



**RTPI**

mediation of space · making of place

## **ROUTES TO EDUCATION**

# **POLICY REVIEW CONSULTATION REPORT**

**January 2017**

# Contents

Introduction .....	3
Summary of consultation.....	4
Background to this policy review .....	5
Key findings and RTPI response:	
1. Length and level of undergraduate degrees.....	6
2. PhD accreditation.....	7
3. Terminology to describe different accreditation levels.....	8
4. Required Learning Outcomes .....	9
5. Integration and alignment of planning issues in policy and practice.....	10
6. Effective Planning School Criteria .....	12
<i>Appendices</i>	
<i>a. Glossary of Terms .....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>b. Consultation questions .....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>c. Summary of 2012 RTPI Learning Outcomes.....</i>	<i>18</i>

# Introduction

## **Dear colleagues,**

Last year the RTPI conducted a review of its accreditation policy for four main reasons:

- (1) queries on the required length for fully accredited undergraduate courses;
- (2) concerns that graduates leaving Planning Schools do not have enough appreciation of planning practice;
- (3) how best to ensure that those leading Planning Schools really understand our discipline and profession and are fully involved in the overall governance of them; and
- (4) indications of confusion over the terminology for accredited qualifications and how best universities and the Institute should communicate the routes to Chartered membership.

The consultation with you over the summer confirmed the views of the RTPI's Education & Lifelong Learning Committee that planning education is in good shape. Accredited Planning Schools continue to be found to be effective during the annual scrutiny exercise by Partnership Boards.

**Following consultation responses, we do not recommend fundamental change to the RTPI [Policy Statement on Initial Planning Education](#). The framework laid down by the 2003 Education Commission is still appropriate and full accreditation should be given for Masters level study of planning.** If both universities and employers play their role well we should expect that after two years of professional practice, graduates of fully accredited courses will be in a very good position to apply for the Licentiate Assessment of Professional Competence to become a Chartered Town Planner.

We also continue to endorse the Education Commission's approach to the content of initial planning education as one that specifies learning outcomes and not detailed curricula. This rightly leaves the decisions on what and how students learn to universities, but with an annual requirement to demonstrate to Partnership Boards that the outcomes are being achieved.

**The RTPI's response, following discussion with the RTPI General Assembly, has been approved by the RTPI's Education & Lifelong Learning Committee and endorsed by the RTPI Board of Trustees.** I hope you agree with the proposals contained in this report, namely:

- Updated terminology to describe undergraduate and postgraduate pathways to full accreditation and student progression to RTPI membership;
- New guidance to support Planning Schools explore existing flexibility for course accreditation;
- Exploring the accreditation of PhDs;
- Revised criteria for Planning School effectiveness with an emphasis on a clear practice focus, leadership of planning, and student understanding of professional practice.

With best wishes,

**Professor Tony Crook CBE FAcSS FRTPI**

Chair, RTPI Education & Lifelong Learning Committee

## Summary of consultation

**This was a focused consultation to explore aspects of the [RTPI's accreditation policy](#) and test it remains fit for purpose.**

The Institute was responding to issues raised by students, employers and universities.

The consultation ran from 8 July 2016 to 3 October 2016.

Decisions were made following discussion at General Assembly and RTPI Board of Trustees.

**A series of quantitative and qualitative data was captured.**

We received 46 responses to the online consultation. This included 16 responses from people who identified themselves as Planning School representatives, 8 employers and 6 young planners. We also received separate responses by email from [RTPI accredited Planning Schools](#), the RTPI South West region and individual members.

We had direct contact with accredited universities in the lead up to the review and at the time the consultation was launched, and a consultation workshop was held with the Planning Schools Forum in September 2016.

The consultation was discussed with industry employers including [RTPI Learning Partners](#) and leading consultancies, and with RTPI Young Planner Chairs. It was promoted to students through the [RTPI Young Planner](#) network, LinkedIn, Twitter and Planning Schools including alumni.

Consultation workshops were held at the RTPI Partnership & Accreditation Panel in June 2016.

