



Department for Education

Institute for Apprenticeships: Occupational
Maps

Association of Colleges response

8 February 2018

a) Are there any skilled occupations you would expect to see on the map which are not currently included?

Some occupations in each route are designated as level 2. As outlined in the T levels Action Plan, T levels will be level 3¹. Consideration needs to be given to how best to approach level 2 occupations. The current technical certificate model offers a range of qualifications at an appropriate level. Perhaps this could form part of a level 2 offer combined with English and maths, other employability skills and a work placement. It would also need to be clarified as to whether this would be an end in itself or could form part of progression to T levels. Currently 48%² of students on level 3 programmes have progressed from level 2 and below study programmes.

Consideration also needs to be given to those sectors not in scope of the proposed route-based system, such as Sport, Travel and Tourism, Performing Arts, Music Performance and some Art and Design qualifications. All of these sectors have employment opportunities available. The Employer Skills Survey 2015:UK results³ shows that in 2015 employment in arts and other services was greater than in construction, agriculture and financial services. In other successful European systems such as Finland³ and Sweden⁴ there are pathways for Sport, the Arts and Travel and Tourism.

For example in sport the sport and physical activity sector's employers have been working closely with the professional body – the Chartered Institute for the Management of Sport and Physical Activity (CIMSPA) – to develop a clear occupational map with common terminology and which is understood by all sector employers⁵. However, the Health and Science draft occupational map as issued does not align to the map, occupations and progression opportunities already under development and well understood by our sector's employers.

AoC Sport college members strongly believe that 'Physical activity' career pathway should be acknowledged within the route title. We recommend the route should be

1

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/650969/T_level_Action_Plan.pdf

2 ILR/Mides data

3 <http://ncee.org/what-we-do/center-on-international-education-benchmarking/top-performing-countries/finland-overview/finland-school-to-work-transition>

4 <http://www.cedefop.europa.eu/en/publications-and-resources/publications/5198>

5 <https://www.cimspa.co.uk/mappingstandards>

amended to “Health, Science and Physical Activity”, in line with the occupational map developed by CIMSPA.

There is no reference to wellness occupations e.g. yoga, pilates and tai chi. These are significantly different to exercise and fitness occupations as listed in Standard Occupation Codes. We would recommend these are included in the technical occupation cluster. Furthermore, PE teacher and sport development officer are two occupations that do not have specific pathway in the occupational map despite this been a popular career for students in further education.

b) Should an existing occupation be assigned to a different route, or a different pathway or cluster within the route?

Some occupations occur in unexpected routes, e.g. bakery which is in sales, marketing and procurement. This might be better placed in Catering and Hospitality as a college based course (see question c.)

Leisure recreation assistant sits in sales and marketing and procurement whilst leisure duty manager is assigned to business and administration and finally, leisure team member is in the health and science route. This does not provide the desired clarity for students, employers and providers. We strongly recommend that these occupations be in the same route which we suggest as the Health and Science.

Consideration needs to be given to how this information will be communicated to key stake holders such as schools (for careers education, information, advice and guidance), parents/carers to help support options and career pathways pre-16.

c) Are there any clusters, pathways or routes that have been deemed appropriate for apprenticeship only that could be taught in the classroom, and should potentially form part of the T level programme?

This is a key question for colleges and could potentially have an impact on young people and college delivery and this staffing.

College Level 2 and 3 ILR/Mides data indicates the **potential** impact on current college-based delivery in key areas would be as per the table below:

Route/cluster to be designated apprenticeship only	Current college-based enrolments
Agriculture, environmental and animal care/ arboriculture & floristry	573

Care services (apprenticeship only route)	41,395 enrolments in health and social care including 1727 enrolments in adult care
Catering and Hospitality/ hospitality team member/ supervisor (inc food preparation)	978
Creative and design/heritage craft person (inc blacksmithing)	86
Health and science/exercise fitness and health assistant	41,958 enrolments on sport courses including 8,742 on exercise and fitness related courses
Protective Services (apprenticeship only route)	19, 432 enrolments at levels 2/3 on public services
Sales, marketing and procurement (apprenticeship only route)/ customer service and specialist retail assistant	383 enrolments on customer service 300 enrolments on bakery
Transport and logistics/ crew member	942 enrolments on non-funded cabin crew courses 124 Aircraft maintenance

We strongly recommend a review of the work-based routes; protective services and social care. It is unlikely that it would be appropriate or possible for 16-year-olds to be able to access work based routes in either protective services or social care and yet many young people are keen to progress into such employment at 18-years-old. On the current courses students gain transferable skills such as teamwork, confidence, leadership and communication skills, which are all vital to the work place and customer/client focused environments in particular. There appears, therefore, to be a mismatch between route and the age and needs of the students involved.

Sport is not a route, but there are over 8,700 college-based enrolments on current exercise and fitness related courses which fall within the health route. Will there be sufficient employer-based apprenticeships for this number of students?

There is a potential disproportionate impact on land based providers and students. Land based colleges deliver both arboriculture and blacksmithing. As land based only providers are smaller than general further education providers the impact of

transferring over 600 enrolments to apprenticeship only will impact on staffing and course viability.

Many students enter catering and hospitality via food preparation. It is a crucial element of courses within this route and is often not a destination in itself, but a stepping stone to careers in catering. There needs to be clarification as to whether food preparation will form part of other occupational clusters such as the caterer.

College-based customer service courses currently provide a route into retail. Students on these courses need the opportunity to build the appropriate skills and confidence before going on to work. In the specific example of bakery, will there be sufficient work-based opportunities to place 300 students a year?

Cabin crew is a non-funded programme which colleges deliver as part of courses in travel and tourism. Travel and tourism, despite employing nearly 3 million people in the UK⁶ in the hotel, travel and leisure sector is not a route. If cabin crew is apprenticeship only this will have an impact on the curriculum for applied general courses in travel and tourism which offer cabin crew as part of the course. Will there be sufficient work based opportunities available?

There will be considerable impact on department viability if aircraft maintenance is a work-based route. Will airports offer work-based opportunities to 16-year-olds?

In summary, moving certain occupations to an apprenticeship only model needs to undergo a thorough impact assessment. An unintended consequence of the move to an apprenticeship model could result in young people becoming disengaged from education and training if they cannot go straight into an apprenticeship at 16. This in turn will impact on social mobility.

6

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/leisureandtourism/articles/tourismemploymentsummaries/characteristicsoftourismindustries2014>