



Provider Monitoring Report

SFEDI Awards

7 March 2022

Contents

1	Background	3
1.1	Scope	3
1.2	Provider Monitoring Report Timeline	4
1.3	Summary of Provider Monitoring Issues	5
1.4	Risk Rating of Issues	6
2	Good Practice and Issues	7
2.1	Good Practice	7
2.2	Issues	7
3	Acceptance of Provider Monitoring Findings	Error! Bookmark
	not defined.	

1 Background

One provider was remotely monitored on 7 March 2022.

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

SFEDI Awards provider monitoring date: 7 March 2022

Provider Monitoring Report approved by
Accreditation Co-ordination Group on: 23 March 2022

Provider Monitoring Report to be signed by SFEDI Awards: 10 May 2022

Action Plan to be emailed
to regulation@sqa.org.uk by SFEDI Awards 10 May 2022

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

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 SFEDI 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, three Issues have been recorded.

Issue	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating
1. Principle 9	Provider 1 had no version control, eg the Malpractice and Maladministration policy.	Low
2. Principles 9 and 16	The provider-devised complaints procedure does not inform candidates that, if dissatisfied with the outcome of their complaint to SFEDI Awards, they can escalate a complaint to SQA Accreditation, as the qualifications regulator.	Low
3. Principles 9 and 17	<p>The provider-devised appeals policy does not make it clear that SQA Accreditation is unable to overturn assessment decisions or academic judgements.</p> <p>Neither does it inform candidates that, if dissatisfied with the outcome of an appeal to SFEDI Awards that they have the right to submit a complaint to SQA Accreditation, as the qualifications regulator.</p>	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 SFEDI 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 and Issues

The following sections detail:

- ♦ good practice noted by providers
- ♦ Issues recorded against SQA Accreditation's regulatory requirements

2.1 Good Practice

The following area of good practice was noted by provider:

Provider 1 highlighted the excellent support given by both SFEDI Awards staff and their External Quality Assurer (EQA)

2.2 Issues

Regulatory Principle 9. The awarding body and its providers must maintain accurate documents, records and data.

When reviewing the provider-devised documentation for Provider 1, the Accreditation Auditor noted that a number of its documents had no version control, eg Malpractice and Maladministration policy. This had also been noted by SFEDI Awards EQA as a recommendation in its Folder Sample Overview Report dated 12 July 2021.

The Accreditation Auditor was unable to ensure that only the most up-to-date versions of applicable documents are available at the point of use.

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

Regulatory Principle 9. The awarding body and its providers must maintain accurate documents, records and data.

Regulatory Principle 16. The awarding body and its providers must have open and transparent systems, policies and procedures to manage complaints.

The provider-devised complaints procedure given to the Accreditation Auditor by Provider 1 does not inform candidates that, if dissatisfied with the outcome of their complaint to SFEDI Awards, they can escalate a complaint to SQA Accreditation, as the qualifications regulator.

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

Regulatory Principle 9. The awarding body and its providers must maintain accurate documents, records and data.

Regulatory Principle 17. The awarding body and its providers must have clear, fair and equitable systems, policies and procedures to manage appeals.

The Accreditation Auditor noted that the provider-devised appeals policy given to them by Provider 1 does not make it clear that SQA Accreditation is unable to overturn assessment decisions or academic judgements.

Neither does it inform candidates that, if dissatisfied with the outcome of an appeal to SFEDI Awards, that they have the right to submit a complaint to SQA Accreditation, as the qualifications regulator — whose role it is to review and ensure that the correct awarding body policies and procedures had been followed.

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