The responses have been grouped into the following areas:

- Length and level of undergraduate qualifications
- PhD accreditation
- Terminology used
- Changes to learning outcomes
- Level of practical teaching
- Scrutiny of Effective Planning School criteria

**Overall, the consultation indicated current RTPI policy and its learning outcomes are generally fit for purpose and do not need fundamental change.**

A number of improvements are recommended by the Institute in response to the consultation:

- Updated terminology to describe undergraduate and postgraduate pathways to full accreditation and student progression to RTPI membership;
- New guidance to support Planning Schools explore existing flexibility for course accreditation;
- Exploring the accreditation of PhDs;
- Revised criteria for Planning School effectiveness with an emphasis on a clear practice focus, leadership of planning, and student understanding of professional practice.

## *Background to this policy review*

- i The 2003 RTPI Education Commission recommended that the educational benchmark for full membership of the RTPI ([via the Licentiate APC route](#)) should be the equivalent of a Masters level qualification. Current RTPI accreditation policy therefore recognises four years' study, or equivalent, leading to Honours level as an acceptable qualification at undergraduate level.
- ii In recent years there have been significant changes to the landscape of higher education in the UK and internationally and changes to planning practice. In response to these changes the RTPI is looking at its 'Routes to Education' with the aim of maintaining standards and quality assurance so the next generation of planners meets both employer and society's needs with a flexible approach to education.
- iii Therefore a review of accreditation policy was guided by the following aims:
  - support accredited Planning Schools to provide and market planning education more effectively;
  - clarify the process to enable students to better understand and progress to professional positions after graduation;
  - help employers to give more focused support to graduates;
  - simplify administration but also ensure standards are retained / enhanced; and
  - support the pipeline of future planners for positions in the UK and further afield.
- iv The Institute is also investigating other pathways to access the profession as part of its focus on 'Routes to Education', for example apprenticeships.

## *Key findings and RTPI response*

### **1. Length and level of undergraduate degrees**

- 1.1 The consultation proposed that the RTPI would be minded to maintain the requirement for a fully accredited combined undergraduate degree to be at the equivalent of Masters degree level, i.e. 4 years or equivalent in length, to ensure graduates have the maturity and breadth of knowledge required to be successful in planning practice.
- 1.2 Consultees were asked if they agreed with the view to maintain this requirement. The majority (66%) of respondents were in favour of maintaining the requirement (increasing to 73% for Planning School respondents) saying that 4 years or equivalent is the appropriate length and that that length of time is required to gain the depth of understanding and the complexity of skills to cover the spatial and specialist learning outcomes.
- 1.3 Responses also highlighted that Scottish undergraduate courses are all 4 years and that two-year Masters and the '3+1' or MPlan undergraduate routes are taught in Ireland so changing the length would have an impact on Scottish and Irish Planning Schools. However, there were some comments highlighting that 3 years would be in line with other professions.
- 1.4 Some respondents suggested the 4-year length is a deterrent to those considering an undergraduate course in town planning and leads to low numbers which makes town planning undergraduate courses less attractive to universities. Undergraduate data provided by universities show that student numbers are stable. Part of the reason for this perceived unfairness may be because graduates from a 3-year spatial course who are unable or choose not to undertake a specialist Masters must follow the same route to membership as someone with a non-accredited degree.
- 1.5 There was also a suggestion that if the length is maintained there should be consideration to whether the fourth year could be PG Cert/PG Dip. level or a sandwich year rather than needing to be a full year.
- 1.6 Whilst the majority were in favour of maintaining the requirement, of those who thought it should be changed, 40% said that it could be delivered in 3 years and 50% as 3 years with a sandwich year. Comments highlighted the value of practical experience and links that can be developed with employers.
- 1.7 Planning Schools highlighted that a change to the length or level of degrees may reduce research focused teaching and staff numbers, and make some specialist courses less attractive.

