

F/EAL/10130 - Visit to Morris Services Limited

Summary at 17/07/2012 15:11:03

Form type?

Centre engagement

Who has control?

EAL

Linked to quals?

Level 2 Certificate For Domestic Electrical Installers

Level 3 Electrotechnical Services

SECTION: Engagement purpose

Summarise the purpose and scope of the engagement.

Type of engagement

Visit - SELECTED

Remote

Second EAL representative (if appropriate)

No answer provided.

Date of the engagement

17/07/2012

Name of centre liaison

James Morris

If appropriate units covered during the engagement

No answer provided.

Engagement reason - Governance and QA and/or Exam Delivery

Standardisation check

Possible Malpractice Investigation

Complaint / Appeal

Review actions

Monitoring of assessment and/or delivery

Learner experiences

Observe exam delivery

Review associated/satellite site(s)

Verify claims (portfolios etc) - SELECTED

Bill enquiry/issues

Engagement reason - Qualification Delivery & Learner Experience

New Centre
High Turnover
Grant Direct Claims status
Centre request
Newly started at centre
New staff involved
New qualifications launched by EAL
Not recently delivered
Review Work In Progress portfolios

Engagement reason - Support and Advice (centre driven)

Pre-approval enquiry (accredited provision)
New partner/site related
CSC
ENAS

Engagement reason - Support and Advice

Improve quality assurance/standardisation
Back to Basics
Assessor/IV training
Briefing on a new service/range of provision
Drop-in - SELECTED
Raise profile of a new service/qualification - SELECTED
Possible new centre/re-activate centre
Centre event

SECTION: Centre update

Summarise main developments at the centre.

What's new/changed?

No answer provided.

What recent external audits, engagements, awards have you had that may help focus this engagement?

Recent examination audit from City and Guilds.

Possible new opportunities/areas of interest at the centre where further support may be required

The Centre was already running City and Guilds versions Initial verification and Periodic and the rigs were seen. The Centre would consider EAL versions in the near future

If engagement was cancelled/postponed details of why?

No answer provided.

SECTION: Engagement summary & main outcomes/recommendations

Summarises the outcomes of the engagement.

Level of compliance in relation to the areas covered in the engagement:

Green (fully compliant) - SELECTED

Amber (some key areas of non-compliance)

Red (significant areas of non-compliance)



Engagement summary and main outcomes

The meeting was hosted by J.Morris and L.Holmes with A.Wilson attending. There was a general discussion on the qualifications and in particular the Level 1 Building Services and Initial Verification and Periodic Testing.

EV Sampling focused on the Domestic Installer, but the sample size was minimised because of the long standing history of good delivery by this centre, there being no outstanding actions for improvement or sanctions. All records of assessment and internal quality assurance, and all portfolio samples requested were present for examination. Minutes of meetings and standardisation were also available. It is clear that this is a well run and organised facility and J.Morris and his team should be congratulated.

There was an examination taking place during the visit and all EAL procedures were adopted and invigilator A.Morris was met during the visit.

No actions were raised on this engagement.

Risks identified during the engagement

No answer provided.

Areas of considerable strength/good practice

Good use short test to support training material for 17th edition Amendments.

Excellent and varied practical demonstration units in workshop.

Recommendations for the centre

No answer provided.

Sections of the report that contain actions

No actions assigned - SELECTED

Governance - actions assigned

Exams - actions assigned

Qualification delivery - actions assigned

Learner Experience - actions assigned

If appropriate, sanctions that will be imposed

Withhold certificates for a qualification

Withhold certificates for a qualification sector

Withhold certificates for a qualification type

Withhold certificates for all qualifications

Put a stop on registrations for a qualification

Put a stop on registrations for a qualification sector

Put a stop on registrations for a qualification type

Put a stop on registrations for all qualifications

If appropriate sanctions that will be recommended

Remove approval for a qualification sector

Remove all qualification approvals

Rationale for the sanctions (if appropriate)

No answer provided.

SECTION: Centre feedback

Please provide your views on the engagement outcomes.

Views on the approach to the engagement final report (eg do you accept it is an accurate reflection of the findings)

Very Supportive

Views on the work and approach of the EV during the engagement

Very satisfied - SELECTED

Satisfied

Not satisfied

Views on the monitoring form and nature of the questions and feedback to the centre

Very satisfied - SELECTED

Satisfied

Not satisfied

If appropriate, what views do you have on whether the assessment arrangements for the qualification(s) covered by this engagement were fit for purpose and/or enable your centre to deliver the qualification efficiently and effectively?

