



Department
for Education

Accelerated Degrees

Government consultation response

November 2018

Contents

Introduction by Sam Gyimah	4
Executive Summary	7
Glossary of acronyms used in this document	14
Accelerated degrees: full analysis of responses	15
Questions 1-9	17
Question 10	19
Analysis	19
Question 16	22
Analysis	23
Government response	24
Question 11	24
Analysis	26
Government response	28
Question 12	29
Analysis	31
Government response	33
Question 13	34
Analysis	35
Government response	36
Question 14	37
Analysis	37
Government response	38
Question 15	38
Analysis	39
Government response	40
Question 17	41
Analysis	42
Government response	44
Questions 18 & 19 (for Providers)	45
Analysis	46

Government response	48
Question 20 (for individuals, including current students)	48
Analysis	49
Government response	50
Questions 21 & 22 (for Employers)	50
Analysis	51
Government response	52
Next steps	53
Annex A: List of respondents to the consultation	54
Annex B: Current provision of Accelerated Degrees (as listed by respondents to Question 18)	56

Introduction by Sam Gyimah

What do we do next when we reach 18? For most of us this is the first, and one of the biggest and most impactful decisions we will ever face. Potential students enrolling on a degree course, for example, must choose whether or not to invest the next three or four years of their lives, and take on potential financial commitments - at a point when they have seemingly limitless options for how to spend their time, and a growing awareness of the many financial pressures they will face for the rest of their lives.

Yet the goal of acceptance to university continues to be prized and sought-after by record numbers of young people in this country, and beyond. They – rightly - want the proven benefits of graduation: the accreditation of their intelligence and hard work, the unique student experience that extends far beyond the academic. And a significant earnings premium over their lifetime compared to non-graduates.

I believe that everyone should have the chance to realise their full potential through the opportunities to develop intellectual and social skills that higher education offers. Not just young people straight out of school, but also those who chose another option after school several years ago, and whose experiences in work and life make them now more keenly aware of the benefits of a degree. And – critically - people of all ages from disadvantaged backgrounds, for whom a degree's value in unlocking wider and better opportunities can be literally life changing.

Flexibility and choice are key to making university education equally accessible to all. Not everyone wants – or is able – to take at least three or more years out of their life to get a degree. More students (and their parents) now understand how the Government supports their tuition and living costs, in return for repayments that only come into effect when they are earning enough as graduates to make this affordable. We are working to ensure this is understood by everyone.

And yet, the degree study options offered by many universities remain moribund. They generally reflect the established standard offer, no matter what subject or provider. Three ten-week terms each year, broken up by an annual 22 weeks of vacation. Most offer no way for undergraduates to study for more of the year, take shorter breaks after each term, graduate quickly and start – or return to – work with their prized degree in hand.

There's a gap in the flexible study choices open right now to most students. Accelerated degrees can help to bridge that gap.

Accelerated degrees are standard degrees in almost every sense. They cover the same learning content as standard degrees, generally studied at the same week-on-week pace as standard degrees, taught by the same lecturers and tutors, and with the same accredited quality of teaching. They simply differ in their timetable. By studying for more weeks each year and taking shorter breaks between terms, accelerated students

can complete the full content of a three-year degree and graduate – but in only two years.

While fellow undergraduates are completing their final year of learning and exams, the accelerated graduate is starting their post-degree career. This puts them a year ahead of their peers – in experience, job-based skills, and earnings of typically around £19,000 per annum. Accelerated degrees offer students immediate financial benefits too: lower total tuition costs, and only two years of living costs to cover rather than three. And because they generally study at the same daily and week-on-week pace as their non-accelerated peers, they have just the same opportunities for life outside study – be that sports and hobbies, part-time work, or caring responsibilities.

Students studying accelerated degree programmes are amongst their strongest advocates. Accelerated students confirm that their wider university experience is no different to that of their peers on a standard degree programme. They attest to exceptionally high levels of satisfaction, based on their ability to graduate and enter work more quickly, the lower overall costs of accelerated study, and academic benefits of focused and dedicated study. SLC's 2018 Customer Survey recorded 92 per cent of accelerated students agreeing they were glad to be on accelerated rather than standard degree courses – 74 per cent agreed strongly.

Many are also students who would simply not have enrolled at all, if getting a degree meant three years out of full-time earning, with no learning at all for nearly half of each year. Or those who are keen to keep the levels of their student loans as low as possible.

Accelerated degrees offer considerable new potential for providers to engage with employers and expand professional vocational degree options, enabling faster graduate qualification and entry into key sectors of the economy such as manufacturing and industry. They are an integral part of our wider government drive to increase the flexibility of higher education provision, including 2018 reforms to Master's loans and part-time maintenance loans.

Current provision of accelerated degrees is low. Providers tell us that a key barrier to wider provision is financial. Any provider offering an accelerated degree is teaching three years of standard degree content over two years. By law, they are only able to charge a standard fee for each calendar year of teaching, meaning they receive two-thirds of the revenue of the standard degree course, but with the same or higher annual teaching costs and overheads to meet.

In spite of this financial disincentive, a number of fee-capped providers do offer accelerated courses. For them, the delivery pressures are tight but manageable. They have balanced the budget and staffing demands and still believe the extra challenge worthwhile – to give highly motivated individuals their chance to choose higher education.

Accelerated degrees may not be right for every type of provider, course or student. But it is essential that we implement changes to challenge stagnation and stimulate the provider market. The higher annual accelerated degree fee cap will support ambitious, flexible and innovative providers to significantly increase provision, both in courses available and the types and locations of universities offering them.

Having considered the full range of consultation responses, we believe that that our proposals offer a fair balance between the needs of providers and students. They will increase the total tuition fee income for providers, while keeping the fee cost of an accelerated degree lower than a standard degree for the student.

It is therefore my intention, subject to Parliamentary approval, to lay Regulations as soon as possible that will set a 20% increase in the annual standard fee cap chargeable for an accelerated degree. Providers will continue to be able to charge fees below the level of the cap, if they wish to do so. They will also be free to choose not to offer accelerated degrees, if they feel they are not the right study model for the ambitions and needs of their target cohorts.

Regulatory reform will only take us so far. We will also work with the sector and potential students to raise awareness and understanding of accelerated degrees – this is essential when 55% of the current standard degree course students surveyed by the Student Loans Company this summer had never even heard of accelerated degrees.

We will undertake a review of the impact of these proposals three years after implementation of the higher fee cap, to assess the impact of these changes on the provision, uptake and outcomes for the first accelerated cohorts of students.

We are at the start of a period of significant change throughout higher education, following the Higher Education and Research Act and the creation of the Office for Students. The Post-18 Review underlines the Government's commitment to ensure that the higher education system incentivises choice and competition across the sector. Accelerated degrees are not the end of our journey, but they are an important step along that road.

Executive Summary

From December 2017 to February 2018, the Government consulted on specific proposals to incentivise wider provision and uptake of accelerated degree courses in England. The key proposal was to increase the annual tuition fee cap chargeable by higher education providers for accelerated degrees, by 20% of the standard fee cap per annum.

This proposal followed from the Higher Education and Research Act 2017, which enabled us to set annual fee caps specifically for accelerated courses, to:

- **incentivise wider provision** of accelerated degrees - by mitigating the cost pressure on providers of delivering the full teaching content of a standard degree over a shorter total timespan; and
- **Incentivise wider uptake** – with increased provision offering students more opportunities to study the content of a standard degree but graduate one year sooner, and for a lower total tuition fee cost.

The higher annual fee cap will increase the accelerated degree income currently available to providers. For a three-year standard degree, accelerated and delivered in two years, the maximum total tuition revenue chargeable per accelerated degree will increase from 67% of a standard degree to 80%.

For students, the total tuition fee for a two-year accelerated degree will be 20% less than its three-year equivalent. Accelerated tuition fees will be 20% more each year than at present, but the total tuition fee cost of an accelerated degree will still be significantly lower than the non-accelerated equivalent - because an accelerated degree requires only two years of tuition and fees to complete, rather than three.

Under the new fee arrangements, while the standard degree student is completing their third year of study, an accelerated degree student will be starting their first year of employment, typically earning around £19,000 in that first year. Their tuition loans will be in the region of £5,500 less than their peers studying three-year degrees. With two rather than three years of living costs to pay for and an extra year of earnings, accelerated degree graduates can be over £25,000 better off after three years than their standard-course contemporaries, yet with the same degree qualification and all the benefits it brings.

Consultation responses came from a wide range of Approved (fee cap) Providers and Approved Providers, as well as all the major HE representative bodies, Further Education Colleges, charitable, professional and industrial organisations and individuals. We are grateful to those who responded to this consultation. The detailed comments and observations provided by many respondents will be valuable as we prepare to implement these reforms.

Respondents expressed a range of views on the detail of the Government's proposals. Amongst providers, there was a broad correlation between agreement with the proposed changes (from existing accelerated degree providers), and disagreement about whether a 20% increase in annual fees for accelerated degree courses would incentivise more providers to enter the market, from those not offering accelerated courses.

There was also a divergence of views on the principle and impacts of accelerated degrees, particularly from providers not currently offering accelerated degrees. These focused on the familiar benefits of continuing to provide degree courses along the established lines, rather than the potential benefits of greater choice and more flexible provision – for providers as well as students.

A detailed analysis of responses to each consultation question is set out in the main body of this document. This summary sets out our decisions, following consideration of all responses, and the rationale for these decisions.