## The RTPI's response to the consultation

- 1.8 With regard to the length and level of accredited undergraduate qualifications, the Institute is content that the [2012 Policy Statement on Initial Planning Education](#), implementing the outcomes of the 2003 RTPI Education Commission, remains fit for purpose.
- 1.9 Fully accredited course pathways will continue to be defined as follows:
- *“At undergraduate level, RTPI accreditation may be given for combined planning programmes of four academic years in length, or equivalent, leading either to a Masters level degree or equivalent (if not precluded by any relevant national framework for higher education qualifications), or to a Bachelors degree at Honours level or equivalent.*
  - *And at postgraduate level, RTPI accreditation may be given for combined planning programmes of at least one calendar year in length (or part-time or mixed-mode equivalent) leading to a Masters level degree or equivalent.”*
- 1.10 It should be clearly noted that the undergraduate MPlan pathway can be delivered in a number of ways. For example, accreditation has already been conferred on PG Diplomas at some universities as part of the ‘3+1’ combined programme. The Institute proposes to draft supplementary guidance for Planning Schools to support and explain what is meant by ‘or equivalent’ and illustrate the flexibilities of the current accreditation policy (i.e. that the number of academic credits to gain the relevant qualification could be achieved in less than four academic years). The guidance will assure universities that non-traditional delivery models which meet the policy requirements will be considered positively by Partnership Boards.
- 1.11 The Institute is investigating, with private and public sector employers and universities, the opportunity and feasibility to pilot a new style Degree Apprenticeship with England. This would allow undergraduates to work and study and gain the requisite knowledge, skills and behaviours to be eligible to submit an application as a Chartered Town Planner through one of the RTPI Assessment of Professional Competence routes.

## 2. PhD accreditation

- 2.1 Consultees were asked if the RTPI should accredit PhD programmes and, if so, what would be the benefits for the RTPI, Planning Schools and the students studying on the programme. 69% of respondents were in favour of accreditation of PhDs and the benefits could include:
- identifying a ‘professional planning route’ as being open to PhD students;
  - recognising that PhDs serving the professional planning community also benefit to the wider profession; and
  - attracting potential students to Planning Schools.
- 2.2 A number of respondents raised the issue of the specialist nature of the PhD and whether it would be challenging to demonstrate how all the learning outcomes would be met. Partnership Boards were noted as a potential way of assessing this approach in the first instance.

### **The RTPI's response to the consultation**

- 2.3 The Institute agrees that PhDs may be a further route to accreditation if the research is judged to have sufficient spatial planning content. By their nature PhDs should already include the required specialist study.
- 2.4 The process will be discussed with universities at Partnership Boards and with the Planning Schools Forum in 2017.

### **3. Terminology to describe different accreditation levels**

- 3.1 There has been confusion from students and graduates about what type of qualification they hold and which route to Chartered Membership is open to them, especially from students who had not studied a combined programme (of spatial and specialist study) and only a spatial or specialist programme. Some employers have also queried the differences. The consultation proposed a change in terminology, suggesting 'fully' and 'partially' as alternative terms. The majority (79%) of respondents supported a change in terminology to improve clarity, saying that in practice this is often the way courses are described.
- 3.2 There was some concern about the choice of terminology used with 'partially' perhaps implying that only part of the qualification is accredited or that a graduate is only partly capable of doing a job. However the Institute does currently describe its Associate membership as a partial professional qualification.
- 3.3 It was noted by one respondent that the Engineering Council uses 'fully' and 'partially' and a course that fulfils the partial requirements of Chartered Engineer (CEng) usually fulfils the full requirement of the lower level Incorporated Engineer (IEng) and that it may be useful to adopt a similar approach.
- 3.4 Some respondents highlighted the importance of clarifying the routes to Chartered Membership for those with a 'partially' accredited course, proposing that there could be earlier recognition of their status and that students with only partial experience have a 'shopping list' of additional experience and competencies that need to be attained. It is the case that applicants for Associate membership must demonstrate additional competencies to those on the (fully accredited degree) Licentiate route.

### **The RTPI's response to the consultation**

- 3.5 The Institute recognises there is some confusion for students in particular. To address misconceptions and support Planning Schools in marketing their courses and promoting the required progression routes and eligibility for RTPI membership, the Institute proposes to clarify terminology.
- 3.6 It will simplify the terms to 'full' (for combined courses) and 'partial' (for spatial or specialist courses) to describe accredited courses to students. A change will be made to the [2012 Policy Statement](#) to outline what is required for an 'Undergraduate pathway' and for a 'Postgraduate pathway'. This will also be communicated through supplementary guidance issued to Planning Schools including a request for websites and other materials to be updated.

