



Centre Monitoring Report

Royal Academy of Dance (RAD)

20 November 2013

Note

Restricted or commercially sensitive information gathered during SQA Accreditation's quality assurance activities is treated in the strictest confidence. However, please note the following:

- ◆ The findings of this report and the associated Action Plan will be presented to SQA's Accreditation Committee.
- ◆ The report and Action Plan will be published on SQA Accreditation's website following receipt of the signed acceptance of audit findings.
- ◆ The contents will contribute towards the Quality Enhancement Rating which will, in turn, contribute towards the quality assurance activity and timescales.

Please note that SQA Accreditation's quality assurance activities are conducted on a sampling basis. Consequently, not all aspects of an awarding body's performance in quality assurance, contract compliance, implementation, awarding of certificates and fee arrangements (not an exhaustive list) may have been considered in this report to the same depth.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Scope and approach of centre monitoring | 1 |
| 1.2 | Centre monitoring report timeline | 2 |
| 1.3 | Centre monitoring dates | 2 |
| 1.4 | Overview | 2 |
| 2 | Centre monitoring findings | 3 |
| 2.1 | Areas of good practice | 3 |
| 2.2 | Requirements | 3 |
| 2.3 | Recommendations | 3 |
| 3 | List of documents reviewed during centre monitoring | 4 |
| 4 | Risk rating of Requirements | 5 |
| 5 | Acceptance of centre monitoring findings | 6 |

1 Introduction

1.1 Scope and approach of centre monitoring

SQA Accreditation conducts quality assurance activities of all awarding bodies offering SQA accredited qualifications or Units. This involves monitoring a sample of the awarding body's approved centres/providers or assessment sites. All centre monitoring will be conducted in a consistent manner within and between centres. The aim of monitoring is to:

- ◆ Ensure compliance under **SQA Accreditation's *Regulatory Principles (2011)*, *Regulatory Principles Directives*, the requirements of the clauses within and any conditions attached to the approved awarding body agreement and the Criteria for Accredited Qualifications.**
- ◆ 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 centres.
- ◆ Inform future audit and monitoring activity for the awarding body.

All Principles were included within the scope of the monitoring activity.

A Requirement has been raised where SQA Accreditation found evidence that the awarding body has not met SQA Accreditation's regulatory requirements.

The following timescales apply:

- ◆ SQA Accreditation will issue this report within 30 working days of the final centre monitoring date.
- ◆ The awarding body must sign and return the report and associated Action Plan within 30 working days of the centre monitoring report being issued.
- ◆ Within a further 20 working days of receiving the proposed Action Plan, SQA Accreditation will confirm whether the Action Plan is appropriate to address the Requirements. This will be subject to the actions proving appropriate to the Requirements raised.
- ◆ SQA Accreditation will monitor progress towards completion of the actions identified in the Action Plan.

A Recommendation may be recorded in instances where SQA Accreditation considers there to be scope for improvement. Where these are agreed during centre monitoring, they are recorded on the report for future reference. As Recommendations are recorded for awarding body consideration only, it is not necessary to agree either actions or timescales to resolve these in the awarding body Action Plan.

1.2 Centre monitoring report timeline

SQA Accreditation centre monitoring report date 11 December 2013

Date centre monitoring report to be signed and submitted by RAD 3 February 2014

1.3 Centre monitoring dates

One approved examination centre was monitored on 20 November 2013.

1.4 Overview

As a result of the centre monitoring activities, no Requirements have been raised and one Recommendation has been recorded. Only Requirements form the basis of the Action Plan therefore no Action Plan has been included in this report.

| Outcome | Area of concern | Risk rating |
|------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Recommendation 1 | Principle 6 | N/A |

2 Centre monitoring findings

The following sections detail Requirements raised and Recommendations recorded against SQA Accreditation's *Regulatory Principles (2011)*, Regulatory Principles Directives, the requirements of the clauses within and any conditions attached to the Approved Awarding Body agreement and the Criteria for Accredited Qualifications.

2.1 Areas of good practice

The following areas of good practice were noted at the approved examination centre. The exam attendant (teacher/applicant) highlighted the:

- ◆ professional and helpful nature of RAD's Examiners
- ◆ efficiency of RAD staff in dealing with any issues raised and how they are always very quick to respond

The examiner highlighted good communication from RAD with plenty of notice when scheduling exams.

2.2 Requirements

No Requirements have been raised.

2.3 Recommendations

Principle 6: The awarding body and their approved centres must have the relevant expertise, quality assurance procedures, technological, financial, human resources and other physical resources, to carry out their regulated functions, during the life of the qualifications and Units they offer.

