



Provider Monitoring Report

MP Awards

9 December 2020

Contents

1	Background	3
1.1	Scope	3
1.2	Provider Monitoring Report Timescales	4
1.3	Summary of Provider Monitoring Issues and Recommendations	5
1.4	Risk Rating of Issues	7
2	Good Practice, Issues and Recommendations	8
2.1	Good Practice	8
2.2	Issues	8
2.3	Recommendations	10
3	Acceptance of Provider Monitoring Findings	Error! Bookmark
	not defined.	

1 Background

One provider was remotely monitored on 9 December 2020.

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 the awarding body's 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 the awarding body 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 the awarding body's SharePoint 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.

SQA Accreditation provider monitoring reports are written by exception focusing only on those areas where corrective action is required or recommended.

1.2 Provider Monitoring Report Timescales

MP Awards provider monitoring date: 9 December 2020

Provider Monitoring Report approved by
Accreditation Co-ordination Group on: 13 January 2021

Provider Monitoring Report to be signed by MP Awards: 24 February 2021

Action Plan to be emailed
to regulation@sqa.org.uk by MP Awards 24 February 2021

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

- ◆ The awarding body will be sent a copy of the Provider Monitoring Report by email.
- ◆ The awarding body must sign the copy of the Provider Monitoring Report and return by email to SQA Accreditation in accordance with the timescale specified above.
- ◆ The awarding body will also be emailed a copy of the Action Plan.
- ◆ The awarding body must complete and return the Action Plan in accordance with the timescale specified above and email 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 a signed copy of the approved Action Plan by email.
- ◆ The awarding body must sign the Action Plan and return by email 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 specify corrective and preventative measures to address them through its Action Plan.

The Action Plan is emailed to MP Awards 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, six Issues have been recorded and two Recommendations have been noted.

Issue	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating
1. Principles 6 & 10	An incorrect and out-of-date version of <i>MP Futures SSO Assessment Strategy 2015</i> ACG Approved 19 December 2015 has been uploaded on SharePoint. Moreover, an extract from this incorrect document is included in <i>MP Awards Centre Manual (May 2017)</i> which has also been uploaded on SharePoint.	Medium
2. Principles 6 & 10	Provider 1 was unable to provide the Accreditation Auditor with copies of training and occupational qualification certificates or continuing professional development (CPD) records for its Assessors and Internal Verifiers for the Accreditation Auditor to ensure compliance with <i>MP Futures SSO Assessment Strategy 2018</i> ACG Approved 27 June 2018.	Medium
3. Principle 6	Provider 1 was unable to provide the Accreditation Auditor with a copy of its conflict-of-interest policy.	Very Low
4. Principles 6 & 12	The MP Awards/centre-devised <i>Complaints Policy (March 2019)</i> given to the Accreditation Auditor by Provider 1 does not inform candidates that, if still not satisfied with the outcome of a complaint to the awarding body, they have the right to escalate a complaint to SQA Accreditation as the qualifications regulator.	Low
5. Principles 6 & 13	Provider 1 was unable to provide the Accreditation Auditor with a copy of its Appeals Policy.	Low

6. Principles 6 & 14	The centre-devised <i>Malpractice/Maladministration Policy</i> document provided to the Accreditation Auditor by Provider 1 makes incorrect references to SQA, when it should be SQA Accreditation, as the qualifications regulator.	Low
----------------------	--	-----

A Recommendation has been noted where SQA Accreditation considers there is potential for enhancement. The awarding body is advised to address any Recommendations in order to reinforce ongoing continuous improvement. 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 5	MP Awards should consider reviewing its documentation uploaded on SharePoint to ensure it is accurate and up to date.
2. Principles 10 & 15	MP Awards should inform its providers that when a candidate leaves prior to completing the full SVQ it is good practice for Assessors to check if candidates have completed any SVQ units and request unit certification where units have been achieved.

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 MP Award'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 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 highlighted by Provider 1:

- ◆ MP Awards is good at identifying where new qualifications can be created and amended to meet industry requirements.
- ◆ MP Awards is receptive to suggestions for continuous improvement.
- ◆ A good working relationship has been established with MP Awards' External Verifier.

