

Action Plan



This Action Plan must be completed electronically and submitted in Microsoft Word format to regulation@sqa.org.uk by 20 March 2019.

Issue number	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating	Proposed action and evidence to be provided (Failure to include a description of your intended methodology AND details of the evidence that you will provide could result in your Action Plan not being approved by ACG.)	Target date for completion by awarding body ¹	Date Issue closed out by SQA Accreditation ²
1. Principle 1	There appeared to be different interpretations of the duration of the <i>Accredited Qualification Agreement</i> with UKA Dance and when it was due to expire. A lack of schedules attached to the revised agreement previously submitted to SQA Accreditation was thought to be an oversight by RSL representatives.	Medium	<p>A meeting took place between RSL and UKA on 22nd January 2019. Although the partnership and contract were not explicitly discussed, UKA expressed a desire meet the requirements of the action plan to continue the relationship and to expand the provision. The minutes of this meeting were captured in the Action Plan for UKA.</p> <p>A follow up discussion took place internally at RSL regarding the continuation of the relationship with UKA. The conclusions are shown in the attached meeting notes.</p> <p>Notes on meeting 24th January 2019, attached.</p>	1st March 2019	26/6/2019

¹ If the awarding body believes it has completed the action prior to approval of the Action Plan by ACG, insert the considered date of completion. The date will be subject to review depending on the quality of the evidence supplied.

² Issues can only be closed out once the evidence to complete the action has been quality reviewed and the Action Plan has been approved by ACG. The period of time between ACG approval and the date the Issue is closed out is not necessarily reflective of any quality issues.

Issue number	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating	Proposed action and evidence to be provided (Failure to include a description of your intended methodology AND details of the evidence that you will provide could result in your Action Plan not being approved by ACG.)	Target date for completion by awarding body ¹	Date Issue closed out by SQA Accreditation ²
	Although it was stated by all parties that the agreement would be subject to an extension as per Clause 8.1, the audit team were unable to see evidence of the decision-making process that underpinned this development.		<p>Following further discussions relating to financial arrangements, a signed version of the contract was returned on 1st March 2019. This contract comes into effect when the current contract expires on 30th April 2019.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes – RSL/UKA follow up meeting (24 Jan 2019) • SIGNED CONTRACT RSL/UKA signed 28 February 2019 		
2. Principles 3 and 15	RSL was unable to provide an update and evidence of final actions taken in respect of 301 erroneous certificates issued between February and July 2017 in respect of SQA accredited Graded Music examinations.	Medium	<p>Despite its best efforts RSL's IT department have been unable to locate the documentation on which progress in terms of certificates being returned and re-issued, was recorded.</p> <p>A member of staff who was involved in this activity recalls that the recall and reissue was instigated and that about 1/3 (equating to 100) certificates were returned and replaced. Quality Committee meeting minutes show two records relating to the issue:</p>	15 th February 2019 Extension to 31 August 2019	2/10/2019

Issue number	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating	Proposed action and evidence to be provided (Failure to include a description of your intended methodology AND details of the evidence that you will provide could result in your Action Plan not being approved by ACG.)	Target date for completion by awarding body ¹	Date Issue closed out by SQA Accreditation ²
	<p>Therefore, SQA Accreditation is unable to determine the effectiveness of the actions taken and to understand RSL's risk appetite with regard to possible future instances of the same problem.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25.9.2017: "return and re-issue of SQA certificates" marked as "Completed" in terms of assurance that all affected candidates have been contacted. • 8.2.2018: "AA reported that the incorrect issue of 301 GME certificates with Ofqual logos is being chased up to ensure that all candidates who return the incorrect ones will receive the correct certificates." <p>A check of records of replacement certificates issued indicates that 95 certificates have been returned and replaced.</p> <p>An additional IT rule is now in place to ensure that certificates are sent out with the appropriate regulator logo. This will eliminate the risk of a human error.</p> <p>In accordance with RSL's revised risk log, RSL classes the release of certificates, which are incorrect for any reason as low risk and low impact with an inherent risk of 9. With mitigations in place the risk is reduced to 6. The target is 6. The risk</p>		

