



Audit Report

Lantra Awards

13 June 2018

Contents

1 Background	1
1.1 Scope	1
1.2 Audit Report and Action Plan Timescales	2
1.3 Summary of Audit Issues and Recommendations	3
1.4 Risk Rating of Issues	5
2 Detail of Audit Issues and Recommendations	6
2.1 Issues	6
2.2 Recommendations	7
3 Acceptance of Audit Findings	8

1 Background

This was the 13th audit of Lantra Awards (Lantra) since it was approved as an awarding body by SQA Accreditation. Lantra's focus as an awarding body is within the land-based sector and it currently has five accredited qualifications.

1.1 Scope

SQA Accreditation carries out quality assurance activity in line with its *Quality Assurance of Approved Awarding Bodies Policy*. This states the type and frequency of our quality assurance activities, describes our reporting procedures and indicates how the awarding body's Quality Enhancement Rating is calculated.

As this was a full audit of Lantra, all regulatory requirements were included within the scope of the audit. Our quality assurance activities are conducted on a sampling basis and, consequently, not all aspects of the awarding body's systems, procedures and performance have been considered in this report to the same depth.

SQA Accreditation audit reports are written by exception focusing only on those areas where corrective action is required or recommended. Consequently, this approach to audit reporting does not detail areas where compliance or good practice was found.

The audit was designed to ensure Lantra complies with SQA Accreditation's regulatory requirements namely:

- ◆ *SQA Accreditation's Regulatory Principles (2014)*
- ◆ *all Regulatory Principles Directives*
- ◆ the awarding body's Accreditation Licence

Awarding body documentation considered for review by the Audit Team includes all documents banked on Lantra's SharePoint site at the time of audit and information supplied to support audit activity. Restricted or commercially sensitive information gathered during SQA Accreditation's quality assurance activities is treated in the strictest confidence.

1.2 Audit Report and Action Plan Timescales

Lantra: audit date:	13 June 2018
Audit Report approved by Accreditation Co-ordination Group on:	27 June 2018
Audit Report to be signed by Lantra:	9 August 2018
Action Plan to be e-mailed to regulation@sqa.org.uk by Lantra:	9 August 2018

The process will apply in relation to the timescales specified above:

- ◆ The awarding body will be sent two signed copies of the Audit Report by post.
- ◆ The awarding body must sign both copies of the Audit Report and return one by post to SQA Accreditation in accordance with the timescale specified above.
- ◆ The awarding body will also be e-mailed a copy of the Audit Report (for information only) and an electronic copy of the Action Plan.
- ◆ The awarding body must complete and return the Action Plan in accordance with the timescale specified above and e-mail this in Microsoft Word format to regulation@sqa.org.uk.
- ◆ SQA Accreditation will confirm when the Action Plan is appropriate to address the Issues and present it to Accreditation Co-ordination Group (ACG) for approval.
- ◆ Following approval by ACG, the awarding body will be sent two signed copies of the approved Action Plan by post.
- ◆ The awarding body must sign both copies of the Action Plan and return one by post to SQA Accreditation.

The findings of this Audit Report and the associated Action Plan will be published on SQA Accreditation's website following signed agreement.

SQA Accreditation will continually monitor progress towards completion of the proposed actions identified in the Action Plan and update the awarding body's Quality Enhancement Rating as appropriate.

1.3 Summary of Audit Issues and Recommendations

An Issue has been recorded where evidence shows that the awarding body is not compliant with SQA Accreditation's regulatory requirements. The awarding body must address the Issues and specify corrective and preventative measures to address them through its Action Plan.

The Action Plan is e-mailed to Lantra as a separate document to the Audit Report, and must be submitted to SQA Accreditation in accordance with the timescale specified in 1.2.

As a result of the audit and post-audit activities, three Issues have been recorded and two Recommendations have been noted.

Issue	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating
1. Principle 4	Lantra must review its <i>Data Protection Policy</i> to ensure it makes appropriate reference to Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and the Data Protection Act 2018 which came into force in May 2018.	Low
2. Principle 5	Lantra must carry out a review of its policies and public-facing documentation, including those online, to ensure that SQA Accreditation is referred to appropriately and to remove any remaining references to SVQs.	Low
3. Principle 13	Lantra must review its <i>Appeals Policy</i> and <i>Customer Service & Feedback Policy</i> to make it clear that learners cannot appeal to SQA Accreditation. Lantra must also review the multiple references to SQA within both the above policies, review the titles and jurisdictions of other regulators to ensure they are correct, and should note that the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman only deals with complaints in the first instance and not appeals.	Low

A Recommendation has been noted where SQA Accreditation considers there is potential for improvement. The awarding body is advised to address any Recommendations noted as good practice. However, measures to correct or prevent these are not mandatory and therefore do not form part of the Action Plan.