Accelerated Degrees: key Government decisions

- **Implementation of a 20% uplift on annual fee caps for accelerated degrees. For students, this will result in a total fees saving per degree of 20%. For providers it will mean 13% more total income per accelerated degree.**
- **The Government’s view is that “Accelerated degrees” will include any first undergraduate degree delivered in a timespan at least one year shorter than the equivalent standard degree, including standard degrees with (for example) work placements or overseas placement years.**
- **DfE will continue to work with OfS and SLC to establish mechanisms and produce guidance helping providers to identify courses as ‘accelerated’ for higher fee cap purposes, or to seek our help where they are uncertain.**
- **SLC payment mechanisms will enable students to transfer once between an accelerated and a standard degree course (or vice versa) for their first degree.**
- **Access, quality assurance and financial safeguard measures for accelerated degrees will remain the same as for standard degrees.**
- **The Government will review the impact of these changes three years after implementation.**

Context

Accelerated degrees deliver the same study content, and the same calibre of learning and qualification as standard degrees – usually by increasing the number of weeks taught each year, while maintaining the same pace of study week-on week. Accelerated degree students typically study for around 45 weeks each year, and graduate in two years, rather than the standard three years needed for most undergraduate degrees.

Graduating in two - rather than the usual three years - allows accelerated degree graduates to start or return to work, while their peers studying standard three-year

degrees are still in their final year of study. accelerated degree students graduate with lower total tuition fee costs than their peers, save on the living costs of that final standard degree study year and potentially gain an extra year of employment income.

In spite of these benefits, fewer than 1% of the total undergraduate population are currently studying accelerated degrees¹. In response to DfE's 2016 Call for Evidence on Accelerated Degrees², higher education providers cited cost as the main barrier to wider accelerated provision. For a two-year accelerated degree, HEI providers can only charge the standard tuition fee for each calendar year of study – delivering the standard degree's teaching content, but only able to charge 2/3rds of the standard degree's fees for it.

Because of this financial disincentive, for the last 15 years only a handful of providers have offered accelerated courses, mostly in a limited range of vocational subjects such as Accountancy and Law. This niche provision and uptake in turn means that most potential students and employers - as well as many providers - are either unaware of accelerated degrees at all, or share common misunderstandings about them.

Students currently enrolled on accelerated HEI courses are however very clear about the benefits. SLC conducted two parallel Customer Insight surveys in Summer 2018, of current students on accelerated and (separately) on standard degree courses. Key findings included:

For accelerated degree students:

- 92% of participants said they were glad they had chosen to study an accelerated degree rather than a standard degree.
- The main reasons participants gave included the ability to graduate and enter work more quickly, lower overall costs, and academic benefits.
- Participants thought the key benefit of an accelerated degree was finishing the degree more quickly than students on the standard version of the course. Key drawbacks included: academic demands/pressure, fewer breaks during the academic year and financial budgeting during the summer months.

For non-accelerated degree students:

- 55% of survey respondents had not heard of accelerated degrees.

¹ It is difficult to precisely identify the number of undergraduates enrolled on degree courses which would meet the Higher Education and Research Act 2017 definition of an accelerated course. Providers use a variety of titles and modes of delivery for courses that may (or may not) meet the terms of this definition.

² [Link to Call for Evidence]

- Of these respondents, 60% said they would consider an accelerated degree if they were a new student - with the most common reason being that it would allow them to complete their degree more quickly.
- Of the 41% of participants who said they had heard of accelerated degrees, almost half said they did not choose this type of degree because their preferred subject was not available as an accelerated course.
- 32% of respondents said that they would consider switching their degree, but only if they could continue to study the same subject at the same institution.
- Participants thought the key benefits of an accelerated degree were completing study more quickly and lower overall tuition fee costs, and the key drawbacks were demands of study and financial and time management.

The government response

After consideration of all consultation responses, we will proceed with regulations enabling a 20% uplift in annual tuition fee caps for accelerated degrees, and a corresponding 20% uplift in tuition fee loans for accelerated degrees.

The range of views raised by respondents to this consultation are noted, and will be considered in a review of accelerated degree provision uptake and outcomes, three years after implementation of the regulatory changes.

Government's reasoning to proceed with regulations as soon as possible, to enable a 20% higher annual fee cap for accelerated degrees from 2019/21 (subject to Parliament) is as follows.

- Positive impact of proposals – responses indicate sufficient agreement with the incentivising impact of the proposed 20% uplift / savings to support the government's intention to legislate for this increase, as a reasonable starting point for supporting wider, more flexible provision, with a reasonable balance of benefits between provider and student.
- No substantive evidence of negative impact – although some respondents raised a range of concerns about the possible negative impact of increased accelerated provision and uptake, the overwhelming majority of these negative assertions were theoretical, conservative, and not supported by evidence based on existing accelerated degree provision.
- Accelerated degree provision and uptake is not mandatory. Providers who believe accelerated degrees are not suitable for their universities, their curricula or their potential students are not required to offer them. Current and potential students

who do not believe accelerated degrees are right for them are not required to enrol on them.

- There was no consensus from respondents who disagreed with the proposed 20% uplift, on the optimal level of funding uplift.
- Respondents who asserted that 20% would be insufficient to support any increased provision did not offer quantitative costings evidence to demonstrate this.
- Conflict of aims: respondents who disagreed with 20% as a sufficient incentive (for either providers or students) did not suggest how an increase in either value could be secured without a corresponding reduction in the benefit of the other (i.e., because a higher fee uplift must result in a lower student tuition fee total saving, and vice versa).
- Conflicting messages: eight of the 22 HEI providers who disagreed with 20% as a wider provision incentive, went on to answer ‘**yes**’ to the later question, “*Based on the policies set out in this document, are you considering offering new or additional accelerated degrees when tuition cap uplifts are enacted?*”
- Potential to change the current accelerated degree landscape: a number of respondents - including both those who agreed *and disagreed* with a 20% annual provider uplift / overall student saving – did note that 20% would incentivise some providers / students, just not all providers, across all subjects or for all students.
- Length of an accelerated degree: many respondents were concerned that the accelerated degrees fee cap uplift would only be available for a degree course completed within 24 months of enrolment. This would exclude, for example, four year degrees accelerated over three years, and degrees with three years of study but one year of ‘placement’, such as work experience or a year outside England.
The Government confirms that any model of standard first Bachelor Honours degree can be ‘accelerated’ if it is delivered in a total span one year shorter than the matriculation-to-graduation span of the equivalent standard degree.
- The only exception to this principle is that part-time degrees cannot be classified as ‘accelerated’ for the purposes of uplifted maximum fee caps or fee loan caps. The Government’s view is that existing fees flexibility for part-time provision and study allows for sufficient flexibility of the rate of part-time courses, up to the point where an ‘accelerated’ part-time course would be substantively little shorter than a full-time standard degree course.
- Controls and safeguards: the Government does not intend to make any initial changes to the current system of degree controls and safeguards. For quality assurance, financial risk management and access and participation purposes accelerated degrees are to continue to be treated exactly as any other degree.

Issues requiring further consideration

The Government will take into account the impact that recommendations arising from the current Post-18 Review of Education may have on accelerated degrees policy in due course. We will also consider further the following specific points raised by respondents:

- Identifying accelerated degrees' outcomes in benchmarking and metrics, to ensure accelerated degree delivery, uptake and performance can be measured clearly - but also to safeguard against accelerated degree providers being penalised for offering courses which are likely to accrue a higher drop-out / transfer rate than standard equivalents, due to the non-standard pressures on students.

Guidance on the statutory definition of 'accelerated degree'. The Department for Education is working with the Office for Students and the Student Loans Company, to develop systems and protocols to manage the registration and funding mechanisms for all accelerated degree courses for which higher annual fee caps are applicable. We will publish guidance on this process in due course, to help providers to decide whether their accelerated courses meet the legal requirement of 'equivalence'. We will also offer support to enable providers who are unsure whether a course qualifies as accelerated to seek specific case by case guidance.

Glossary of acronyms used in this document

AD	Accelerated Degree
ADG	Adult Dependents' Grant
AP	Alternative Provider / Approved Provider
BAME	Black Asian and Minority Ethnic
BIS	Department for Business, Innovation & Skills
DfE	Department for Education
DSA	Disabled Students' Allowance
ECU	Equality Challenge Unit
ELQ	Equivalent or Lower Level Qualification
FEC	Further Education College
HE	Higher Education
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HERA	Higher Education and Research Act 2017
HESA	Higher Education Statistics Agency
LCL	Long Course Loans
NUS	National Union of Students
OfS	Office for Students
PLA	Parents' Learning Allowance
SLC	Student Loans Company
STEM	Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics
TEF	Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework
UCAS	The Universities & Colleges Admissions Service
UUK	Universities UK

Accelerated degrees: full analysis of responses

In December 2017, the Department for Education published a consultation on the provision of accelerated degree courses in higher education. The consultation sought views on how to enable and encourage wider provision and uptake of accelerated degree courses. The consultation was available [online](#) and also as a Word document for download. Respondents were invited to respond online or by using the downloadable Word version to enter responses and submit these by email, or in hard copy by post.

A total of 98 responses were received. Of these, 87 were submitted through the online questionnaire. One online response was a glitch (no data entered for any questions). A further two online responses came from institutions which each provided two non-identical responses. Response statistics have been adjusted to eliminate double-counting, but comments from both pairs of respondents have been included in content analysis.

Eleven further responses were submitted by email. Three of these offline responses followed the format of the online questions, and their data has been incorporated in the statistical analysis. The remaining eight email responses did not follow the question format of the online consultation, or give clear answers to the specific individual consultation questions. As with the 'double' responses noted above, the non-format offline response data is not included in the percentage scores for question responses, but has been taken into account in content analysis of responses.

Not all respondents answered all questions.

