

FETAC Desk Monitoring Report
February 2012

FETAC Desk Monitoring Report

Certification Period

February 2012

Contents

1. Details of Provider
2. Evidence Reviewed
3. Monitor Findings
4. Areas for Improvement and Recommendations
5. Monitoring Outcomes
6. Recommendations/Actions to be taken by FETAC
7. Provider Feedback

1. Details of Provider

Provider Name SQT Training Ltd.

Provider Address Limerick

Provider Registration No. 38111U

Monitoring Focus <i>Please tick as appropriate</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Monitoring Type <i>Please tick as appropriate</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Standard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Thematic	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non Standard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Programme	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Quality System	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Assessment	X
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Evidence Reviewed - Please List

IV report

EA report

RAP report

3. Monitor Findings including good practice and areas for improvement

IV report.

A very good report covering all of the learner's assessments over 11 modules. There are some very good comments indicating that the verification process has been conducted rigorously.

EA report.

Sampling is fine and there are some very good comments that should prove useful to the provider. There were 9 grade changes out of 94 learners. It would have been useful to have more information as to the circumstances for these changes.

RAP report.

A very good report indicating a thorough analysis of both IV and EA reports as well as a complete review of learner performance across all modules. This has produced some ideas for improvements.

4. Areas for Improvement and Recommendations

	The provider must	By this date
4.1 Essential Recommendations (Required Action(s))		
Recommendations to Provider 4.2 Developmental Recommendations	The provider should consider Continuing to ensure good practice and follow through on areas for improvement identified.	

5. Monitoring Outcomes (insert outcome no)

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality assurance of authentication is effective 2. <i>Quality assurance of authentication of assessment is effective with minor areas for improvement</i> 3. <i>Quality assurance of authentication of assessment is moderately effective with significant areas for improvement</i> 4. <i>Quality assurance of authentication of assessment is not effective</i> 	1
---	----------

6. Recommendations/Actions to be taken by FETAC – tick box ✓

<i>a) Conduct site visit to follow up on the implementation of the essential recommendations as set out above</i>	
<i>b) Request assessment reports from provider for review for its next assessment period</i>	
<i>c) With-hold provider certification until recommendations set out in section 5 are fully addressed</i>	
d) Provider to be commended by FETAC on good practice	X

7. Provider Feedback

In this section the Provider, having participated in the Monitoring process, is invited to provide feedback following the completion of the Draft Desk Monitoring Report by the FETAC Monitor.

Feedback and Comments

FETAC Desk Monitoring Report
October 2011

FETAC Desk Monitoring Report

Certification Period

October 2011

Contents

1. Details of Provider
2. Evidence Reviewed
3. Monitor Findings
4. Areas for Improvement and Recommendations
5. Monitoring Outcomes
6. Recommendations/Actions to be taken by FETAC
7. Provider Feedback

1. Details of Provider

Provider Name	SQT Training
Provider Address	
Provider Registration No.	38111U

Monitoring Focus <i>Please tick as appropriate</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Monitoring Type <i>Please tick as appropriate</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Thematic	
Non Standard			Programme	
			Quality System	
			Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
			Other	

2. Evidence Reviewed - Please List

External Authenticators report
Internal Verification report
Results Approval panel meeting report

3. Monitor Findings including good practice and areas for improvement

Overall work was clear and all supporting documentation was fully completed. The external authentication report was quite detailed and contained some commentary on the quality and standard of work presented by learners. It is suggested that for future reference this report should be typed. The sampling strategy used is clear and consistent.

While the internal verification report is good and quite detailed with some comments in relation to work being presented by learners, it is noted that the report is dated for the day following the external authentication visit. It is an essential component of the external authentication process that the internal verification report is available for viewing by the external authenticator.

The results approval panel meeting minutes are also quite clear and detailed with a good template used for the process.

4. Areas for Improvement and Recommendations		
4.1 Essential Recommendations (Required Action(s))	The provider must	By this date
	<p>Ensure that the internal verification report is completed and available for the external authenticator visit and for the results approval meeting process.</p> <p>Explain and clarify the arrangements regarding the Internal Verification report as soon as possible using the feedback (page 6) section of the report.</p>	Prior to the next assessment period.
Recommendations to Provider 4.2 Developmental Recommendations	The provider should consider	
	Ensuring all reports are prepared electronically.	

5. Monitoring Outcomes (insert outcome no) 2

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quality assurance of authentication is effective 2. Quality assurance of authentication of assessment is effective with minor areas for improvement 3. Quality assurance of authentication of assessment is moderately effective with significant areas for improvement 4. Quality assurance of authentication of assessment is not effective 	2
--	---

6. Recommendations/Actions to be taken by FETAC – tick box ✓

a) Conduct site visit to follow up on the implementation of the essential recommendations as set out above	
b) Request assessment reports from provider for review for its next assessment period	✓
c) With-hold provider certification until recommendations set out in section 5 are fully addressed	
d) Provider to be commended by FETAC on good practice	

7. Provider Feedback

In this section the Provider, having participated in the Monitoring process, is invited to provide feedback following the completion of the Draft Desk Monitoring Report by the FETAC Monitor.