## 4. Required Learning Outcomes

- 4.1 The consultation asked consultees to consider if the current 13 RTPI spatial Learning Outcomes were fit for purpose, if any of the RTPI specialist Learning Outcomes could be merged, and the integration of practical experience into accredited planning programmes.
- 4.2 Consultees were asked if they felt the spatial Learning Outcomes were generally fit for purpose but would benefit from a light-touch review. A large majority (89%) of respondents agreed with that statement.
- 4.3 There were a number of individual suggestions from Planning Schools for small changes to language or additions to learning outcomes but no obvious consensus emerged. A number of possible overlaps or reconfigurations between the descriptions were identified. For example the requirement to cover the political and ethical nature of planning was identified by a respondent for removal if split between other learning outcomes.
- 4.4 Contrary to these proposals for reduction, a number of respondents from Planning Schools identified aspects of planning knowledge or topics which might be included in either rewritten or extra learning outcomes: i) sustainable development, ii) recognition of the social fabric that planning works with could be strengthened and iii) a lack of consideration of the wider role of urban planning.
- 4.5 The other respondents (employers and local authority officers) identified: i) project and financial management, ii) inclusive planning, iii) planning in the media, iv) more references to the code of conduct, specifically in reference to the statement about equality of sectoral groups and inclusivity and v) the political nature of planning and the role of councillors and members of the public.
- 4.6 In addition, there were responses provided to ensure that any future changes were cognisant of the QAA Town and Country Planning Subject Benchmark Statement (April 2016), and that how the outcomes are assessed should be clarified.
- 4.7 With regard to the current 6 specialist Learning Outcomes, respondents agreed that they could be merged (66%) in some way. There were generally positive statements made regarding the existence of specialisms and the ability of the specialisms to be judged in a flexible way. Where respondents answered 'No' the feedback was that there were no difficulties with the current learning outcomes and that there would be no merit or benefit in merging them.

### **The RTPI's response to the consultation**

- 4.8 In light of the responses, the Institute has undertaken a light touch-review and considers the current core list covers the required amount of sustainable development planning knowledge. It proposes to retain the current learning outcomes. A glossary will be included within the RTPI's accreditation guidance to illustrate how its learning outcomes are flexible and adaptable enough to cover emerging skills and other areas of planning knowledge.
- 4.9 The Institute values specialist planning education and considers it can be integral to the work of town planners throughout their career. There is potential to streamline requirements to allow universities flexibility in delivery of fully accredited courses, reflecting current practice. The Institute proposes removing specific requirements in the [2012 Policy Statement](#) to demonstrate the relationships between other planning contexts and other specialisms; and other specialist skills, as these are covered within other requirements on the core list.

- 4.10 Specialist accredited degrees will continue to propose additional bespoke learning outcomes for assessment by Partnership Boards.
- 4.11 This proposal will not affect existing RTPI accredited courses, all of which will remain in place.

## 5. Integration and alignment of planning issues in policy and practice

- 5.1 The question of aligning policy and practice within accredited programmes to ensure that graduates are able to handle, or have a general understanding of, the key requirements of a regulatory planning system is something that has been raised by employers through the RTPI's Learning Partners survey and through other informal mechanisms. Consultees provided a series of interesting suggestions on how practical experience should be gained, not just taught.

### ***Practical experience gained alongside university teaching***

*APC – the APC was seen as a key method of ensuring this requirement. For example 'the APC is the key stage in assessing the ability of planners to apply their planning education in policy and practice settings' and that it is 'difficult to test this on completion of a course at a university, the real test is the ability for the student to apply these in practice. That is why we have the APC and its framework'.*

*Mentoring – not just for Licentiates but also using staff members or graduates to mentor students while at university.*

*Course content – including using live projects, role-playing projects, focusing on planning processes in the modules, studio or workshop modules, practical assignments and ensuring this is included in the accreditation of the programme.*

*Practitioner input – within module delivery as visiting lecturers or employed directly by the university as well as in projects. The existing criteria in the Effective Planning School criteria were identified as covering this.*

*Work experience – mandatory work placements in the courses; asking the student and employer to assess the competency of the sandwich year or term placement, circulating questionnaires after graduation to understand link between skills learnt in the degree to practice.*

*Responsibility of the student to show how they have met that requirement.*

- 5.2 Suggested ways of developing this from respondents included: sharing knowledge on best practice through Partnership Boards; giving annual education awards to planning schools; engaging with employers on what Planning Schools do and what realistically they should expect from graduates (and from the course learning outcomes); and for the RTPI to be more specific with Planning Schools on expectations.
- 5.3 When asked the question 'Do you agree that practical experience should be integral to all learning outcomes? How can this be achieved?' a majority of 69% of respondents answered

yes, although the qualitative data showed a range of indicators focused on structural delivery of modules rather than teaching practice.