Fit for purpose

What views do you have on the qualification(s) covered by this engagement that you wish to feedback to EAL (eg the relevance of the qualification to sector needs, aspects of the content or assessment arrangements which in your view disadvantaged certain learners; progression opportunities, or the appropriateness of the qualification specification)?

Fit for purpose

Any other comments/feedback the centre wishes to make about the engagement and/or EAL

Supportive & Helpful visit

SECTION: Governance and quality assurance

Focuses on the centre's core systems, partnership arrangements, developments and overarching QA arrangements and policies.

Does the centre have robust internal arrangements?

Yes - all in place - SELECTED

No - no single named point of accountability in place

No - centre coordination ineffective

No - poor track record in complying with actions

No - existing/new partnerships not documented

No - key policies inadequate (eg Equality and Diversity, Health and Safety, Complaints and Appeals)

No - poor security of key documents

No - unpaid bills



Does the centre have appropriate staff (with expertise and competence) and resources in place to deliver the qualification(s) in accordance with the relevant qualification and/or regulatory requirements?

Yes - staff and controls in place - SELECTED

No - delivery team records are out of date

No - poor arrangements in place in relation to staff monitoring, support and/or training/staff development

No - unqualified/ inexperienced /peripatetic staff



- No - staff not on the centre's profile
- No - inappropriate equipment and/or other resources being used
- No - frequent changes to staff affect performance
- No - staff have wrong remit
- No - occupational competence is in question
- No - in sufficient managerial and other resources in place to enable it to effectively and efficiently undertake the delivery of the qualifications
- No - insufficient competent and qualified delivery and/or quality assurance staff to meet the demand for assessment and verification activity

Does the centre have appropriate learner registration, tracking and certification request arrangements and are they maintained for a minimum of 3 years?

- Yes - SELECTED
- No - inadequate registration arrangements in place to ensure learners are clearly and uniquely identified (eg ULN or SCN not in place/ supported)
- No - learner records and details of achievements are not accurate, kept up to date, securely stored and available for external verification and auditing
- No - inadequate consideration of RPL, APL, proxy, exemptions and equivalences
- No - registrations are often late, inaccurate and/or incomplete (eg not all learners being assessed are registered)
- No - records are not maintained for a minimum of 3 years
- No - incorrect, incomplete and/or unauthenticated certification claims made
- No - registration and certification information does not correspond with SAP

Does the centre have appropriate arrangements in place for dealing with special consideration and reasonable adjustment requests (including appropriate records)?

- Yes - SELECTED
- No - inappropriate arrangements and records in place to identify and record special considerations and reasonable adjustments
- No - use of assessment in foreign language not agreed with EAL
- No - translators credentials not supplied to EAL

Does the centre have appropriate arrangements in place to prevent and, if they occur, investigate allegations of malpractice and maladministration?

- Yes - appropriate arrangements in place - SELECTED
- No - insufficient internal controls in place (eg no internal review procedures, no documented processes, etc)
- No - no documented malpractice/malpractice arrangements in place

No - possible/actual instance of maladministration/malpractice identified during the engagement



Does the centre have appropriate QA arrangements in place?

Yes - SELECTED



No - learner delivery/QA team ratios inappropriately balanced



No - there has been a major non-compliance identified during this visit which could be deemed an adverse effect by the regulators



No - inadequate QA team records



No - insufficient rigour applied



No - insufficient coverage for the range of qualifications being offered



No - no recognition of high-risk qualifications/units



Does the centre have appropriate standardisation arrangements in place?

Yes - effective standardisation arrangements are in place - SELECTED



No - centre has no standardisation plans in place



No - standardisation has not taken place in the last 12 months



No - standardisation has not occurred across all active delivery sites, staff or assessment methods



Is the centre aware and adhering to EAL Policies and procedures?

Yes - all staff are aware and adhere to EAL policies and procedures - SELECTED



No - staff are not aware of EAL policies and procedures



No - staff do not adhere to EAL policies and procedures



No - staff are using out of date policies and procedures



Has the centre provided learners with access to complaints and appeals procedures and policies?

Yes - fully compliant - SELECTED



No - insufficient evidence that learners are aware of the policies and procedures



No - insufficient evidence that learners are aware of complaints policy and procedures



Notes

No answer provided.

Details of any actions the centre must address

No actions added.

Potential Risk

Green - SELECTED



Amber

Red



Rationale for the risk judgement

There is no risk as the centre has robust QA systems and policies in place.

SECTION: Exam delivery

Focuses on how the centre delivers exams and whether this is being carried out in accordance within EAL's "Procedures for conducting the exam component with EAL qualifications."

List the exam staff you interviewed

Anne Morris

Name the learners you interviewed

N.Bond R.Cooper

Did the exam venue(s) comply with EAL's exam procedures?