Issue number	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating	Proposed action and evidence to be provided (Failure to include a description of your intended methodology AND details of the evidence that you will provide could result in your Action Plan not being approved by ACG.)	Target date for completion by awarding body¹	Date Issue closed out by SQA Accreditation²
			<p>register is owned by the Director of Global Operations and reviewed at monthly meetings of the Quality Committee, the Delivery and Experience Committee as well as by the RSL Board of Directors</p> <p>Nevertheless, in the event of a certificate related error, which necessitates certificate recall and re-issue, detailed records of progress against each centre and individual, will be maintained and retained.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extracts from Quality Committee meetings on 25/9/17 and 08/02/18 Extract of records of 95 replacement certificates issued. • Screenshot of the dialogue relating to the 'additional IT Rule' • Extract from RSL risk register March 2019 		

Issue number	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating	Proposed action and evidence to be provided (Failure to include a description of your intended methodology AND details of the evidence that you will provide could result in your Action Plan not being approved by ACG.)	Target date for completion by awarding body ¹	Date Issue closed out by SQA Accreditation ²
3. Principles 6 and 15	On reviewing quarterly registration and certification data submissions for RSL's <i>Graded Examinations in Popular Music Performance</i> , it was noted that there appeared to be more certifications than registrations.	Low	<p>RSL believes the discrepancies highlighted on the Candidate Data Submissions summary are due to the non-alignment between the calendar-based reporting periods and RSL's exam periods for its Graded Music Exams. Each of these exam periods (A, B, C) is preceded by several months of registrations. Therefore, some registrations can fall outside of the reporting window, while all certifications fall inside the window. Similarly, when all registrations are contained in a reporting window, it is possible that the related certifications fall into the next window.</p> <p>RSL will undertake an analysis of its registration and certification data for the relevant qualifications over a sufficient period of time to test this supposition, reporting back to SQA Accreditation accordingly.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysis report 	30 September 2019. Extension to 30 November 2019.	

Issue number	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating	Proposed action and evidence to be provided (Failure to include a description of your intended methodology AND details of the evidence that you will provide could result in your Action Plan not being approved by ACG.)	Target date for completion by awarding body ¹	Date Issue closed out by SQA Accreditation ²
4. Principle 14	<p>There was no evidence available at the audit that an Issue raised in the recent RSL provider monitoring report, dated 2 December 2018, regarding Reasonable Adjustments had been entered in the Malpractice Log by either RSL or UKA Dance as per policy.</p> <p>Also, policy documents of both RSL and UKA Dance do not adequately and consistently reflect the need to notify the qualification regulator of suspected and/or actual malpractice/maladministration upon discovery</p>	Low	<p>Following discussion during the audit visit, it was agreed that this action constituted Maladministration rather than Malpractice. There was no compromise to the integrity of the assessment in that the RA, had it been applied for as per the requisite timelines, would have been granted. The RA was thus in the best interests of the candidate.</p> <p>The centres have been reminded of the timelines for applications for RA and that RSL grant these, including at a training event in February, for which a briefing document is attached as evidence.</p> <p>The RSL Malpractice and Maladministration policy has been updated to reflect the revised definition of this action.</p> <p>The policy has also been amended to make reference to the requirement for suspected as well as proven cases of Malpractice to be notified to SQA Accreditation as soon as a priority.</p>	20 February 2019 Extension to 30 September 2019	

Issue number	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating	Proposed action and evidence to be provided (Failure to include a description of your intended methodology AND details of the evidence that you will provide could result in your Action Plan not being approved by ACG.)	Target date for completion by awarding body ¹	Date Issue closed out by SQA Accreditation ²
			<p>This requirement has also been conveyed to relevant internal staff.</p> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REVISED MALPRACTICE Policy [Draft] • Minutes of UBA Highland Regulated Grades Standardisation - 8th February 2019 		

Approved by ACG 26 June 2019