***Practical experience gained within university courses***

- *Through sandwich courses and greater involvement of practitioners on courses;*
- *Encouragement of part-time study at postgraduate level (and relationship between local planning authorities);*
- *Employer sponsored activity within the university;*
- *Through the course content including modules on the planning system, work experience, live projects, field trips, case studies, mock planning application submissions or volunteering with Planning Aid.*

5.4 It was also suggested by a number of respondents that a bespoke and proportionate approach should be taken to evaluate this within each Planning School.

5.5 Where respondents answered 'no' the reasons stated included:

- 'The APC is there to ensure that [planning education] translates into practical experience'.
- 'The combination of initial education is where universities deliver the theoretical, conceptual and contextual discussion and the practical experience gained during the Licentiate period'.
- 'It would be a shift in Planning Schools from being a research led teaching organisation to that of a training organisation'.
- 'Employers must take some responsibility for this rather than impact the quality of university education'.
- 'Planning Schools should showcase practical experience from each programme rather than from a set list of learning outcomes'.
- 'Practical experience cannot be guaranteed and if there are high student numbers this would cause difficulties for the Planning School to organise'.
- 'Placements are more useful for undergraduates rather than postgraduates where there is not always time available for placements'.

5.6 Possible options recommended were to make it a requirement to gain experience with employers as part of the educational programme and for universities to form strong links with planning organisations who offer job opportunities or work experience.

**The RTPI's response to the consultation**

5.7 The breadth of responses illustrate existing good practice and identify a number of alternative suggestions for ways that practical experience and professional skills can be introduced into planning teaching. Respondents indicated this would in fact be best achieved through scrutiny via the Effective Planning School criteria and tested at Partnership Boards.

5.8 It is the Institute's view that while practical teaching is implicit within the learning outcomes it is key that Partnership Boards should specifically scrutinise the approach of Planning Schools to ensure students' understanding of planning practice.

5.9 The Institute proposes to strengthen and specifically highlight practice and practitioner involvement within the Effective Planning School criteria to ensure practical experience -

integral to the teaching of planning programmes and therefore the understanding of students of the professional practice – should be tested at each annual review.

- 5.10 As suggested by respondents, Planning Schools should showcase practical experience embedded within their programmes.

## **6. Effective Planning School Criteria**

- 6.1 The consultation document proposed merging the current 8 Effective Planning School criteria, without losing any of the existing requirements, into four:
- Clear Planning Focus (including Stakeholder Involvement, Professional Involvement and Achievements)
  - Quality Assurance (including External Examiners)
  - Institutional Support and Resources
  - Equality and Diversity
- 6.2 The consultation also asked consultees for the types of indicators required for each of the criteria to guide Partnership Boards in their scrutiny role.
- 6.3 A majority (71%) of respondents agreed with the proposal but there was concern expressed that it is important that the criteria still ensure a distinct 'Planning School' with a professional focus. The requirement for a number of Chartered/Associate members was raised and that a quota would be problematic for universities, particularly since the requirement to have a PhD generally comes above the requirement to have professional membership in academic job descriptions.
- 6.4 Some respondents felt that it would be too dogmatic to require a Head of School to be a Chartered Town Planner. However others felt that there should at least be a requirement to have a number of Chartered Town Planners as staff. Respondents also stated that schools (including international schools) should have a minimum of one external examiner who is a Chartered Town Planner.
- 6.5 Responses showed support to maintain the requirement to ensure diversity of access to the profession, and one suggestion of a separate criterion on 'inclusive planning'.
- 6.6 With regard to assessment, some respondents suggested that universities should have the flexibility to demonstrate their effectiveness using other qualitative criteria where appropriate rather than requiring specific indicators to be met. This builds on the existing practice of the Partnership Boards under the current criteria.

### **The RTPI's response to the consultation**

- 6.7 With a clear level of support for streamlining the assessment criteria but with better guidance for Partnership Boards and Planning Schools on the requirements expected, the Institute has concluded to merge its criteria from 8 to 5.
- 6.8 This will ensure clear emphasis and definition of the discipline of town planning (as a Planning School) and regularly test how professional involvement and practical teaching is delivered. The Institute will amend the [2012 Policy Statement](#) and publish a number of guidelines or indicators as to how universities could demonstrate effectiveness.