Respondents were asked to provide demographic details in Questions 1-9 of the consultation. Their responses are detailed below. Of all respondents (including offline submissions), 32% were publicly funded Higher Education providers³, 24% were representative organisations within the Higher Education sector, and other specialist professional bodies, 10% were Alternative Higher Education Providers³, 7% were Further Education Colleges and 7% were self-identified Higher Education graduates.

³ Following the Higher Education and Research Act 2017, and the establishment of the Office for Students in April 2018, most publicly funded Higher Education providers from the 2019/20 academic year onwards are now defined as "Approved (fee cap) Providers; and most Alternative Providers of Higher Education as "Approved Providers".

No respondents identified themselves as current students enrolled in either traditional or accelerated degree courses.

Questions, analysis of responses, and Government response have been grouped as follows:

Questions 1-9	Demographics of respondents
Questions 10 and 16	Definitional and any other practical considerations
Questions 11, 12 and 13	20% uplift in fee caps / fee loan caps, 20% saving in cost of tuition fees
Questions 14, 15 and 17	Requirement for specific additional measures or safeguards for accelerated degrees
Questions 18 and 19	Provider experience and intention for accelerated provision
Question 20	Views of individuals including current students and potential accelerated degree applicants
Questions 21 and 22	Views of current or potential employers of accelerated degree graduates

Questions 1-9

The first section of consultation questions asked respondents to provide demographic data to identify them as education providers, employers, representative bodies, charities, individuals, higher education graduates, trade union or staff association. The chart and table below provide a breakdown of respondents by type.

Graphic 1: Bar chart of respondents to the 2017 Accelerated Degrees consultation by type




Table 1: Numbers and percentages of respondents to the 2017 Accelerated Degrees consultation, by type

Respondent type	Total	Percent
Publicly funded higher education provider	31	32.0%
Representative organisation, business, or trade body	23	23.7%
Individual (other)	11	11.3%
Alternative higher education provider (with designated courses)	9	9.3%
Further education college	7	7.2%
Higher Education graduate	7	7.2%
Other (please state)	4	4.1%
Body representing students in higher education	2	2.1%
Charity or social enterprise	1	1.0%

Respondent type	Total	Percent
Employer	1	1.0%
Alternative higher education provider (no designated courses)	1	1.0%
Not Answered	0	0.0%
Trade union or staff association	0	0.0%
Legal representative	0	0.0%
Central/local government, agency or body	0	0.0%
Student in Higher Education	0	0.0%
Total	97	


Question 10

Are there any other technical features of accelerated degree courses that we should take into account for the purpose of new fee arrangements?

The consultation set out a series of proposals for the purpose of identifying what kinds of course should be entitled to charge annual 'accelerated degree' tuition fees, as set out in Schedule 2 (4) to the Higher Education and Research Act 2017. The defining factors proposed for accelerated degrees included:

- A course leading to a student's first undergraduate degree
- Equivalent 'standard' (not currently accelerated) degree courses exist.
- Study is completed in a period of time of at least twelve months less than the equivalent standard degree course.
- Degree course is approved by the Office for Students as an 'accelerated degree'.
- Offered, validated or franchised by Approved (fee cap) providers, and
- Offered, validated or franchised by Approved providers.

Responses to the question were:



Q10	Total	Percent
Yes	57	65.5%
No	20	23.0%
Not Answered	10	11.5%
Total	87	

Analysis

There is a certain amount of replication between responses to Question 10 (technical features of new fee arrangements to be considered) and Question 16 (additional practical

considerations to take into account). We have therefore put these two questions, their analysis and Government responses together in this document.

Responses to the defining proposals noted above focused in particular on:

- *A course leading to a student's first undergraduate degree* – very few comments on this proposal. One respondent recommended accelerated fee loans should be available for undergraduate degrees other than first degrees, as they could be valuable in rapid re-skilling for graduates seeking to change their original career direction.
- *Equivalent 'standard' (not currently accelerated) degree courses exist* – several responses asked how 'equivalent standard' will be interpreted. Specific challenges included: will existing degrees offered by another provider meet the definition of 'equivalent'?, will the non-traditional teaching patterns of accelerated degrees make them not 'equivalent' to the same course taught over the standard three-year study timetable; and concern that the need for accelerated degrees to be 'equivalent' will inhibit genuinely innovative development of new degree courses and ways of learning.
- *Study is completed in a period of time of at least twelve months less than the equivalent standard degree course* – many respondents cited the proposal of accelerated degrees being two-year degrees, a possible definition that is mentioned elsewhere in the consultation, but not in this question. Respondents emphasised their concern that accelerated courses should not be restricted to completion in two years, as this would prevent acceleration of any degrees longer than the standard three years, whether for longer study (for example medicine), or to incorporate work placements or study abroad. Courses featuring developmental opportunities such as placements were cited as especially important for the success of more disadvantaged students, to develop skills and experience in the workplace.
- *Degree course is approved by the Office for Students as an 'accelerated degree'* – very little mention of OfS in responses to this question. One respondent sought clarification on how the OfS approval process for accelerated degrees will operate.
- *Offered, validated or franchised by Approved (fee cap) providers, and offered, validated or franchised by Approved providers* – no comments specifically directed to these parameters.

Other responses focused on wider issues around the delivery and effectiveness of acceleration, including:

- Significant emphasis from respondents on the need for students on accelerated courses to be able to 'decelerate' and transfer back into the standard equivalent degree course, should they find themselves unable to sustain the unique

requirements of accelerated study – and the converse need to allow standard degree students to transfer into accelerated study, should they wish.

- Respondents queried how credit transfer would work when transferring between accelerated and standard courses (either way), and whether SLC mechanisms would be able to account for the range of difference circumstances that these kinds of transfer might create.
- The need for a clear cross-sector definition of ‘accelerated degree’ was cited by several respondents
- The quality of accelerated degrees compared with standard degrees and how the performance metrics of accelerated degrees (atypical rates of attendance and retention) can be fairly measured against standard degree course data.
- Concerns over what respondents perceived as the detrimental impact of accelerated degrees on students - their capacity for part-time work during and/or between terms, their engagement with the full ‘student experience’ of learning, and their ability (and increased need for support) to manage the stress of accelerated study. Some respondents felt these pressures made accelerated study particularly unsatisfactory for disadvantaged students, students with disabilities and students with family or other carer responsibilities.
- The pressure providers will face in meeting the specific teaching and support resourcing needs of accelerated provision, including increased teaching staff and costs, timetable challenges, inability of accelerated teaching staff to research, opportunity costs and estate management pressures when facilities are being used to teach over the summer. These concerns are repeated in responses to a number of later consultation questions. Government response

Uncertainty over the definition and duration of ‘accelerated degree courses’ pre-dates this consultation. Accelerated degrees are frequently referred to more widely in the HE sector as ‘two-year degrees’. The consultation set out the Government’s proposal that, to qualify as ‘accelerated’ for tuition fee purposes, a degree course would need to be equivalent to an existing standard degree course, but delivered within one less year. There were, however, references in consultation to ‘two-year’ courses as the accelerated equivalent of the most common model of standard degree, i.e. a course taught in three years in total.

The Government’s view is that **any first undergraduate degree can be recognised as an accelerated degree, entitled to charge annual fees up to the higher cap, if an equivalent non-accelerated degree course exists**. This should therefore include accelerated degrees that are taught over more than two years, such as four or five year standard degrees, or three year standard degrees that are four years from enrolment to graduation by including, for example, integrated Master’s degrees, or placement, sandwich, Erasmus or other study abroad years.

We will work with OfS and SLC to develop a registration process that will allow providers to identify whether their proposed courses will meet the statutory definition of 'accelerated' for fee purposes. This will include a function allowing providers to discuss and seek specific decisions over the working definition of 'equivalent', and where it is unclear whether the standard 'equivalent' degree meets the required parameters allowing a one year shorter degree to be listed on registration as accelerated.

The Government does not intend at this stage to allow accelerated fee loans to be awarded for any second undergraduate degrees, or for first or other graduate degrees. However, we are working closely with the Student Loans Company to ensure that students on accelerated courses will receive the relevant loans applicable should they transfer from an accelerated to a standard course, or vice versa. Exact entitlements will depend on when any such transfer takes place during the period from enrolment to graduation.


Issues of course flexibility and credit transfer between accelerated and standard degree courses, remain the responsibility of individual providers to determine and deliver. The Office for Students will require providers to publish information on their arrangements for a student to transfer.

Some respondent concerns about accelerated degrees appear to be assertions with little or no empirical evidence to support them. This is not to say these concerns may be unfounded – but this also suggests they are not inevitable, and the likelihood of them occurring is difficult to estimate in such a nascent type of provision. Current accelerated degree providers and students do not generally seem to have substantiated these wider concerns to date.

Government's view is that these concerns must be considered and assessed in the longer-term context of a specific review of accelerated degrees and the impact of the changes to be implemented. The review will be carried out three years after implementation of the necessary regulatory measures.

Question 16

Are there any additional practical considerations we should take into account as we develop our final regulations to support accelerated degree course provision?



Q16	Total	Percent
Yes	63	72.4%
No	16	18.4%
Not answered	8	9.2%
Total	87	

Analysis

As noted above, Question 16 responses were wide-ranging and extensive. Many of the observations, presumptions and concerns were also given in response to other questions, such as the funding sufficiency of a 20% increase in annual accelerated fee caps, the quality assurance of accelerated degrees, or the capacity of students to deliver the more condensed study while still enjoying a student experience fully comparable to their standard degree peers.