Recommendation	Detail of Recommendation noted
1. Principle 1	The awarding body should review its <i>Adverse Effects Policy</i> to ensure it contains reference to SQA Accreditation and should consider including examples of types of incident it would report to the Regulator.
2. Principle 1	It is recommended that Lantra review its <i>Managing Conflicts of Interest Policy</i> to make it clear that it is the awarding body's responsibility to lead the process for updating declarations — and include a frequency for doing so.

1.4 Risk Rating of Issues

SQA Accreditation assigns a rating to each Issue recorded, depending on the impact on or risk to the awarding body's operations, its SQA accredited qualifications and/or the learner. Issues recorded during the audit will count towards Lantra's Quality Enhancement Rating which will, in turn, contribute towards future quality assurance activity. Further detail on how the Quality Enhancement Rating is calculated can be found on the [SQA Accreditation website](#).

2 Detail of Audit Issues and Recommendations

The following sections detail Issues recorded and Recommendations noted against SQA Accreditation's regulatory requirements.

2.1 Issues

Regulatory Principle 4. The awarding body shall continually review the effectiveness of its business services, systems, policies and processes.

A review of all documents and policies banked on SharePoint was carried out by the Lead Auditor prior to visiting Lantra. It was noted that Lantra's *Data Protection Policy* was last reviewed in 2016 and still made reference to the Data Protection Act 1998. Lantra must review its *Data Protection Policy* to ensure it makes appropriate reference to Regulation (EU) 2016/679 and the Data Protection Act 2018 which came into force in May 2018. This has been recorded as **Issue 1**.

Regulatory Principle 5. The awarding body shall provide clear information on its procedures, products and services and ensure that they are accurate and appropriate to SQA accredited qualifications.

One of the Recommendations raised at the March 2017 audit noted that 'Lantra should carry out a review of its policies to ensure that SQA Accreditation is referred to properly and remove any reference to SVQs from its documentation.'

A large amount of documentation reviewed by the Accreditation Auditors was still found to have reference to SQA and not SQA Accreditation. There was also some reference to the SVQ brand; however, Lantra no longer has any SVQs accredited. The Lead Auditor explained that whilst SQA Accreditation has shared corporate responsibilities, Lantra must ensure that it refers to SQA Accreditation appropriately and avoid confusion with SQA in its awarding capacity.

Lantra must carry out a review of its policies and public-facing documentation, including those online, to ensure that SQA Accreditation is referred to appropriately and remove any remaining references to SVQs. This has been recorded as **Issue 2**.

Regulatory Principle 13. The awarding body and its providers shall have clear, fair and equitable procedures to manage appeals.

Lantra's *Appeals Policy* states that '*an appeal or complaint can be made to the appropriate regulatory authority (Ofqual in England, Wales and Northern Ireland or SQA in Scotland)*'. In the first instance a candidate would normally make a complaint and as part of that complaint learners can ask for appeals evidence to be considered as part of their case. The awarding body's *Customer Service & Feedback Policy* also contains a section on appealing to the regulatory authorities which is inaccurate as it states that appeals can be made to SQA.

Lantra must review its *Appeals Policy* and *Customer Service & Feedback Policy* to make it clear that learners cannot appeal to SQA Accreditation. Lantra must also review the multiple onerous references to SQA within both the above policies, review the titles and jurisdictions of other regulators to ensure they are accurate, and should note that the Scottish Public Services Ombudsman only deals with complaints in the first instance and not appeals. This has been recorded as **Issue 3**.

2.2 Recommendations

Regulatory Principle 1. The awarding body shall have clearly defined and effective governance arrangements.

It was noted from Lantra's 2017 self-assessment report that the awarding body had updated its *Adverse Effects Policy*, however, there was no corresponding banked document on SharePoint. A version of the policy was shown to the Audit Team during the visit but it lacked sufficient reference to SQA Accreditation. The awarding body should review its *Adverse Effects Policy* to ensure it contains reference to SQA Accreditation and should consider including examples of types of incident it would report to the Regulator. This has been noted as **Recommendation 1**.

The Audit Team reviewed and discussed the detail of Lantra's *Managing Conflicts of Interest Policy*. The policy itself is robust but lacks clarity in terms of process. It was therefore recommended that Lantra review the policy to make it clear that it is the awarding body's responsibility to lead the process for updating declarations — and include a frequency for doing so. This has been noted as **Recommendation 2**.

3 Acceptance of Audit Findings

For and on behalf of Lantra Awards:

For and on behalf of SQA Accreditation:

Print name

Print name

.....

.....

Signature

Signature

.....

.....

Designation

Designation

.....

.....

Date

Date

.....

.....