



Provider Monitoring Report

Safety Training Awards (STA)

9 January 2018 to 8 January 2019

Contents

1	Background	1
1.1	Scope	1
1.2	Provider Monitoring Report Timeline	2
1.3	Summary of Provider Monitoring Issues	3
1.4	Risk Rating of Issues	5
2	Good Practice and Issues	6
2.1	Good Practice	6
2.2	Issues	6
3	Acceptance of Provider Monitoring Findings	9

1 Background

Four STA providers were monitored between 9 January 2018 and 18 April 2018.

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

STA provider monitoring dates:	9 January 2018 to 8 January 2019
Provider Monitoring Report approved by Accreditation Co-ordination Group on:	13 March 2019
Provider Monitoring Report to be signed by STA:	26 April 2019
Action Plan to be e-mailed to regulation@sqa.org.uk by STA:	26 April 2019

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

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 STA 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, five Issues have been recorded.

Issue	Detail of Issue recorded	Risk rating
1. Principle 6	When reviewing the policy/procedure documentation at Provider 4, the Accreditation Auditor noted that none of the provider's documents showed any evidence of version control.	Low
2. Principle 12	Neither the <i>Safety Training Awards Approved Training Centre (ATC) Manual</i> nor the provider-devised <i>Complaints Policy</i> for Provider 4 reviewed by the Accreditation Auditor informed customers/learners 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 qualification regulator.	Medium
3. Principle 13	The provider-devised <i>learner Appeals Procedure</i> for Provider 4 reviewed by the Accreditation Auditor did not inform customers/learners of the situations under which they are able to appeal. Nor did it inform them, if still not satisfied with the outcome of an appeal to the awarding body, they have the right to escalate a complaint to SQA Accreditation as the qualification regulator.	Medium
4. Principle 14	Provider 4 did not have formal arrangements in place to inform assessment staff of STA's procedures as stated in <i>Safety Training Awards Approved Training Centre (ATC) Manual, Version 18.6</i> for dealing with malpractice and maladministration.	Medium
5. Principles 14 & 15	Provider 1 knowingly resulted and claimed certificates for candidates who undertook the <i>STA Award in Emergency First Aid at Work at SCQF</i>	Very High

	Level 6 course and exam on 30 November 2017 who did not meet the pre-requisite that learners must be 16 years of age or above on the first day of the course.	
--	---	--

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 STA'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 noted by providers:

Provider 1 highlighted:

- ◆ how good STA are at reviewing and updating their procedures and acting on feedback from its providers
- ◆ call centre are very good at calling back providers with an answer within 48 hours

Provider 3 highlighted:

- ◆ STA's online registration process as good

Provider 4 highlighted:

- ◆ STA's pricing structure.

2.2 Issues

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

When reviewing the policy/procedure documentation at Provider 4, the Accreditation Auditor noted that none of the provider's documents showed any evidence of version control.

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

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

Safety Training Awards Approved Training Centre (ATC) Manual, Version 18.6 states that 'Centres must operate a fair and transparent complaints system for the benefit of learners, which covers as a minimum:

- ◆ The situations under which learners are able to make a complaint;
- ◆ To whom their complaint should be addressed;
- ◆ The timescales for dealing with their complaint;
- ◆ How the complaint is escalated / what the learner can do if they are not satisfied with the resolution of their complaint and under what circumstances they are able to complain to Safety Training Awards.'

Neither the *Safety Training Awards Approved Training Centre (ATC) Manual* nor the provider-devised *Complaints Policy* for Provider 4 reviewed by the Accreditation Auditor

informed customers/learners 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 qualification regulator.

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.

Safety Training Awards Approved Training Centre (ATC) Manual, Version 18.6 states that 'Centres must have in place an appeals procedure which is transparent and available to all learners which covers as a minimum:

- ◆ The situations under which learners are able to appeal;
- ◆ The process to be followed if a learner has an enquiry or appeal about the results of their assessment;
- ◆ How and when appeals should be submitted;
- ◆ Ensuring that appeals are dealt with impartially and fairly;
- ◆ Timescales for submitting and dealing with appeals;
- ◆ The process to be followed if a learner is not satisfied with the results of their appeal and appealing to Safety Training Awards.

The provider-devised *learner Appeals Procedure* for Provider 4 reviewed by the Accreditation Auditor did not inform customers/learners of the situations under which they are able to appeal. Nor did it inform them, if still not satisfied with the outcome of an appeal to the awarding body, they have the right to escalate a complaint to SQA Accreditation as the qualification regulator.

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

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

The corporate malpractice and maladministration policy for Provider 4 reviewed by the Accreditation Auditor, did not contain information to make customers/learners fully aware of *Safety Training Awards Approved Training Centre (ATC) Manual, Version 18.6* which states that 'Centres must have a procedure for dealing with allegations of potential malpractice and maladministration, which covers as a minimum:

- ◆ Procedure and timing for notifying Safety Training Awards;
- ◆ How and when any investigations will take place;
- ◆ Co-operation with and following direction of Safety Training Awards;
- ◆ Ensuring investigations, where sanctioned by Safety Training Awards are undertaken by individuals of appropriate competence who have no interest / involvement in the outcome;
- ◆ Timescales for the investigation;
- ◆ Reporting to Safety Training Awards.'

Therefore, Provider 4 did not have formal arrangements in place to inform assessment staff of STA's procedures as stated in *Safety Training Awards Approved Training Centre (ATC) Manual, Version 18.6* for dealing with malpractice and maladministration.

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

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

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

The *Qualification Specification for STA Award in Emergency First Aid at Work at SCQF Level 6, Version 17.3 (2017)* states that 'Learners must be 16 years of age or above on the first day of the course.'

Provider 1 informed the Accreditation Auditor that a large number of candidates undertook the *STA Award in Emergency First Aid at Work at SCQF Level 6* course and exam on 30 November 2017.

The Accreditation Auditor was then shown a list of learners whose certificates could not be resulted by Provider 1 until these candidates reached 16 years of age. The provider confirmed to the Accreditation Auditor that they were aware that learners must be 16 years of age or above on the first day of the course, and that the resulting of these learners had not been blocked or challenged by STA. An example from the list shown to the Accreditation Auditor was for one candidate who undertook the course and exam on 30 November 2017. However, they did not turn 16 years of age until the end of December 2017.

Therefore, Provider 1 knowingly resulted and claimed certificates for candidates who undertook the *STA Award in Emergency First Aid at Work at SCQF Level 6* course and exam on 30 November 2017 who did not meet the pre-requisite that learners must be 16 years of age or above on the first day of the course.

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

3 Acceptance of Provider Monitoring Findings

For and on behalf of STA:

For and on behalf of SQA Accreditation:

Print name

Print name

.....

.....

Signature

Signature

.....

.....

Designation

Designation

.....

.....

Date

Date

.....

.....