The main issues and concerns noted by respondents included:

- The need to ensure students can ‘decelerate’ from accelerated to standard degrees, or vice versa, and how credit transfer can be delivered for such transfers (and how SLC will match that complexity).
- The importance of quality assurance for accelerated degrees, both in this country and internationally, and of metrics reflecting accelerated degree outcomes that will be atypical to traditional degrees
- The importance of realistic provider understanding of the complexities entailed in delivering accelerated degrees, and thus the level of investment required
- Student understanding of the demands, challenges and risks of accelerated study
- Distance learning should be allowed, as it may be required for summer teaching of some accelerated degrees.
- The importance of clear definitions for accelerated degrees, including the OfS role
- The critical need to drive up far better awareness of accelerated degrees and the experiences of accelerated degree students, within the HE sector and more widely


- Capacity of accelerated degree students to undertake part-time work, during term and in vacations
- A number of suggestions for more fundamental system-wide flexibility of study and funding - between courses, providers, speeds & modes of delivery, and more closely responsive to skills shortages. Will these changes promote substantive transformation? Are they responding to a genuine, evidenced student need?
- Importance of recognising that accelerated degrees will not be right (or possible) for all students and all subjects – in particular those with a high proportion of practical learning. In addition, the risk of accelerated degree teaching having a negative impact on HE research.
- Supplementary funding (Parents' Learning Allowance, Adult Dependents' Grant and the Disabled Students' Allowance) is currently awarded at annual values regardless of the length of study per annum: will this change for accelerated degrees?
- Sector-wide impact assessment of accelerated degrees is vital, including consideration of living cost affordability, accommodation costs, and the pressure that current maintenance payment cycles will place on accelerated degree students (in terms of budgeting across the whole year with three payments linked to the three standard terms).
- Can parity of experience between accelerated degrees and standard degrees be ensured? Do accelerated degrees reduce 'value added' opportunities such as work placements, inter-cultural experience, or skills development outside the study requirements? Will accelerated degree students be disadvantaged if they progress to postgraduate study?
- The risk of accelerated degrees (alongside degree apprenticeships, Foundation courses, HNDs and other two-year 'sub-Bachelor' HE qualification), creating a perception – or a reality – of a two-tier landscape with 'superior' vs 'inferior' degrees.

Government response

As with Question 10, we will ensure that these general comments and concerns are assessed following the implementation of accelerated degree policy changes, and specifically within the DfE review of accelerated degrees which will take place three years after implementation.


Question 11

Do you agree that an annual fee cap set initially at the standard rate plus a 20% uplift is the right amount to incentivise wider provision of accelerated degrees?



Response	Total	Percent
Yes	27	31.0%
No	50	57.5%
Not answered	10	11.5%
Total	87	

Breakdown of Yes / No respondents to Q11



Respondent Type	Yes		No	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Publicly funded higher education provider	5	18.5%	22	44.0%
Alternative higher education provider	5	18.5%	5	10%
Further education college	6	22.2%	1	2.0%
Representative body or charity	4	14.8%	8	16.0%
Other*	7	25.9%	1	28.0%
Total**	27		50	

*includes higher education graduate, Individual (other) and Other (please state).

** In addition, 10 of the total 87 online respondents did not answer this question.

Analysis

Almost twice as many respondents disagreed that 20% was a sufficient uplift on annual fees to incentivise wider provision of accelerated degrees. Amongst those who disagreed there was a significant range of views about disincentives. Many of these ‘disincentives’ were also noted by respondents who supported the 20% uplift - as issues to be considered but not (in their view) necessarily insurmountable barriers. And several of the HEI respondents who answered ‘no’ to this question later answered Q19 to indicate that they would be (or were actively considering) providing new accelerated degrees *as a result of the policy changes proposed in this consultation*.

Respondents who agreed that 20% was a sufficient uplift to incentivise wider provision described 20% as “a good compromise” (HEI), “broadly fair” (GuildHE), a not unreasonable starting point (University Alliance), “the right level” to both incentivise providers and offer students good value for money (APs), a “pro rata” approach that seemed “proportionate” (NUS), “the right balance” (FECs). Those supporting 20% also noted that:

- this amount was likely to incentivise some but not all
- Government will want to consider how accelerated higher cost courses could be funded

- success depends on the willingness of providers to be flexible, and will need a genuine change in attitudes and approaches to teaching, delivery of programmes and support.

Several respondents recommended a formal review of accelerated degrees after three years to better understand the impact of the changes. A few respondents suggested that 20% was too high, or that fee caps should be correlated to the success outcomes of specific providers and courses.

Reasons for which respondents rejected 20% as the right amount to incentivise provision included:

- A 20% increase in annual fee caps for accelerated degrees is simply “not enough to incentivise” wider provision. Actual cost of accelerated provision will require an increase of 40%, 50% or even higher than 50% (ie higher than the full cost of standard degrees).
- Providers face greater financial risks with accelerated degrees than with standard courses.
- Opportunity cost savings suggested in consultation (for example, the administrative costs of an additional year) will not be realised, or will be offset by higher overheads (such as maintenance having to be delivered in overtime instead of over the summer).
- Teaching costs, student support costs, and/or all costs, are the same for or higher for accelerated vs standard courses.
- 20% will incentivise slightly but not greatly, but will not be sufficient to incentivise expanded provision in specialist skills, where it is most needed

A number of respondents across all categories appeared to disagree with the 20% increase because of concerns relating to accelerated degrees per se, rather than because of funding insufficiency. These objections included:

- potential impact of greater accelerated degree provision ‘cannibalising’ the standard degree market, leaving neither type of course with sufficient critical market mass to support provision
- an assertion that the proposals are not subject-neutral (because of different course costs) and thus not provider-neutral, which is at odds with a provider-neutral Government ethos.
- students’ marketable employment skills include attributes developed outside of study curriculum, such as volunteering, societies or work placements. It is felt that students need the ‘maturing’ element (in both study and life skills) of a traditional degree timespan

- the claim that Government policy intention with accelerated degrees is simply to drive down taxpayer costs.

Government response

The Government notes that 2/3rds of respondents who answered this question disagree that a 20% annual fee uplift would incentivise wider provision, However, the comments elaborating on this disagreement were diverse, and sometimes contradicted with other 'disagree' respondents, or with the same respondents' later answers. Eight of the HEIs who disagreed that 20% was sufficiently incentivising later (Q19) indicated they were intending or considering offering accelerated degrees as a result of the proposals set out in this consultation. Several dissenting respondents did note that the uplift would be sufficient to incentivise new provision by some providers and/or for some courses.

Very few respondents who disagreed with the proposed 20% suggested what percentage of fees uplift, if any, would offer a sufficient incentive. Suggestions included 40% and 50%. One respondent asserted that accelerated degrees would cost *more in total* to deliver than standard degrees.

Although respondents expressed views on where additional costs for providing accelerated degrees would arise, these did not appear to be based on experience of accelerated degree provision but on envisaged budgetary pressures, such as additional maintenance costs for providers who would be unable to refurbish accommodation or study properties during the summer vacation.

None of the respondents who rejected 20% as sufficient provided empirical data or specific budgetary examples of the cost shortfalls for accelerated degree provision.

Finally, it appeared that several dissenting respondents argued against wider provision or uptake of accelerated degrees on principle, regardless of whether or not the 20% uplift was sufficient. Negative assertions included that teaching and learning on accelerated courses simply cannot be of the same calibre as standard courses, that accelerated degree students will be unable to benefit from the wider 'full student experience' opportunities of a standard duration degree, and they will also be unable to take on part-time work at any point, due to the acute pressures of accelerated study.

The Government's aim has always been to incentivise increased provision of a wider range of accelerated degree courses, offered by many more providers than at present. The majority of providers who responded to the (then) BIS [2016 Call for Evidence on Accelerated Degrees](#) indicated that the current fees structure was the most significant factor inhibiting expansion of accelerated degree provision.

We recognise that accelerated provision is currently a niche element of the higher education market. Our intention is to make changes which will increase the existing - but stagnant and narrow – options to enrol in accelerated degree courses, by legislating to

enable a reasonable financial incentive for providers, balanced against a reasonable level of saving on the cost of tuition fees for accelerated students.

The Government has no intention to make provision of (or enrolment on) accelerated degree courses mandatory, for either providers or students. In our view, the respondents disagreeing with 20% as an incentivising uplift have raised understandable concerns, but have generally argued based on assumptions of challenges to provision and uptake, rather than substantiated evidence. This is especially relevant in the context of a proposal where engagement is wholly optional for providers and students.


It is therefore the Government's intention to seek to lay regulations as soon as possible, to enable registered providers of degrees meeting the statutory definition of accelerated to charge a maximum annual tuition fee up to 120% of the non-accelerated degree annual tuition fee cap.

We recognise that concerns expressed by respondents reflect their wider experience of degree provision. We are also very grateful for the depth of consideration of this consultation's proposals, offered by a wide range of providers as well as the leading representative organisations across higher education. Some of these concerns may reflect the lack of information and evidence-based data on the reality of accelerated degree provision or study.

We are taking forward work to secure and disseminate detailed information on the experiences of accelerated degree providers and students. We also commit to review the impact of the changes set out in this response, including changes to annual fee caps, three years after the first enrolments on accelerated degree courses where fees are chargeable at the uplifted rate.


Question 12

Do you agree that a 20% reduction overall for students, in tuition fee and maintenance loans, would incentivise wider take-up of accelerated degrees by students?



Response	Total	Percent
Yes	35	40.2%
No	43	49.4%
Not answered	9	10.3%
Total	87	

Breakdown of Yes / No respondents to Q12



Respondent Type	Yes		No	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Publicly funded higher education provider	8	22.9%	18	41.9%
Alternative higher education provider	7	20.0%	3	7.0%
Further education college	6	17.1%	1	2.3%
Representative body or charity	5	14.3%	8	20.9%
Other*	9	25.7%	12	27.9%
Total	35		43	

*includes higher education graduate, Individual (other) and Other (please state).