<b>Revised criteria of effectiveness</b>	<b>Examples of potential guidelines / indicators</b>
Clear Planning Focus & Leadership	<p>An up-to-date and relevant Statement of Education Philosophy is maintained with clear specialisms.</p> <p>Those directing accredited courses, including the heads of Planning Schools, must be academics who have an active engagement in and understanding of planning policy and practice.</p> <p>The head of the Planning School should be a member of the executive of the academic governance unit of which the Planning School is part.</p> <p>There are members of academic staff who are registered members of the RTPI.</p> <p>Key achievements include regular production and publication of planning research, and the engagement and promotion of planning as a career and profession.</p> <p>Mechanisms are in place to engage with and establish links between planning research and professional practice.</p>
Clear Practice Focus	<p>There is professional involvement of Chartered Town Planners in the teaching of modules, assignments and case studies.</p> <p>Students participate in a number of site visits and practical projects.</p> <p>Clear links to RTPI Nations and English regions.</p> <p>Practitioners are involved in the research activity of the planning school.</p>
Quality Assurance	<p>Provision of external examiner reports.</p> <p>A cross section of samples of student work is made available.</p> <p>Student survey results are assessed and acted upon.</p>
Institutional Support & Resources	<p>There is a core recognisable planning team that forms the Planning School.</p> <p>University commitment to support the course(s) is evident and ongoing.</p>

	Sufficient teaching and student space and sufficient library provision, research opportunities and online teaching as required.
Equality & Diversity	<p>University policies ensure equal access to the course, e.g. widening participation schemes.</p> <p>Support to integrate international students is in place.</p> <p>The understanding and teaching of inclusive planning.</p>

6.9 Universities and Partnership Boards could also consider using an accompanying narrative as a way to demonstrate their effectiveness using other qualitative criteria alongside these indicators.

## Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

3+1	An integrated course which has 3 years at undergraduate level plus a diploma or Masters year leading to a fully accredited (combined) qualification. On 3+1 courses there may be a partially or non-accredited exit point at 3 years.
Accreditation Board	Board made up of RTPI members and RTPI staff who consider formal submissions for accreditation from universities seeking accreditation for the first time.
Accredited courses	Courses delivered by RTPI accredited universities which meet the RTPI learning outcomes and have been accredited by an Accreditation Board or Partnership Board.
Assessment of Professional Competence (APC)	Formal assessment of competency-based routes to Chartered Membership of the RTPI. For example graduates who have completed a fully accredited course and have at least 2 years' experience in practice can apply through the Licentiate route.
Associate membership	A class of RTPI membership for those with a non-accredited or partially accredited degree and a certain level of practice experience. Associate members take the Associate APC route to Chartered Membership.
Chartered Town Planner	A class of RTPI membership with the designation MRTPI or FRTPI. Chartered Membership of the RTPI is the hallmark of expertise and integrity.
Combined	Also described as 'fully accredited', an RTPI accredited course which meets all of the Spatial and Specialist learning outcomes. This could be through an MPlan, a 4-year undergraduate course or an intensive one-year Masters.
Dual accredited	RTPI accredited courses that are also accredited by another professional institute e.g. RICS.
Effective Planning School	Criteria from the RTPI Policy Statement on Initial Planning Education which must be met by schools seeking accreditation and demonstrated annually at Partnership Boards in order to maintain accreditation.
ELLC	The RTPI's Education Careers and Lifelong Learning Committee. A committee of RTPI members reporting to the RTPI Trustee Board focusing on education, careers and lifelong learning issues.
Fully accredited	Also described as 'combined', an RTPI accredited course which meets all of the spatial and specialist Learning Outcomes. This could be through an MPlan, a 4-year undergraduate course or an intensive one-year Masters.
Inclusive Planning	Planning for everyone, regardless of age, ability, gender or background.

