

F/EAL/23629 - Visit to Morris Services Limited

Summary at 18/11/2013 16:58:59

Form type?

Centre engagement

Who has control?

EAL

Linked to quals?

Level 2 Certificate For Domestic Electrical Installers

Level 3 NVQ Diploma In Installing Electrotechnical Sys & Equip (Buildings, Structures & Environment) (SE) (QCF)

Level 3 Electrotechnical Services (SE)

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

05/11/2013

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 - SELECTED

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

Raise profile of a new service/qualification

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?

Level 1, 2 Green card CSC H&S qualification.

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

Rail

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 engagement was hosted by J.Morris L.Holmes and A.Wilson attending. The centre remit was reviewed and updated with any expired qualifications removed at the Centre coordinators request. The Centre strategy was discussed and agreed.

L.Holmes had ensured rigorous IV and QA with sampling, plans and records across all qualifications which were available and up to date. Minutes of meetings and standardisation were available. All samples had been carried out in line with the sampling plan.

Further detail can be found in the relevant sections of this report.

No actions were identified during this visit and the next visit was agreed.

Risks identified during the engagement

No answer provided.

Areas of considerable strength/good practice

No answer provided.

Recommendations for the centre

Review IQA documentation

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)

I can confirm this report is an accurate reflection of the centre engagement visit carried out.

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?

All assessment arrangements were fit for purpose and enable the centre to deliver the qualifications efficiently and effectively by following the recommended guided learning hours.

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)?

All current qualifications are directly relevant to the industry and enable progression.

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

We appreciate the ongoing support and guidance provided as a small private training provider from the awarding body and our EV.

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**

Sampling of portfolios showed that some learners had access to complaints and appeals procedures, and the centre is approved with another AO's so the centre has a full set of policies and procedures in place.

It is recommended that the centre reviews the Internal Quality Assurance documentation available on the website and possibly utilise the strategy documentation to compliment the current records. however the current IQA process was sound with standardisation which improves the consistency and quality of sampling.

Details of any actions the centre must address

No actions added.

Potential Risk

Low - SELECTED

Medium

High

Very high

Rationale for the risk judgement

There is no risk to the Centre.

SECTION: Exam delivery

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

List the exam staff you interviewed

No answer provided.

Name the learners you interviewed

No answer provided.

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

Yes - fully compliant

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

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)

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

No answer provided.

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

Low

Medium

High

Very high

Rationale for the risk judgement

No answer provided.

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

QA staff sampled/interviewed

L HOLMES

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

The centre has a schedule for undertaking internal Quality Assurance of the programmes and qualifications. Although 100% sampling takes place before being submitted for claims, the EV has recommended that interim sampling could be reduced due to the quality of the delivery.

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 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

Good rigorous IQA with competent staff with requested documentation available which was complete accurate and regular meetings provide a good closure of issues raised as part of the IQA process.

Was the staff performance and knowledge adequate?

Occupational knowledge for delivery and assessment of the qualification meets the requirements. This was confirmed by viewing CV's and qualifications to prove occupational competence.

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 - **SELECTED**

Q & A session - **SELECTED**

Practical demonstration - **SELECTED**

Group participation

Appropriate training materials

Appropriate visual aids used - **SELECTED**

Summarise session

Appropriate tasks/exercises used - **SELECTED**

Appropriate learner support

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

Particular assessment requirements are taken in to account and highlighted during the induction process and continually monitored for change.

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

Low - SELECTED

Medium

High

Very high

Rationale for the risk judgement

There is no risk to qualification delivery.

SECTION: Learner experience

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

Learners you interviewed/sampled

DEI Mark Bryant 002 005

David Kizza 008 009

M.Shaddick 002 003005006 007 008 009

S.Rice 005 006

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

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 No - learner(s) felt they had insufficient time No - inadequate learner plan in place **Did the learner(s) understand the process and qualification?**Yes 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)**

No answer provided.

Notes

No learners were interviewed during this visit. Evidence was derived from sampling of portfolios and feedback from Assessors.

Sampling of portfolios and centre records provide evidence that learners understood the process and qualification, had received feedback and appropriate materials and had enough time to complete the qualifications.

Details of any actions the centre must address

No actions added.

Potential Risk

Low - SELECTED

Medium

High

Very high

Rationale for the risk judgement

There is no risk

SECTION: Advice and support

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

(Additional) Topics/details covered in this engagement

There was also a discussion on site assessing, and the Qualified Supervisor qualification, and it was suggested that this was incorporated into the next EAL Regional Briefing. There was an NVQ portfolio which was currently under completion and it was noted that some of the evidence had been referenced against knowledge. The Centre was reminded that performance needed to be referenced against examples from the real working environment. Other areas discussed were
Extending domestic installer end date and mapping to the QS
The use of Windows 8 with the on line examinations.
Rail qualifications and other possible associated EAL qualifications.
No documents added.

Notes

[Claims - Claims 041113.docx](#) private to this form

[EV Strategy - Morris Electrical EV centre strategy2.doc](#) private to this form

End of form