Analysis

Although the majority of respondents who answered this question again disagreed that a 20% uplift in fees would incentivise wider student take-up of accelerated degrees, the difference was much smaller – 40% agreed vs 49% disagreed (10% did not answer).

Reasons for disagreement were again diverse, with many ‘disagree’ responses caveated by the observation that 20% will incentivise some but not all students. As with Question 11, a number of ‘disagree’ responses were again focused on concerns about accelerated degrees as a mode of study at all, rather than the specific question of how incentivising for students the estimated savings would be.

Both ‘agree’ and ‘disagree’ respondents broadly concurred that accelerated degrees are particularly attractive to ‘young mature’ students (especially the 20-30 age group), and to those who are keen to enter the workplace as quickly as possible. Time saved was often cited as a greater incentive than lower debt. GuildHE noted that time saved would be a more critical factor for non-traditional students.

On the issue of costs savings, views from respondents were polarised, with strong assertions both that potential savings are a significant factor for students, and that costs and savings are not a relevant factor for most (for example, because students are increasingly unconcerned about levels of future debt, which they believe they are unlikely to have to fully repay). One respondent (answering in a personal rather than institutional capacity) noted that, “In a recent survey into what motivated our [HEI] students on the accelerated program to select this mode of study, the implications of the two year study period on finances was identified as the most influential factor.”

Some respondents noted that the cost of an accelerated course under the new proposals could be higher than at present (for example, 2 years x 100% of current fee caps vs 2 years x 120%), and queried whether uptake would increase over present levels as a result. Others noted that future students would compare the current total cost of accelerated degrees not with the 'uplifted' total cost, but with the standard degree equivalent cost. Another assertion was that wider uptake would flow more effectively from wider provision than from the potential savings of time or money.

Both 'agree' and 'disagree' respondents flagged concerns over the adequacy of maintenance loans, although it was noted that this is a pressure for all students, including those on standard degree courses. Some respondents considered maintenance would be a particular pressure for accelerated degree students, asserting that they would not be able to supplement living costs with any part-time work during term or vacation times. Others challenged the adequacy of Long Course Loans, especially the National Union of Students and The Equality Challenge Unit, who cited the budgetary pressures for any students not entitled to receive Long Course Loans. NUS and ECU also highlighted the impact on mature students on additional entitlements such as Parents' Learning Allowance, Adult Dependents' Grant and Disabled Student Allowance.

Criticisms of the perceived inherent drawbacks of accelerated degrees included:

- accelerated degree students missing out on opportunities available to their standard degree student peers, for wider non-study experiences and for building social capital
- accelerated degree students must manage unacceptable levels of stress
- Reduced course fees leaving providers of accelerated degrees under-funded for the true delivery costs, resulting in poorer quality of teaching and related resources
- Financial savings for accelerated students would need to be equal to the potential part-time earnings they would not be able to realise over the life of the degree course
- Students perceiving lower-cost courses as 'cheaper' and thus of lower quality; and
- The assertion that, "This [accelerated degree] system reduces accessibility to degree courses for women (parents) and students with disability who will struggle to cope with 45 weeks teaching and learning."

Respondents (both 'agree' and 'disagree') made a number of suggestions for how accelerated degrees could be supported and taken up more widely, with a broad consensus over specific recommendations, including:

- The need for greater awareness-raising of both the challenges and the benefits of accelerated degrees, and the wider context of student finance generally

- The need for better evaluation to understand the impact of accelerated degrees, especially on employability for accelerated degree graduates
- The need to consider accelerated degrees in the context of a wider landscape of measures aimed at widening participation and improving the flexibility of tertiary study (such as part-time study, apprenticeships, online learning)
- The importance of quality assurance for accelerated degrees - their wider credibility and links to professional accreditation
- The complexity and challenge of widening participation, as students who currently opt out of higher education are more likely to have a higher than (student) average proportion of life complexities and dependencies, and thus a greater need for provider investment in effective support mechanisms.

Government response

Responses to this question - both 'agree' and 'disagree' – did not offer a consensus over the incentivising relevance of lower costs for students considering accelerated degrees. Both types of respondent nonetheless agreed that accelerated degrees per se were likely to be attractive to some students - and that, even if a cost saving was not an incentive, a time saving would be.

There was greater consensus on the pressures around living costs and the adequacy of maintenance loans and Long Course Loans. Several asserted that accelerated degree students would not be able to sustain any level of part-time work during their two years of study. However, research noted in the 2017 DfE Literature Review⁴, and recent DfE discussions with students currently on accelerated courses, both suggest this is not the case. On current evidence, the Government believes that accelerated degree students have the same opportunities to undertake part-time work as their traditional degree peers.

Government acknowledges the general concerns over student maintenance, and the specific considerations for accelerated degree students over Long Course Loans and other maintenance grants such as PLA, and we will consider these further, before and specifically in the Accelerated Degrees Review three years after implementation.

⁴ Foster, Will, Liz Hart & Tony Lewis, 2011, "Costing study of two-year accelerated honours degrees", Higher Education Funding Council for England, http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/hefce/content/pubs/indirreports/2011/RE_0311/rd03_11.pdf


The overwhelming majority of respondents did not indicate that a potential 20% saving would be a disincentive to students considering accelerated degrees, or that a higher saving would need to be realised to incentivise.

Taken in conjunction with the responses to Question 11, the Government's view is that a 20% fees uplift for accelerated degrees – and the resulting 20% saving in tuition fees costs (together with potential living costs savings) will incentivise increased enrolment on accelerated degrees. In our view this level of uplift and savings offers a reasonable balance of the financial needs and interests of providers and of students, that will offer a level of incentive to both - sufficient initially to stimulate wider provision by some providers, and wider take-up by some students.

Government also recognises the benefits of raising awareness and communicating clear, accurate, up-to-date and data-based information about accelerated degree courses - to providers, students, accrediting bodies, HE organisations and employers and their representative bodies. We will prioritise work within DfE and with partners across the sector, on how best to deliver this better awareness and understanding of accelerated degrees.

Question 13

Do you agree that a 20% increase in loan cap rates per annum is the right value to incentivise wider uptake of accelerated degrees at Approved providers?



Response	Total	Percent
Yes	27	31.0%
No	46	52.9%
Not answered	14	16.1%
Total	87	

Analysis

As with responses to Questions 11 and 12 (on the incentivising impact of a 20% annual fees uplift / total student fees saving), a majority of respondents disagreed with 20% as an incentivising fee loan cap uplift for students considering accelerated degrees offered by Approved Providers. And, as with comments made in response to Questions 11 and 12, 'disagree' respondents offered a diverse and somewhat contradictory range of assertions beyond the specific question (incentivising impact on Alternative Provider students).

Examples of comments offered by 'disagree' respondents include:

HEIs

- The loan uplift may increase the risk to students of financial instability
- The loan uplift may incentivise APs to expand provision of lower-cost courses and reduce provision of higher cost courses
- The proposed 20% uplift is not based on market data: the increase should be 30%, or 50%
- The loan cap uplift will be insufficient for providers to cover the true costs of offering accelerated degrees, including higher wellbeing costs required by accelerated degree students and costs of teaching, capital revenue forgone, curriculum redesign costs – all having a negative impact on teaching and quality
- Alternative providers rely on casual teaching staff, and thus may offer a poorer teaching experience for students

Alternative Providers

- Maintenance loans should be increased, to offset the reduction in summer earning capacity for accelerated students
- 20% is the 'right' uplift to match the Approved (fee cap) provider uplift, but will not incentivise wider provision / uptake in the long run

Representative bodies

- (UUK) with limited information on how APs may react to a 20% loan cap increase, it is not possible to determine the impact.
- (Independent HE) Upfront fees are a key student barrier, so this uplift will attract them. But there is no evidence that the amount of loan available to students has a significant impact on AP fees charges. Loans should also be available to students on non-designated degrees (Tier 4 licences), to incentivise their wider uptake. Changes to maintenance funding, where there is greater pressure, would have a greater impact on students than fee loan changes.
- (NUS) Maintenance is a bigger critical factor than fee loan levels for AP students.
- (Engineering Council) a 20% uplift will not enable higher cost courses - these are the skills subjects most critical to the UK economy.

Comments from respondents who agreed with the loan cap uplift for AP students indicated greater consensus on the key issues. HEIs asserted that the uplift would offer greater benefits to Alternative Providers than their fee-capped peers, because they are already 'geared up' to offer accelerated degrees.

This view was corroborated by 'agree' APs, who noted that they have already realised effective costing models to deliver accelerated degrees. They also suggested that the higher fee loan cap would particularly incentivise accelerated students who are unable to earn over the summer to supplement their overall degree (tuition and living) costs. Some suggested the increase could promote greater partnership on accelerated degree provision between both types of provider (Alternative and fee-capped), to their mutual benefit.

Other respondents who agreed with 20% as an uptake incentive did note the need for caution, in particular to ensure APs used additional fee revenues to expand participation and equal access, and for the OfS to maintain oversight to ensure the quality of provision of accelerated courses by all providers is maintained.

Government response

Students enrolled on accelerated degree courses at Approved Providers are already subject to tuition fees that are typically slightly or significantly higher per annum than the amount they are able to borrow as student loans from Government. In addition, fees charged by different APs can vary hugely, from £12,000 total tuition fees to £27,000 even for the same degree courses (for example Accountancy). One Alternative Provider (not a respondent to the consultation) currently charges £25,000 per annum for a two-year accelerated degree course.