Initial Planning Education	The three elements required by the RTPI for members taking the Licentiate Route to Chartered Membership.
Learning Outcomes	Areas of planning and professional skills and knowledge that must be demonstrated for a course to be RTPI accredited. The RTPI has spatial and specialist Learning Outcomes.
Licentiate membership	A class of membership for members who have completed either a combined course (fully accredited) or have completed both spatial and specialist courses. Licentiate members take the Licentiate APC route to Chartered membership.
MPlan	This is an integrated undergraduate degree meeting both the spatial and specialist learning outcomes leading to a combined (fully accredited) qualification.
PAP	Partnership and Accreditation Panel. Panel of RTPI members who have roles on Accreditation Boards or Partnership Boards.
Partially accredited	An accredited qualification that meets either the spatial or specialist Learning Outcomes. Completing one of these courses is not enough to become a Licentiate Member of the RTPI and graduate would either need to complete an additional accredited qualification or follow the Associate route to Chartered Membership.
Partnership Board	Board of RTPI members, RTPI staff and Planning School representatives who meet annually to scrutinise the effectiveness of the schools, accredit new courses (where appropriate) and support the development of the school.
Routes to Education	An initiative by the RTPI to improve and open up pathways into a career in town planning so the next generation of planners meets both employer and society's needs with a flexible approach to education.
Spatial	A course that meets the RTPI's spatial Learning Outcomes (as listed in the Policy Statement on Initial Planning Education). A Graduate from a spatial course would be partially accredited and would either need to complete a specialist course or take the Associate route to membership.
Specialist	A course that meets the RTPI's specialist Learning Outcomes (as listed in the Policy Statement on Initial Planning Education). A Graduate from a specialist course would be partially accredited and would either need to complete a spatial course or take the Associate route to membership.
Statement of Educational Philosophy	The <a href="#">2012 RTPI Policy Statement on Initial Planning Education</a> expects all Planning Schools to articulate a Statement of Educational Philosophy which explains 'the distinctive contribution each school makes to planning education'. It 'provides the most important influence on course content and design'.

## *Appendix B: Consultation questions*

Q1. Do you agree that the requirement for a fully accredited combined undergraduate course is maintained at 4 years or equivalent?

If not, what do you think would be an appropriate length for fully accredited undergraduate course?

- 3 years undergraduate
- 3 years + sandwich year?
- other

Q2. (For planning schools): If the length of undergraduate study changed, how would this affect your courses and your planning school?

Q3. Do you support a change to terminology which would indicate which route to membership a graduate could take? This could be by identifying them as 'fully' or 'partially' accredited.

Q4. Do you think the RTPI should accredit PhD programmes? What would the benefits be for RTPI, Planning Schools and those taking PhDs?

Q5. Do you agree that the spatial Learning Outcomes are generally fit for purpose but would benefit from light touch revision? Are there any particular learning outcomes that you would revise or remove?

Q6. Do you agree that the specialist Learning Outcomes can be merged?

Q7. How can we be sure that students graduating from accredited programmes can handle the integration and alignment of planning issues in policy and practice settings?

Q8. Do you agree that practical experience should be integral to all Learning Outcomes? How can this be achieved?

Q9. Do you agree that the Effective Planning School criteria should be merged and revised into four categories to reflect the changing nature of planning schools?

Q10. What indicators should be used by Partnership Boards/Accreditation Boards scrutinizing these criteria?

## *Appendix C: Summary of 2012 RTPI Learning Outcomes*

### **'Spatial' learning outcomes**

1. Spatial planning knowledge within the context of institutional and legal frameworks
2. Substantiated responses to spatial planning challenges
3. Spatial planning theory and assessment / lessons learnt from different contexts and scales
4. Efficient resource management
5. Political and ethical nature of spatial planning and decision-making
6. Built and natural environments and implications of climate change
7. Concept of rights and representation in the planning process
8. Development strategies and development finance; including added value for the community
9. Principles of equality and equality of opportunity, and importance of community engagement
10. Principles and processes of high quality design and public realm
11. Effective research, analytical, evaluative and appraisal skills
12. Communication skills in an interdisciplinary context, negotiation, mediation, advocacy and leadership skills
13. Professional standards of ethical behaviour, lifelong learning and critical reflection

### **'Specialist' learning outcomes**

1. Specialist planning theories and practice
2. Social, economic, environmental and political context for a chosen area of planning specialism
3. Distinctive contribution of the specialism to the making of place and the mediation of space
4. Relationships between spatial planning contexts and specialist areas of expertise
5. Specialist skills and knowledge for professional practice
6. Mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change