Yes - fully compliant - SELECTED

No - related materials are not displayed on the wall

No - clock is not visible to learners in the room

No - a notice board is not available in the room (eg white and/or black boards that are used to list the start and end times, etc)

No - insufficient workstations are available for onscreen exams (with at least one spare computer and printer - if printers are required)

No - onscreen exam arrangements do not comply with relevant Health and Safety requirements

No - technical help is not on standby for onscreen exams to deal with software/hardware issues preventing exam completion (a sole supervisor is not permitted to provide technical help)

No - staff are not aware of EAL exam procedures

No - staff are not working to the current version of exam procedures

No - the centre does not have appropriate arrangements in place to protect the confidentiality of the exam materials

No - centre does not have robust internal policies and procedures in relation to protecting the security of the hardware and software that is used to deliver onscreen exams

No - centre is not capable of supporting EAL exam software

No - each workstation is not the required distance of 1.25m apart (from the outer edge of one screen to the next - unless they are positioned back-to-back and separated by privacy screens - the principle objective is to ensure that a learner's work cannot be overseen by another learner)

No - exams are not conducted and marked by the centre in accordance with EAL's procedures



Are the centre's pre-exam arrangements compliant with EAL's exam procedures?

Yes - fully compliant - SELECTED

No - learners are not informed of the exam arrangements

No - instructions (eg pen colour, time, etc) and noted errors are not explained to learners

No - the identity/authenticity of the learners who take the exam are not checked

No - exam materials are not securely stored

No - the centre does not have appropriate arrangements in place to protect the confidentiality of the exam materials

No - learners are allowed to take in unauthorised materials (eg mobiles and cameras) (in some instances calculators/dictionaries may be permitted)

No - exam materials are not opened in front of the learners/onscreen exams are not made securely available to learners

Are the centre's exam delivery arrangements compliant with EAL's exam procedures?

Yes - fully compliant (including centre marked assessments where used) - SELECTED

No - staff do not notify when there is only 15 and 5 minutes remaining

No - staff do not clearly instruct learners to stop and enforce the "time expiry"

No - staff do not ensure that learners have completed all relevant details on the relevant cover sheet(s)/screen(s)

No - some procedures not being followed for centre based assessments

No - staff answer questions in relation to questions aimed at learners

No - staff do not take a register of attendance

No - staff do not supervise the exam and are not vigilant and do not create and maintain an accurate and appropriate attendance register and supervision report for every exam (and return these with paper based exams or make available for possible future EAL scrutiny in relation to onscreen exams - note records should be kept for three years)

No - staff do not accompany learners who have to leave the room and sufficient staff are not in place to supervise the remaining learners

No - staff do not ensure exam materials are not removed from the room, and that exam materials are not collected/appropriately closed-down before learners leave the room

No - staff do not ensure that answer materials are matched to learners and are stored securely prior to dispatch to EAL

No - centre not following procedures for centre marked assessments

All exam materials are returned in accordance with EAL's procedures? (Checked against EAL's Exam Conduct Report)

Yes

No - papers are not returned in accordance with EAL procedures

Notes

The Centre had been visited by another Awarding Organisation with respect to observation of examinations in March 2012 to ensure compliance with JCQ requirements. Centre supervision and attendance records were all available

Provide any details of findings which may indicate suspected Malpractice / Maladministration, (e.g. compliance to EAL exams procedures including loss or theft or confidentiality of assessment materials)

No answer provided.

Details of any actions the centre must address

No actions added.

Potential Risk

Green - SELECTED

Amber

Red



Rationale for the risk judgement

No risks were identified in the conduction of the examinations at this Centre.

SECTION: Qualification delivery

Focuses on how the centre delivers EAL qualifications, the assessment methods used, application of quality assurance procedures and the appropriateness of the centre's staff and resources (including sites used to deliver the qualification).

Delivery staff sampled/interviewed

A WILSON
J MORRIS

QA staff sampled/interviewed

L HOLMES

What is the centre's approach to quality assurance and what are the recent findings/issues?

Good use of QA documentation along with sampling plans

Was the centre's approach to quality assuring assessment arrangements appropriate?

Yes - SELECTED

No - the internal quality assurance arrangements were not documented and/or clearly understood by staff in order to be consistent with national requirements and ensure the quality and consistency of assessment.

No - assessment decisions and practices are not regularly sampled and/or findings are not acted upon to ensure consistency and fairness.



No - staff do have not have sufficient time, resources and authority to perform their roles and responsibilities effectively.

No - roles, responsibilities, authorities and accountabilities of the assessment and verification team across all assessment sites are not clearly defined, allocated and/or understood.