However, respondents who disagreed with the proposed 20% increase in annual tuition fee loan caps focused not on the incentivising impact for AP students, but on the impact

on Alternative Providers and their capacity to afford to offer accelerated degrees at all, or to ensure the necessary quality and breadth of provision. A degree ‘market’ where tuition fees are so widely differentiated for the same course subjects would seem to suggest that Alternative Providers are able to set their accelerated degree fees at a level which fully covers costs of provision, but also attracts a sufficient cohort of students to make this provision financially viable.

The primary impact of a 20% fee loan uplift will be to expand the affordability of accelerated degree courses from Alternative Providers for students who currently struggle to bridge the gap between the maximum they can loan from Government, and the AP tuition fees being charged for their preferred courses.

The Government has noted the comments on Alternative Provider affordability in the wider context of accelerated degree policy. In light of the capacity for APs to set fees at their preferred rate, and to offer only those courses which they consider to be financially viable, we will lay Regulations to enable a 20% uplift in fee loans for students enrolled on accelerated degrees offered by Alternative Providers.

We recognise the possible risk that some providers might simply increase their tuition fees to match the uplift in loans available, without then using this additional income to widen provision or strengthen access and participation on these courses. We will assess accelerated degrees provision and uptake three years after the fee loan cap changes have been implemented, to determine the impact on the range of delivery of accelerated degrees by Alternative Providers, volumes of uptake, outcomes for accelerated degree graduates, and impact (if any) on fees being charged.

Question 14

Do you agree that accelerated degree fees should be treated in the same way as other higher course fees for the purpose of access?

Response	Total	Percent
Yes	64	73.6%
No	14	16.1%
Not answered	9	10.3%
Total	87	

Analysis

A clear majority of respondents agreed that accelerated degree fees should be treated the same as other higher course fees for access purposes, including over 70% of HEI providers answering this question, and all but one of the 12 responding representative

bodies. Many of these respondents recommended targeting access funding at potential students from under-represented and/or non-traditional higher education backgrounds, as the specific benefits of accelerated study are regarded as more likely to be attractive to these specific groups. Mature students were particularly highlighted.

Respondents who supported parity of access treatment also observed that measures would need to reflect the specific pressures and circumstances of students on accelerated courses, compared to standard ones. There was also concern that accelerated degree access funding might need to be ring-fenced to specifically protect disadvantaged students.

It was suggested that disadvantaged students might be more likely to seek accelerated study because of the potential savings, but would then risk missing out on the wider 'value-added student experience' benefits of standard degrees, such as work placements and study abroad. Some respondents also suggested access funding might need to be used to reduce living cost pressures for 'atypical' students, as a counter-measure against accelerated degrees becoming 'second class degrees' for the most disadvantaged.

Similar concerns were raised by respondents who disagreed with the proposal to treat accelerated degrees the same as standard degrees for access purposes - for example that accelerated degrees would have a greater need for proportionately more access funding, because of their unique challenges and their appeal to non-traditional students.

Government response

The Government concurs with the consultation support for treating accelerated degrees the same as other higher course fees for the purpose of access. We note the concerns that accelerated degrees will simultaneously be more attractive to types of student who are not attracted to standard degrees, but who may often face greater access challenges per se than their peers. We also acknowledge that the specific challenges of accelerated study may place some students under even greater pressure, and require even greater access support services and measures, than they would face on a standard degree course.

We will undertake to assess the effectiveness of accelerated degree funding and expenditure on access measures, in comparison to their standard equivalent degrees - during the period of initial review following legislation to uplift accelerated degree annual fees, and in the DfE accelerated degree Review three years after implementation.

Question 15

Should any additional safeguards and controls be in place as a proportionate and effective measure to ensure expanded provision of loans for accelerated degrees provide value for money to the taxpayer?

Response	Total	Percent
Yes	39	44.8%
No	37	42.5%
Not answered	11	12.6%
Total	87	

Analysis

The proportion of yes/no responses to this question was broadly split between those who felt existing safeguards and controls for student loans were sufficient (to ensure the increase annual loans for accelerated degrees would still provide value for money for the taxpayer), and those who detailed concerns. Respondents who answered ‘yes’ to the need for additional safeguards and controls went on to detail a wide range of concerns and proposals around accelerated degree provision. Some of these concerns did not appear to relate to the specific question being asked, but instead referred to perception of wider challenges around accelerated degrees.

Examples of the issues raised in these ‘yes’ responses include:

- Concerns about students’ capacity to manage the specific demands of accelerated degrees, and the impact on students who may need to transfer from accelerated to standard degree courses, including a proposal that accelerated degree applicants should be screened by providers to ensure only capable students are enrolled.
- The assertion that accelerated degrees will need to establish their accreditation with all relevant professional bodies, and will suffer from credibility issues outside England, particularly in the EU, due to their short duration.
- The need for effective metrics / benchmarking:
 - to evidence value for money from accelerated degrees
 - to prevent system abuse (for example, by providers lowering entry criteria for accelerated degree students to boost revenue while expecting high drop-out / deceleration).
 - to validate the premise that accelerated degree students have the same wider student experience and achieve the same outcomes as their standard cohort peers.
 - to monitor performance of under-represented students, and assess non-continuation statistics; and
 - to improve “understanding and expectations of the quality of accelerated degrees across stakeholders, including students, schools and employers.”

- The need for accelerated degrees to demonstrate quality assurance compliance, with additional safeguards to maintain standards.
- The assertion that accelerated degrees are incompatible with research-intensive teaching “which has implications for the student learning experience”, and that compressed teaching is not compatible with “richer learning”.
- Concern that students forced to choose accelerated courses to save money will get a poorer experience all round, resulting in accelerated degrees becoming lower-class degrees for less advantaged students.
- The need to maintain parity of both academic and wider student experience between accelerated degrees and standard degrees.
- Proposal that redistributing accelerated degree maintenance payments more frequently over each year would reduce financial risk and help students to budget, by mimicking the eventual pattern of salary receipts.
- The assumption that accelerated students will miss out on work opportunities during study, and thus may enter work sooner but perform less well over time. Similarly, that accelerated degree students will not get the opportunity to build soft skills or undertake placements which are needed boost employability.
- Providers must be genuinely free to offer accelerated degrees, not coerced by OfS.

Respondents who did not agree with the need for additional safeguards and controls concurred strongly that appropriate measures are already in place (through OfS registration requirements, TEF etc) and that HEI providers should already have mechanisms in place to safeguard all degree provision, including accelerated degrees, which should simply be ‘business as usual’.

Respondents who answered “No” also noted that any additional measures for accelerated degrees alone risk implying that Government regards them as “inferior products” - and that additional measures will place more bureaucratic pressure on providers than for standard degrees, thus dis-incentivising wider provision.

Government response

Some of the concerns raised by those supporting the need for additional safeguards and controls do need to be considered carefully in the wider context of accelerated degree provision. However, many of the points raised did not specifically relate to accelerated degree control and safeguards, such as

- the perceptions around quality and credibility for shorter degree courses
- students’ capacity to study for more weeks per annum (including an assumption that accelerated courses do not allow for part-time work or work placements)

- the assumption that teaching accelerated courses is incompatible with research.

On the specific issue of safeguards and controls, we agree that there is a need for greater transparency, and to develop metrics that will specifically allow delivery and impact of accelerated degrees to be benchmarked and tracked. The aim will be to ensure that such courses can be compared and assessed against wider accelerated provision, and with standard degree provision.

It is also important that the transfer of students between accelerated and standard courses (both out and in) can be facilitated, and then identified and tracked in performance data. We also need to consider how accelerated provision can be reflected in performance and outcome metrics, to take the wider diversity of provision into account compared to less diverse providers.


However, the Government's default policy on accelerated degree courses has always been to treat them as one type of provision of a higher education degree, within an increasingly diverse landscape. This diversity offers more potential students the chance to find the degree course which best suits their specific study needs, with the expectation that whatever model of teaching is chosen, the quality of learning and student experience should be the same.

We recognise the strength of arguments against creating control or safeguarding mechanisms unique to accelerated degrees. There should be no expectation or allowance for the teaching and study experience of accelerated degree courses to be qualitatively different in any way to standard degree courses, or subject to any lower quality assurance requirements than the equivalent standard courses. Accelerated degrees should not be treated or perceived as 'different' from standard degrees, in the quality of the degree itself or in the measures safeguarding that quality.

It is critical that accelerated study and provision are understood more widely and in far greater depth than they are at present. This understanding should be based on empirical data and the direct experience of accelerated providers, students, graduates and their employers. For these reasons the Government will not seek at this stage to introduce any different safeguards or controls for accelerated degrees to those that already exist for standard degrees.

Question 17

Should the Government be aware of any other issues relating to the way in which the proposed tuition fee policy for accelerated degree courses will affect any of the protected characteristics? If your answer is 'yes', please set out what steps in your view the Government might take to mitigate any negative impact.



Response	Total	Percent
Yes	35	40.2%
No	37	42.5%
Not answered	15	17.2%
Total	87	

Analysis

Respondents who answered this question were split between those who agreed that the Government should be aware of other issues where accelerated degree proposals might affect protected characteristics, and those who disagreed.. For those who thought Government did need to be aware of specific issues – particularly HEI providers - there was a higher level of consensus than in responses to some other areas of consultation.

Key issues raised included:

- The lack of data on how existing accelerated degree courses impact on students with protected characteristics, when compared with standard degrees (for example, rate of enrolment, transfers between courses / providers, deceleration into standard courses, degree attainment and graduate outcomes).
- The study timespan and greater annual intensity of accelerated degrees. Compared with standard equivalent degree study requirements, delivery of accelerated degrees will have an inherent impact on institutional processes and procedures that deal with, for example, extenuating / mitigating circumstances

(including ad hoc leave periods), reasonable adjustments, resits, and student complaints and appeals.

