



Provider Monitoring Report

Industry Qualifications (IQ)

9 March 2016

Contents

1	Background	1
1.1	Scope	1
1.2	Provider Monitoring Report Timeline	2
1.3	Summary of Provider Monitoring Issues and Recommendations	3
1.4	Risk Rating of Issues	4
2	Good Practice, Issues and Recommendations	5
2.1	Good Practice	5
2.2	Issues	5
2.3	Recommendations	7
3	Acceptance of Provider Monitoring Findings	8

1 Background

One provider was monitored on 9 March 2016.

1.1 Scope

SQA Accreditation carries out quality assurance activity in line with its *Quality Assurance of Approved Awarding Bodies Policy*. This involves monitoring a sample of the awarding body's approved providers or assessment sites. Provider monitoring visits will be conducted in a consistent manner within and between providers.

The aim of monitoring is to:

- ◆ ensure Industry Qualification's (IQ) compliance with SQA Accreditation's regulatory requirements
- ◆ confirm that quality assurance arrangements are being conducted by the awarding body in accordance with its prescribed arrangements
- ◆ ensure that quality assurance arrangements are being conducted in a consistent manner, within and between providers
- ◆ ensure that providers are receiving the appropriate guidance, support and documentation from IQ in order to facilitate a high standard of qualification delivery
- ◆ inform future audit and monitoring activity for the awarding body

All Principles may be included within the scope of the provider monitoring activity.

Awarding body documentation considered for review includes all documents banked on IQ's Quickr Place at the time of provider monitoring and information supplied by providers to support provider monitoring activity. Restricted or commercially sensitive information gathered during SQA Accreditation's quality assurance activities is treated in the strictest confidence.

1.2 Provider Monitoring Report Timescales

IQ provider monitoring date: 9 March 2016

Provider Monitoring Report approved by
Accreditation Co-ordination Group on: 7 April 2016

Provider Monitoring Report to be signed by IQ: 20 May 2015

Action Plan to be e-mailed
to regulation@sqa.org.uk by IQ: 20 May 2016

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

- ◆ The awarding body will be sent two signed copies of the Provider Monitoring Report by post.
- ◆ The awarding body must sign both copies of the Provider Monitoring 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 Provider Monitoring 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 Provider Monitoring 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 Provider Monitoring 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 must specify corrective and preventative measures to address them through its Action Plan.

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

As a result of the provider monitoring activity, four Issues have been recorded, and no Recommendations have been noted.

Issue	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating
1. Principle 5	Course provider materials did not sufficiently differentiate between the QCF qualification and the SQA Accredited qualification.	Low
2. Principle 6	Could not evidence completed risk assessments that should be taking place, according to SIA guidelines, with regards to all security qualifications.	Medium
3. Principle 11	Not all protected characteristics were adequately referenced in the provider's equality policy, as per the Equality Act 2010.	Low
4. Principle 12	The provider's complaints policy did not adequately reference the full escalation routes for candidates to take when dissatisfied.	Low

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 provider monitoring will count towards IQ'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:

http://accreditation.sqa.org.uk/accreditation/Regulation/Quality_Assurance/Quality_Enhancement_Rating

2 Good Practice, Issues and Recommendations

The following sections detail:

- ◆ good practice noted by providers
- ◆ Issues recorded and Recommendations noted against SQA Accreditation's regulatory requirements

2.1 Good Practice

The following areas of good practice were noted by Provider1:

The awarding body is particularly efficient at resulting and certificating candidates.

2.2 Issues

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.

The Accreditation Auditor, when reviewing provider administrative materials, could not be satisfied that the materials sufficiently differentiated between the QCF qualification and the SQA accredited qualification of the Award for Working as a CCTV Operator (Public Space Surveillance) within the Private Security Industry. There were various instances throughout provider materials where only the QCF qualification was noted and where both variations should be detailed, as the qualifications are not equivalents. Instances also occurred on the external-facing provider website, whereby it appeared that the provider did not deliver SQA accredited qualifications, as only the QCF qualification was listed.

This has been recorded as **Issue 1**.

Regulatory Principle 6. The awarding body and its providers shall maintain accurate documents, records and data.

The Accreditation Auditor reviewed provider satellite centre files and could not find evidence of completed risk assessments that should be taking place, according to SIA guidelines, with regards to all security qualifications. It is understood that the satellite centres may be undertaking this activity. However, it could not be evidenced at the provider, which one would believe to be the centralised administrative hub for retention of such documents.

This has been recorded as **Issue 2**.

Regulatory Principle 11. The awarding body shall ensure that its qualifications and their assessment are inclusive and accessible to learners.

The Accreditation Auditor reviewed the provider's equality policy and identified that not all protected characteristics, as per the Equality Act 2010 were adequately referenced.

This has been recorded as **Issue 3**.

Regulatory Principle 12. The awarding body and its providers shall have open and transparent systems to manage complaints.

The provider's complaints policy was reviewed and did not adequately reference the full escalation routes for candidates to take when dissatisfied. The Provider representative contended that candidates were made aware of their right to complain to both the awarding organisation and Regulators within the provider appeals policy, to which their complaints policy makes reference. However, the Accreditation Auditor, although acknowledging this, explained that the requirement is for candidates to determine they have a right to complain to the awarding body and to the Regulator outside of the provider's appeals process, and therefore the full escalation routes should be detailed in their complaints policy.

This has been recorded as **Issue 4**.

2.3 Recommendations

No Recommendations were recorded.

3 Acceptance of Provider Monitoring Findings

For and on behalf of Industry Qualifications: For and on behalf of SQA Accreditation:

Print name

.....

Print name

.....

Signature

.....

Signature

.....

Designation

.....

Designation

.....

Date

.....

Date

.....