p.41–42). Provide CPD packs and sample assessments co-developed with CAS/HE.

Monitor destination data to adjust core size and content over time (Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report, pp. 8–10; BCS Curriculum Response, Section 5).

Q17. What non-qualification activities do you think are successful at supporting vocational students to engage best in their course content in order to achieve in their course and progress to their stated destination?

To support students who are leaning towards a tech career, there are a range of activities: high-quality industry experiences (micro-placements, visits), hackathons, physical computing clubs, and AI ethics/safety workshops increase engagement and practical

competence (Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report, pp. 22–23; CAS communities data, pp. 17–18).

Digital portfolios and showcase events aligned to occupational standards help learners evidence skills for employment and HE. Requiring published AI policies and staff CPD ensures safe use of tools and consistent practice (AI Paper, pp. 3–5). These activities particularly benefit lower prior-attainment and SEND cohorts, building confidence and bridging to Level 3 study (Consultation, pp.42–46).

Q18. We plan to roll out V Levels, Foundation Certificates, and Occupational Certificates together by route, to ensure coherence across levels and clear progression. Do you think this is the best approach?

Yes, if paired with a transition framework for a phased roll out of subjects. Risks include regional capacity gaps (staffing/equipment) and confusion if defunding precedes availability of replacements.

Are there alternative rollout strategies we should consider, or any unintended consequences we might be overlooking?

Retaining funding for existing quals until replacements are live, publishing route-specific CPD/IAG packs (including AI/digital literacy guidance), and monitoring equity via shared datasets on admissions/continuation/achievement (Consultation, pp.43–45; Retention Report, Enhanced Data Sharing).

Q19. What steps should we take to ensure the outline content for V Levels, Foundation Certificates and Occupational Certificates is high-quality across subjects and awarding organisations? Please give us your views:

We support the consultations intention to adopt co design with employers, HE, awarding organisations, and teachers and FE staff, publish draft content for consultation, and require sample assessments before first teach.

As we said earlier - explicitly embed AI/data literacy and applied practice across V Levels/Foundation/Occupational Certificates (BCS Curriculum Response, Sections 4–5).

Q20. We're proposing that there is no awarding organisation branding for V Levels, Foundation Certificate and Occupational Certificate titles to make qualifications easier to understand. Do you foresee any problems with this?

Risk: employer recognition currently linked to Awarding Organisation (AO) brands; transition may create uncertainty.

How could we mitigate these?

Mitigation: strict titling conventions, digital verification/badging that shows standards alignment, and targeted employer outreach explaining the new brands. Publish cross AO comparability guidance and exemplar candidate evidence. CAS/BCS can support communications to schools/colleges and HE, ensuring navigability during transition.

Equalities impact

Q21. Could any of the proposals have an impact – positive or negative – on people with any of the following protected characteristics?

Age, Disability, Sex

Please explain your answer:

Age: Refer to our response to question 6: Age diversity in computing pathways is significant: in Scotland, 60% of new computing undergraduates were aged 19+, compared to 45% in England. (Demand for UK computing degrees in 2025: BCS analysis of UCAS data)

Disability: Refer to our answer to Q1 - without dedicated CPD and leadership development for the post 16 sector, schools with lower prior attainment and SEND cohorts may experience weaker delivery, widening inequities. And in Q2 our answer - a reduction in mid-tier qualifications could affect

disadvantaged or SEND students who often rely on stepping stones to academic achievement. There could be a risk of potential dropouts as the learning curve to a fully specialist qualification could be too steep, with a knock on effect on student's confidence, and willingness to stay on the course.

Sex: Refer to our response on gender Q2: BCS analysis shows women IT specialists make up 22% of the tech workforce and whilst female representation is improving, progress to gender parity is slow.

Q22. What action could help reduce any negative impacts you identified in the previous question? Please give us your views:

Age: BCS recommends: V Levels to accommodate both school-leavers and later entrants through flexible structures and progression routes

Disability/SEND: Improve CPD for teachers and school leaders; carefully consider mitigations of the removal of mid-tier qualifications, ensuring there are, for instance, SEND adjustments such as multimodal assessment, scaffolding, and AI safety/privacy guidance to improve accessibility.

Sex: V Levels should leverage inclusive design and relatable contexts for women and girls to accelerate current progress.

Q23. Are there elements of V Levels or Foundation and Occupational Certificates that are required in your view to increase accessibility or improve outcomes for those with SEND? Please give us your views:

See Q22 above

Q24. Are there any other equality-related impacts you think we should consider? Please give us your views:

- Regional disparities in staffing/equipment can disadvantage rural/low income communities; include loan schemes, on site labs, and employer support for equipment (BCS Empowering Teachers: Inspiring Young Minds Impact Report, pp. 8–10). Home digital access matters; recognise digital literacy via a qualification so all learners can evidence skills (BCS Curriculum Response, Sections 2.4–2.9). Track intersectional data (gender x race x SES) to target support effectively (BCS/CPHC Retention Report, EDI & data insights).
- Socio-economic status: invest in devices/connectivity and track participation.

Who we are

BCS is the UK's Chartered Institute for Information Technology. The purpose of BCS as defined by its Royal Charter is to promote and advance the education and practice of computing for the benefit of the public.

We bring together industry, academics, practitioners, and government to share knowledge, promote new thinking, inform the design of new curricula, shape public policy and inform the public.

As the professional membership and accreditation body for Information Technology we serve over 60,000 members including practitioners, businesses, academics, and students, in the UK and internationally.

We also accredit the computing degree courses in over ninety universities around the UK. As a leading information technology qualification body, we offer a range of widely recognised professional and end-user qualifications.