- If providers cannot ensure that the same support structures are in place for accelerated degree courses, this could have a significant negative impact on a number of protected characteristics, particularly students with disabilities, mature students with caring and/or parental responsibilities, students with mental health issues, pregnancy / maternity and BAME students. One HEI respondent made a comparison between accelerated degrees and intensive professional training courses, which:

“often result in women / part time / workers with unconventional work patterns or working hours being excluded as they cannot balance their competing responsibilities”

- Disabled students, student parents and/or carers rely on additional student finance support in the form of grants, including the Disabled Student Allowance, Parents’ Learning Allowance, Adult Dependents’ Grant, and Childcare grant. At present, these do not change with the length of the academic year. Respondents (including ECU, NUS and Independent HE) commented that this support should be reviewed and increased and/or scaled, on the lines of Long Course Loans, to match the greater length of the accelerated degree academic year, to protect against putting students entitled to claim such support at a disadvantage if they are studying for the longer annual courses of an accelerated degree.
- Financial implications of study. Although the total cost of an accelerated degree under this policy will be lower than that of a standard equivalent degree, they will incur higher costs per annum for each individual year of study, due to uplifted tuition fees and higher living costs for the additional weeks of study. Respondents suggested these higher year-on-year costs are likely to impact more on non-traditional student groups (disadvantaged students, parents / carers and those with disabilities).

There were also a number of concerns raised which reflect the same wider negative assumptions / presumptions around accelerated degrees, such as:

- accelerated degree students being completely unable to transfer between courses or providers
- accelerated degree students having no capacity to take up part-time work while studying, thus losing both essential income and essential wider skills
- Mature students with existing large financial commitments (such as mortgages, families) and/or those who are financially disadvantaged would be unable to consider accelerated courses because of the inability to earn from full-time summer work.

- Accelerated degree graduates are more likely to be awarded lower-class degrees (because of the inherent difficulty in accelerated study), and/or will not benefit from the potential to develop wider 'student experience' skills, which in turn will reduce their employment prospects.
- Students with protected characteristics generally need more support with study and academic development: there are concerns that providers will not be able to offer this support on accelerated courses. Potential students who are most likely to be attracted to accelerated degrees because of the financial saving will then be more likely to fail to graduate, precisely because they enrolled on an accelerated course.

Government response

The Government accepts the need to closely assess the impact of accelerated degrees on individuals with protected characteristics. It is essential that we can assess and determine how their student experience may differ in any aspect from the wider student cohort on both accelerated and non-accelerated courses, and also how decisions to enrol for a degree, and graduate outcomes, may be affected by the wider provision and uptake of accelerated degree courses.

We note the concerns relating to the specific financial support grants and allowances which are a key component of the decision process for protected characteristic students. However, these allowances are already constructed so as to take account of students' costs over a full year – including, for example, all students currently enrolled on longer than standard 30 week/year degree courses.

The Department of Education will publish an Equalities Analysis of the changes set out in this response. It should be noted that the current, comparatively tiny cadre of students enrolled on accelerated degrees – especially at HEI providers – makes the analysis of empirical data, particularly for students with protected characteristics, difficult to extrapolate meaningfully.

We recognise the challenge and uncertainties generated by the lack of data generally around accelerated degree students in England: their decisions to enrol, their study and wider student experiences, and their graduate outcomes.


However, the very low levels of available provision, lack of wider awareness and relatively low uptake of the accelerated courses that do exist, have remained unchanged now for a number of years. Without Government seeking to address the financial constraint cited by providers as their primary reason for not expanding their accelerated course provision, this low provision and uplift do not seem likely to change. In turn, this niche provision and uptake will continue to make statistically meaningful analysis of accelerated degrees difficult - for all students, and especially those affected by protected characteristics.

Subject to the conclusions of the Equalities Analysis, the Government will implement the proposals as set out in consultation. We will also, as noted earlier, undertake a review of the impact of these proposals three years after implementation of uplifted fees and related measures.

Questions 18 & 19 (for Providers)

Q18: Do you currently provide any form of accelerated degree course? If 'yes', please provide details of type of course, study pattern, current enrolment cadre

Q19: Based on the policies set out in this document, are you considering offering new or additional accelerated degrees when tuition cap uplifts are enacted? If your answer is 'yes', please set out what types of course and volume of provision you are considering.



Q18	Do you currently provide any form of accelerated degree course?			
	Yes	No	Not Answered	Total
HEI	14 (48.3%)	15 (51.7%)	0 (0.0%)	26
AP	7 (70.0%)	2 (20.0%)	1 (10.0%)	10
FEC	2 (28.6%)	5 (71.4%)	0 (0.0%)	7

Q19	Based on the policies set out in this document, are you considering offering new or additional accelerated degrees when tuition cap uplifts are enacted?			
	Yes	No	Not Answered	Total
HEI	14 (46.7%)	14 (46.7%)	2 (6.7%)	27
AP	5 (50.0%)	4 (40.0%)	1 (10.0%)	10
FEC	6 (85.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	7

Analysis

Responses to these questions gave clear evidence of the wide diversity, both within and between HEIs and Alternative Providers, of the types of Honours degrees identified by their providers as accelerated (listed at Annex B to this document). These responses also highlighted the diverse modes of study and teaching patterns currently being employed both termly and annually.

Many of the accelerated degree course currently offered by respondents to this consultation are vocationally / professionally oriented, but a wider range of courses are offered by a few providers. Accelerated courses range from the well-established accelerated degrees in Law, Accountancy and Business Studies, through Quantity Surveying, Architectural Design and Manufacturing Engineering, Audio Production, Digital Design and Computer Science, to Psychology, Medical Science and English Literature.

Modes and patterns of accelerated teaching are diverse. Most accelerated courses require enrolment in September, some providers also offer start dates in January or June. Teaching may be split over three or four teaching blocks, or a series of modules across the full timespan of the accelerated degree. Most acceleration currently matches or closely parallels the teaching content of a standard three-year degree, but with that content scheduled across two years – either by increasing the number of weeks taught per annum, or (less frequently) by increasing the intensity of study per week.

There are also examples of accelerated courses where three years of content are delivered in a period of between two and three years, and where longer degrees are moderately accelerated (five years of a medical degree compressed into 4.5 years). Another permutation involves enrolment onto a three-year course where the first year of teaching is ‘foundation’ (Level 3), with the three years of Levels 4-6 degree content effectively ‘accelerated’ over the remaining two years.

In all these models, accelerated degree modules may therefore be identical to those being taught across the same subject’s three-year cohorts, with accelerated and standard degree students studying and attending lectures and classes side-by-side.

Some respondents indicated they had decided to stop offering accelerated degrees, due to lack of uptake, and/or the impact of accelerated teaching on staff workload and research-based activities. Others indicated that their intake of accelerated students had increased in recent years, and that they were actively planning to expand provision and places. More respondents reported growth of their accelerated degree enrolments than those who had chosen to stop offering them.

Respondents noting their intention to expand or embark on accelerated degree provision indicated in most cases that this was a direct result of the policies proposed in consultation. However, some Alternative Providers stated their expansion plans were regardless of the consultation proposals. HEI and AP respondents who indicated that they did not intend to offer accelerated degrees as a result of the policies proposed under consultation, cited a range of considerations acting as inhibitors for their particular institution. Most of these concerns have already been noted in answers to preceding questions, including:

- No interest from potential students / market information is not available to determine sufficiency of interest from potential students
- accelerated degree provision is simply not viable for the provider
- The culture of learning and benefit of the 'wider student experience' is not compatible with accelerated study
- Pressures on students and the resulting greater need for support mechanisms and resources make accelerated degrees financially impracticable to them and/or too great a risk - to more vulnerable students especially
- accelerated degrees risk a negative impact on the overall quality of teaching, and of research
- The lack of a long summer vacation impacts adversely on:
 - Students' opportunities for rest, reflection, work experience and earnings
 - Lost research opportunities for teaching staff, and no scope to train or develop innovation in their teaching offer
 - Adverse impacts and higher costs relating to fixed assets – revenue opportunities, capital repair, maintenance and refurbishment are all jeopardised if university properties are being used to teach or provide accommodation across the whole year.

Eight of the HEI respondents who had disagreed to Question 11 ("Do you agree that an annual fee cap set initially at the standard rate plus a 20% uplift is the right amount to incentivise wider provision of accelerated degrees?") went on to answer 'yes' to Question 19 ("*Based on the policies set out in this document, are you considering offering new or additional accelerated degrees when tuition cap uplifts are enacted?*") Nearly half the

respondents to Question 19 who confirmed they were considering offering accelerated degrees do not currently do so.

Those providers who indicated their intention to expand or initiate accelerated courses were positive about their benefits:

- accelerated degrees are attractive to potential students, with an emphasis on traditionally self-excluding demographic cohorts such as mature students
- accelerated degree students demonstrate a very high work ethos, are highly organised and engaged, keen to take advantage of all learning experiences, including opportunities offered for volunteering, research projects and community events.
- Provider metrics indicate accelerated degree students are often higher attaining – with better degree outcomes and graduate employment experiences.


Government response

The wide variety of types of accelerated course, patterns of delivery, changes in enrolment patterns and future intentions of providers, as demonstrated in responses to Questions 18 and 19, may reflect the endemic ‘niche’ qualities of accelerated degree provision. The relatively tiny volume of existing provision and uptake may be both cause and effect of, for example, the historic absence of clear (and regulated) definition, low awareness amongst potential students and employers as well as many providers, and a lack of substantive data on the impact of accelerated study on student, graduate and provider. Combined with the financial disincentive of existing annual fee caps, the low traction and lack of growth of accelerated degrees is not surprising.