Feedback and Comments

Angela/Tina, Thank you for your feedback. Here are our comments.

Re: Internal Verification

The internal verification took place on 30 Sept as per the front page of the document and was signed on that day on the front. The form was reviewed by the External Authenticator on 4 October during his visit. When I was sending the forms to FETAC on 5/10/11, I noticed that the last signature at the very end wasn't completed and I signed it just before sending, hence the date of the 5/10/11. Sorry if this was misleading. The Internal Verification is always completed before the External Authentication and the report has always been made available to the External Authenticator.

Re: External Authenticator Report

We will ask the External Authenticator to type his report for all future assessments.

FETAC Desk Monitoring Report
December 2010

FETAC Desk Monitoring Report

Date of Completion

20 December 2010

Contents

1. Details of Provider
2. Evidence Reviewed
3. Monitor Findings
4. Good Practice Identified
5. Areas for Improvement Identified
6. Conclusions and Outcomes
7. Recommendations/Actions to be taken by FETAC
8. Provider Feedback

1. Details of Provider

Date	9 th August 2011
Provider Name	SQT
Provider Address	Limerick
Provider Registration No.	38111U
E-mail	
Type of Provider	Private Provider

Monitoring Focus <i>Please tick as appropriate</i>	Yes	No	Monitoring Type <i>Please tick as appropriate</i>	Yes	No
Standard			Thematic		
Non Standard			Programme		
			Quality System		
			Assessment	X	
			Other		

2. Evidence Reviewed - Please List

IV report
EA report
RAP report

3. Monitor Findings - Overall

IV Report

A good report based on sampling 100% of learners as is the stated policy of SQT. In this case there were 5 assessors across all of the modules involved. Constructive comments were made for all modules/awards in the reports.

EA Report

The EA stated that the sample size used was 30% with at least one from each course. There were 8 modules in total and it was stated that 27 awards were moderated. From the list of learners given there were 63 learners in total across 8 modules. It is a bit unclear which learners were moderated from which modules. One result was changed. It would be helpful if there was a standard system to sampling and a clear statement of sample selected and any changes explicitly identified. There were 4 cases of close borderline marks, but none were noted as changed. The EA comments against each module were clear and helpful.

RAP Report

The RAP presented indicates a thorough review and analysis of all aspects of the courses involved.

4. Good Practice Identified – Please List

5. Areas for Improvement Identified and Recommendations to Provider

See section 4 and 5 of the FETAC Quality Assurance Assessment Guidelines for Providers.

	The provider must:	By this date
5.1 Essential Recommendations (Required Action(s))	A more uniform approach to sampling would be desirable for both IV and EA. If they each choose a different sample, it would be useful to have details of each. If grades are changed it would also be useful to have them identified.	
Recommendations to Provider 5.2 Developmental Recommendations	The provider should consider	

6. Monitoring Outcomes

Desk Monitoring Outcomes	<p>1.</p> <p>2. QA effective subject to minor areas for improvement.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>4.</p>	
Monitor FM08		
Date 8/1/11		

7. Recommendations/Actions to be taken by FETAC

<i>a) Conduct site visit to follow up on the implementation of the essential recommendations as set out above</i>
<i>b) Request assessment reports from provider for review for its next assessment period</i>
<i>c) With-hold provider certification until recommendations set out in section 5 are fully addressed</i>
d) Provider to be commended by FETAC on good practice
.
<i>e) FETAC to initiate provider review of registration</i>

8. Provider Feedback

In this section the Provider, having participated in the Monitoring process, is invited to provide feedback following the completion of the Draft Desk Monitoring Report by the FETAC Monitor.

Feedback and Comments

A more uniform approach to sampling would be desirable for both IV and EA. If they each choose a different sample, it would be useful to have details of each.

SQT are happy that the Internal Verification sampling process is comprehensive and will continue to 100% check assessment work.

It is a bit unclear which learners were moderated from which modules. One result was changed. It would be helpful if there was a standard system to sampling and a clear statement of sample selected and any changes explicitly identified. There were 4 cases of close borderline marks, but none were noted as changed.

Moderated learners are identified on our Summary Results Sheet for each Roll Class. We would be happy to submit copies of these along with the IV, EA & RAP reports, to show which assessments were reviewed. We will ask the EA to make comment also instead of just initialling them. The EA does already look at borderline results, and in some cases is happy to leave the mark as is, as he feels that it doesn't warrant moving the person up a grade if it's not consistent with the work of someone who deserves it. Again, we will ask him to make comment.

The external authenticator will be required to carry out a min 10% sampling strategy **and** also ensuring that there are a minimum of 12 Assessments from each Component which ever is greater.

If grades are changed it would also be useful to have them identified.

This will now be visible from the Roll Class Summary Results Sheet. The EA will have them identified going forward.