No - Assessment and/or internal quality assurance is not conducted by relevant qualified, experienced and/or occupationally expert staff.

No - assessment decisions of unqualified assessors are not checked, authenticated and countersigned by a qualified assessor or quality assurance staff member

No - decisions of unqualified quality assurance staff are not checked, authenticated and countersigned by an internal verifier who is appropriately qualified, experienced and/or competent.

No - there was a conflict of interest amongst the assessor(s) and/or quality assurance staff sampled

Notes

No answer provided.

Was the staff performance and knowledge adequate?

All staff are competent to deliver the qualifications on the remit

List the associate sites visited (if appropriate)

No answer provided.

Assessment methods sampled

Observing learners perform naturally in the workplace

Asking learners questions

Professional discussion

Setting tests/examinations

Setting projects and tasks

Observe learners' performance in simulated conditions

Using evidence from other people (including peers and witnesses)

Assessing the learner's report of their work

Taking account of past experiences and achievements

Delivery/training arrangements (if appropriate)

Lesson plan

Clear presentation techniques

Q & A session

Practical demonstration - SELECTED

Group participation

Appropriate training materials - SELECTED

Appropriate visual aids used - SELECTED

Summarise session

Appropriate tasks/exercises used

Appropriate learner support - SELECTED

Were appropriate assessment arrangements and evidence in place?

Yes - SELECTED

No - inappropriate stimulus materials were used by the centre (eg materials which facilitate learners' demonstration of their knowledge, skills and understanding)

No - evidence generated by learners in assessments is not always attributable to the learner concerned (either directly or via their contribution to group work)

No - assessments were not completed in accordance with the normal specified conditions associated with the qualification(s)

No - the criteria against which learners' performance is to be differentiated was not understood by assessors and/or accurately and consistently applied.

No - changes to the marking/assessment of evidence needed to be made

No - the recorded assessment results did not reflect the level of attainment demonstrated by the learner(s)

No - the centre did not take into account all admissible evidence generated by the learner(s) when marking an assessment/awarding the unit

No - the centre did not comply with rules specified in relation to the quantity or type of evidence generated by learners that will be accepted and/or expected

No - the centre did not comply with rules specified in relation to how the final mark for the qualification will be calculated.

Were Particular Assessment Requirements applied in assessment as per EAL guidance?

Yes - approval was sought where necessary and adequate records maintained - SELECTED

No - learners were not provided with opportunities to claim reasonable adjustments and/or special considerations

No - inadequate records of requests maintained

No - EAL approval was not sought prior to assessment

Notes

A wide range of practical tasks which met qualificalional requirements

Was assessments carried out in another language other than English and if so was approval sought from EAL beforehand and is the level of demand consistent with those delivered in English?

None

Details of any actions the centre must address

No actions added.

Potential Risk

Green - SELECTED

Amber

Red



Rationale for the risk judgement

There are no risks to the centre as systems and procedures are in place.

SECTION: Learner experience

Focuses on the learner's experiences whilst undertaking the qualification(s)

Learners you interviewed/sampled

Sampled;- J.Quinennell R.Coulson

Interviewed N.Bond L.Britton R.Cooper Tarsem Sooriya

Has the learner(s) met their relevant delivery staff?

Yes - SELECTED

No



Did the learner(s) know about the relevant QA staff and arrangements?

Yes - SELECTED

No



Did the learner(s) have access to the appropriate materials to undertake the course/qualification/unit?

Yes - SELECTED

No - learner(s) received some materials

No - learner(s) received too many materials

No - learner(s) had not received appropriate materials



Has the learner(s) received feedback from their associated delivery staff?

Yes - SELECTED

No - learner(s) did not receive sufficient feedback

No - quality of feedback is poor or non-existent



Did the learner(s) feel they had enough time to complete the qualification/course/units?

Yes - SELECTED

No - learner(s) felt they had insufficient time

No - inadequate learner plan in place



Did the learner(s) understand the process and qualification?

Yes - SELECTED

No - learner(s) did not receive sufficient information

No - induction /exit process inadequate

No - learner(s) not considered in the delivery



Did the learner(s) have any views on EAL (eg in relation to the qualification, the course, the centre and materials, etc)

Learners understood the DEI qualification, but did not know EAL.

Notes

All learners were extremely complimentary of the course and staff.

Details of any actions the centre must address

No actions added.

Potential Risk

Green - SELECTED

Amber

Red



Rationale for the risk judgement

There are no risks to the learner as support and systems are all in place.

SECTION: Advice and support

Captures details of the advice, support and guidance given to the centre.

(Additional) Topics/details covered in this engagement

Discussion on Initial Verification and Periodic Inspection and Testing.

No documents added.

Notes

No documents added.

End of form