The Government considers this level of interest – and the lack of a consensus in suggesting alternative measures - to be sufficient to support the proposed introduction of regulations enabling a 20% uplift in accelerated degree annual fees, and to proceed with the related measures set out in this consultation.

Question 20 (for individuals, including current students)

Based on the policies set out in this document, are you considering applying for an accelerated degree when tuition cap uplifts are enacted? - If your answer is ‘yes’, please set out what type of course and provider you are considering.



Q20	Total	Percent
Yes	3	3.4%
No	24	27.6%
Not answered	60	69.0%
Total	87	

Analysis

Seven respondents to this question identified themselves as graduates, however none indicated they had previously taken an accelerated degree. No other respondents here explicitly indicated they were responding as current or potential students.

Respondents who provided comments to this question noted concerns raised elsewhere about accelerated degrees (accelerated degrees are too stressful, they make it difficult to also undertake part-time work, longer study time is needed to learn / access specialist facilities). Two respondents queried why accelerated degrees could not be taken (and supported by student loans) as second degrees in specific subjects, analogous to the STEM Equivalent or Lower Level Qualification entitlements for part-time degrees. They both noted that, for subjects where there is a pressing need for more degree-skilled individuals in England, it would logically seem preferable to support quicker (accelerated), rather than slower (part-time) second degrees.

Government response

We will do not propose taking forward any further actions at this time in the context of the responses received.

Questions 21 & 22 (for Employers)

Q21: Have you been, or are you currently an employer of any graduates of accelerated degrees? - If your answer is 'yes', please tell us about your employee – subject of degree, job role.

Q22: Based on the policies set out in this consultation document, do you agree that an accelerated degree has any specific merit in current or future potential employees? - If your answer is 'agree', please set out any advantages you consider an accelerated degree-qualified graduate might have as an employee over their standard three-year degree equivalent.

Q21	Total	Percent
Yes	4	4.6%
No	14	16.1%
Unsure	10	11.5%
Not answered	59	67.8%
Total	87	

Q22	Total	Percent
Agree	9	10.3%
Disagree	11	12.6%
Unsure	11	12.6%
Not Answered	56	64.4%
Total	87	

	Q21			Q22		
	Yes	Unsure	No	Agree	Unsure	Disagree
HEI	2	7	3	1	7	3

	Q21			Q22		
AP	2	1	1	2	1	2
FE	0	0	2	1	1	0
Representative body	0	2	3	3	1	2
Employer	0	0	1	0	0	1
Other	0	0	4	2	1	3
Total	4	10	14	9	11	11

Analysis

Respondents to this question set who identified themselves as employers were mostly from the higher education sector, as degree providers, further education colleges or HE representative bodies, including professional bodies representing specific skills or areas of work.

Respondents – including those who did employ accelerated degree graduates, and those who did not - were somewhat ambivalent on the question of any specific merits of an accelerated degree for employers. Suggested benefits (compared to traditional degree students) included:

- Better organisational, work management and time-keeping skills
- Greater commitment to work, more focused and determined
- Employees seeking a degree qualification will spend less time out of the workforce if enrolled on an accelerated degree
- Employers encouraging staff to undertake accelerated degrees to up-skill as part of continuous professional development will lose staff from the workforce for a shorter period of time.
- Accelerated degrees can be an option within continuous professional development for employers seeking a more highly skilled workforce.
- The high proportion of mature students on accelerated degrees will bring the benefits of their post-18 wider experience to employment (including that of being familiar with full-time working patterns, either because of the pace of accelerated study or because they have worked before enrolment).

Concerns or negative perceptions, suggested by respondents who did not currently employ accelerated graduates, included:

- Accelerated graduates will be less 'rounded' than their standard peers, due to the lack of the 'full student experience' (interests pursued outside of study, part-time working, social contact)
- Accelerated graduates will only perform better because the accelerated study pace appeals to higher-performing, more ambitious individuals
- The lack of professional work placement opportunities for accelerated degree students will make them less attractive to employers
- Accelerated degrees will only have value for employers if they are professionally accredited and/or closely tailored to meet specific vocational requirements
- If accelerated degrees have the same quality assurance requirements as their standard equivalents, there should be no reason for accelerated degree graduates to be either less or more attractive to graduate employers.

Government response

The small number of substantive responses to this question set make it challenging to draw unequivocal conclusions here. Those who raised concerns about accelerated degree benefits for employers mostly cited the same concerns about accelerated degrees in principle, as set out in responses to other questions.

As elsewhere, these include criticisms which appear to be based on misconceptions – for example, that accelerated students cannot and will not be able to enjoy the 'student experience' of their standard peers, will not be able to undertake subject-relevant work placements, or even work part-time.

Government's view is that the direct experience of accelerated graduate employers has greater weight than the concerns of respondents who have not employed accelerated graduates. Responses to these two questions do not provide reasons to change implementation of the consultation proposals. As noted before, we will assess the impact of and outcomes for accelerated degree graduates three years after these proposals are implemented through Regulations, with particular attention given to the employment experiences of accelerated and their equivalent standard degree graduates.

Next steps

Our intention is to lay Regulations enabling annual accelerated degree fees to be capped at a maximum of 1.2 x the equivalent standard degree caps, as soon as possible. Those Regulations will need to be approved by Parliament before becoming law.

We will develop a programme of further work on direct engagement to raise understanding and awareness of the reality of accelerated degree provision, study and graduation, including information and guidance addressing concerns and misconceptions raised in responses to this consultation, and directed across the post-18 sector (for providers, students and potential students, representative bodies and employers).

We will continue to work together with OfS and SLC on the process mechanism, and guidance to providers on the definition of courses legally entitled to charge accelerated fees up to the higher fee cap, including working with UCAS and HESA to consider the impact on identifying outcomes for accelerated degrees.

We will undertake a review of the impact and effectiveness of the 20% fee cap uplift on accelerated degrees – in provision, uptake and initial graduate outcomes - three years after enrolment on courses charging up to the new annual accelerated degree fee cap has commenced.

Annex A: List of respondents to the consultation

Alternative higher education provider (no designated courses)
Academy of Contemporary Music
BPP University
Brit College
Buckingham University
Edge Hotel School
GMS London
Navitas
Regent Group
SAE institute - creative media institute
The Institute of Contemporary Music Performance
Body representing students in higher education
National Union of Students
Southampton Solent University - Students Union
Charity or social enterprise
Equality Challenge Unit
Further education college
Askham Bryan College
London South East Colleges
Middlesbrough College
Solihull College
Yeovil College
Publicly funded higher education provider
Aston University
Birkbeck, University of London
Birmingham City University
Bishop Grosseteste University (based in Lincoln)
Brunel University London
Coventry University
Imperial College London
Kent University
Kings College London
London Metropolitan University
London South Bank University
Middlesex University London
Sheffield Hallam University
Southampton Solent University
Teesside University
The Open University

University of Brighton
University of Bristol
University of Chester
University of East Anglia
University of East London
University of Hertfordshire
University of Huddersfield
University of Plymouth
University of Salford
University of Sheffield
University of Southampton
University of Staffordshire
University of Wolverhampton
Representative organisation, business, or trade body
Association of Colleges
Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services
Association of School and College Leaders
Brevia consulting
Council of Deans of Health
EEF The Manufacturers' organisation
Engineering Council
Engineering Professors Council
Graduate Entry Nursing International Network
GuildHE
Independent Higher Education
Junior Lawyers Division (The Law Society)
London Mathematical Society
MillionPlus
National Centre for Universities and Business
New College Durham
Royal Society of Chemistry
The Russell Group
Universities UK
Universities wales
University Alliance
University and College Union
Which?

Annex B: Current provision of Accelerated Degrees (as listed by respondents to Question 18)

- BSc Quantity Surveying
- BSc Construction Project Management
- BSc Property and Real Estate
- BSc Building Surveying
- BSc Architectural Design and Technology.
- BSc Accounting and Finance
- Business Management
- Business accounting
- BSc Business Enterprise and Entrepreneurship
- Business, Accounting and Enterprise
- English Literature / English
- Journalism / Media and Journalism
- Football Coaching and Performance
- Law
- Sport Strength and Conditioning
- BEng Manufacturing Engineering
- BSc Medical Sciences
- BA Primary Education
- Early Years Education / Early Childhood studies / Early Childhood Development & Learning
- Computing for Business BA
- Computer Science BSc (Hons)
- Education Studies BA (Hons)
- Psychology (with Foundation Year)
- Digital Design Consultancy
- Management & Leadership
- Policing
- Marketing & Public Relations
- MB ChB Medical School degree (4.5 years rather than 5)
- Economics
- International Relations
- BSc/BA Audio Production
- BSc/BA Digital Film Making
- BA/BSc Music Business
- BSc/BA Games Programming
- BSc/BA Game Art Animation
- BSc/BA Visual Effects Animation
- BSc/BA Web Development (Hons)
- BA(Hons) Hotel Management degree
- BA(Hons) Event and Hospitality Management degree
- BA(Hons) Music Industry Practice
- BA(Hons) Music Industry Practice including foundation year
- FdA Education and Training
- GSM London (offers all degrees as accelerated – including Accounting, Business, Economics, and vocation-oriented management degrees)



Department
for Education

© Crown copyright 2018

This document/publication (not including logos) is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

To view this licence:

visit www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

write to Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London, TW9 4DU

About this publication:

enquiries www.education.gov.uk/contactus

download www.gov.uk/government/consultations

Reference: DFE-00339-2018



Follow us on Twitter:
[@educationgovuk](https://twitter.com/educationgovuk)



Like us on Facebook:
facebook.com/educationgovuk