2.2 Issues

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

Regulatory Principle 10. The awarding body shall ensure that it has the necessary arrangements and resources for the effective delivery, assessment and quality assurance of SQA accredited qualifications.

While reviewing documentation uploaded on SharePoint by MP Awards, the Accreditation Auditor noted that it contained an incorrect and out-of-date version of *MP Futures SSO Assessment Strategy 2015 ACG Approved 19 December 2015*. Moreover, an extract of this incorrect document is included in *MP Awards Centre Manual May 2017* which has also been uploaded on SharePoint.

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

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

Regulatory Principle 10. The awarding body shall ensure that it has the necessary arrangements and resources for the effective delivery, assessment and quality assurance of SQA accredited qualifications.

Provider 1 was unable to provide the Accreditation Auditor with copies of training and occupational qualification certificates or continuing professional development (CPD) records for its Assessors and Internal Verifiers for the Accreditation Auditor to ensure compliance with *MP Futures SSO Assessment Strategy 2018 ACG Approved 27 June 2018*.

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

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

MP Awards *Centre Manual* (May 2017) states 'The Centre must establish, maintain and at all times comply with an up-to-date written conflict of interest policy which includes the Centre procedures for handling such circumstances. All such cases, actual or suspected, must be reported immediately, or as soon as possible, after the situation arises.'

Provider 1 was unable to provide the Accreditation Auditor with a copy of its conflict-of-interest policy.

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

Regulatory Principle 6. The awarding body and its providers shall maintain accurate documents, records and data.**Regulatory Principle 12. The awarding body and its providers shall have open and transparent systems to manage complaints.**

The MP Awards/centre-devised *Complaints Policy* (March 2019) given to the Accreditation Auditor by Provider 1 does not inform candidates that, if still not satisfied with the outcome of a complaint to the awarding body, they have the right to escalate a complaint to SQA Accreditation as the qualifications regulator.

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

Regulatory Principle 6. The awarding body and its providers shall maintain accurate documents, records and data**Regulatory Principle 13. The awarding body and its providers shall have clear, fair and equitable procedures to manage appeals.**

MP Awards *Centre Manual* (May 2017) states 'Approved Centres must have in place, review and update their policies and procedures for appeals and complaints. All Candidates having exhausted the Approved Centres processes have the right to invoke the MP Awards' processes and systems.'

Provider 1 was unable to provide the Accreditation Auditor with a copy of its Appeals Policy.

This has been recorded as **Issue 5**.

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

Regulatory Principle 14. The awarding body and its providers shall ensure that it has safeguards to prevent and manage cases of malpractice and maladministration.

In reviewing the centre-devised *Malpractice/Maladministration Policy* document provided to the Accreditation Auditor by Provider 1 it was noted that the document makes incorrect references to SQA, when it should be SQA Accreditation, as the qualifications regulator.

This has been recorded as **Issue 6**.

2.3 Recommendations

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.

While reviewing the awarding body documentation uploaded on SharePoint the Accreditation Auditor noted that an exemplar certificate under Principle 6 was incorrect and therefore should be removed from SharePoint. However, the Accreditation Auditor did note that accurate accredited qualification exemplar certificates had been uploaded on SharePoint under Principle 15 by MP Awards.

MP Awards should consider reviewing the documentation it has uploaded on SharePoint to ensure it is accurate and up to date.

This has been noted as **Recommendation 1**.

Regulatory Principle 10. The awarding body shall ensure that it has the necessary arrangements and resources for the effective delivery, assessment and quality assurance of SQA accredited qualifications.

Regulatory Principle 15. The awarding body and its providers shall have effective, reliable and secure systems for the registration and certification of learners.

Provider 1 informed the Accreditation Auditor that where a candidate leaves without having completed a full SVQ, Assessors do not check to see if the candidate has completed any SVQ units.

MP Awards should inform its providers that it is good practice for Assessors to check if candidates have completed any SVQ units, when a candidate leaves prior to completing the full SVQ.

This has been noted as **Recommendation 2**.