The *RAD Examinations Information, Rules and Regulations* document states under 4.5.6 that 'Lighting: the studio should be well lit by natural or artificial light. Where direct sunlight is likely to obstruct either the candidate's or Examiner's focus or attention, there should be blinds, curtains or shutters'.

On the day of the approved examination centre visit the pianist commented to the Accreditation Auditor that the direct sunlight had made it difficult for them to read the sheet music. However, the Accreditation Auditor observed no impact of this during the examination. **This has been recorded as Recommendation 1.**

RAD may wish to consider incorporating an instruction to 'always check lighting conditions with the accompanist' within its *RAD Examinations Information, Rules and Regulations* document.

3 List of documents reviewed during centre monitoring

| Document title | Date of issue | Version number |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| RAD Examinations Information, Rules and Regulations | 31 March 2013 | |
| Specification: RAD Graded Examinations in Dance: Grade 4–5 (Ballet) at SCQF Level 5 | 1 March 2013 | |
| RAD Examinations Operations Manual | January 2013 | |
| RAD Entry Forms AEC1 & AEC2 | 2013 | |
| RAD Conflicts of Interest Policy | March 2012 | |
| RAD Diversity and Equality Policies and Procedures | July 2012 | |
| RAD Customer Service Statement | August 2012 | |
| RAD Examiner Allocation Policy | February 2013 | |
| RAD Annual Examination Tour Planning Policy | February 2013 | |
| RAD Tour Scheduling Policy | March 2013 | |
| RAD Focus on Exams | February 2013 | Issue 1 |
| RAD Policy and procedures for processing and issuing results and Certificates | March 2012 | |
| RAD Procedures for Monitoring the Work of Examiners | November 2012 | |
| RAD Examinations Operations Manual | | |
| RAD Examiners Handbook | April 2012 | |
| RAD Examiner Tour Quality Assurance Report | | |
| RAD Notification of a Candidate with a Disability/Condition & Application for Reasonable Adjustments: Graded and Vocational Graded Examinations | | |
| RAD Special Consideration Application Form | | |
| RAD Special Considerations — Internal Guidelines | | |
| RAD Complaints, enquiries about results, and appeals | May 2012 | |
| RAD Malpractice and Maladministration Policy | August 2012 | |
| RAD Policy and Procedures for the Recognition of Centres to offer Awards | February 2013 | |

4 Risk rating of Requirements

SQA Accreditation assigns a risk rating to each Requirement recorded as a result of awarding body quality assurance activity. The table below illustrates how the rating for a Requirement is assigned. A weighting is applied that depends on the risk identified and the possible impact on qualifications and/or the learner of failure to implement that Requirement.

The assignment of a risk rating allows an awarding body to assign their resources to areas which have been identified as having a major impact on the qualifications and/or the learner. The risk rating also allows SQA Accreditation to assign its resources to support awarding bodies in improving their performance.

| Risk | Impact of Requirements identified through quality assurance activity |
|-----------|---|
| Very Low | The Requirement has been identified as likely to cause minimal concern and would not threaten the integrity of the qualification or impact adversely on the learner. Any overall effect is likely to be small scale and/or localised, rather than widespread. The identified Requirement is unlikely to recur once resolved and no long lasting damage would be anticipated. |
| Low | The Requirement has been identified as low impact but is of sufficient importance to merit intervention, with a low threat to the systems or procedures associated with the qualification and/or impact on the learner. Disruption may not just be localised but more widespread and would possibly cause residual damage; however, this could be easily corrected without further consequence. |
| Medium | The Requirement has been identified as having the potential to damage the credibility of the qualification and/or be detrimental to the learner. There may be some impact to the systems or procedures that support the qualification or the operational effectiveness of the awarding body. |
| High | The Requirement has been identified as having a potentially high impact on the integrity and reliability of the qualification, or the effective operation of the awarding body as a whole, if corrective action is not quickly taken. There is a high probability that the qualification and/or learner will be negatively affected. |
| Very High | The Requirement has been identified as having a serious impact on the integrity and reliability of the qualification or the effective operation of the awarding body if corrective action is not immediately taken. There is a very high probability that the qualification and/or learner will be negatively affected. |

In assigning a risk rating, each Requirement is considered on its own merit, taking account of the context in which it was identified.

5 Acceptance of centre monitoring findings

For and on behalf of RAD:

Signature

.....

Designation

.....

Date

.....

For and on behalf of SQA Accreditation:

Signature

.....

Designation

.....

Date

.....