

**Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework Partnership (SCQFP)  
Periodic Review Report (2018)  
Executive Summary**

**Name of CRB:** City and Guilds London Institute (CGLI)

**Date of periodic review visit:** 27 November 2017

**Background to the periodic review**

The City and Guilds London Institute (CGLI) was initially approved by the SCQF Partnership as a CRB in 2009. Its previous periodic review was in 2014. Since then CGLI has undergone a period of restructuring and the Institute of Leadership and Management relinquished its status as a separate CRB and its programmes now come under CGLI responsibilities. During this time CGLI has undergone three annual monitoring activities. This periodic review visit was carried out in November 2017.

*Process Note: each review is carried out by a team consisting of a member of the SCQF Quality Committee, an SCQF Partnership Officer and an External Reviewer. The CRB makes a submission using a standard template and considering the SCQF Quality Assurance Model Criteria. Following the submission, a visit is carried out to the CRB's premises and a full report produced. This document notes the key finding within that full report.*

**Summary of findings**

*Criterion 1 A Body of Good Standing*

*Highlights*

- CGLI has a long history of working with a wide range of education and training provision and a deep and clear knowledge and understanding of these systems is embedded in the organisation;
- The membership of the Scotland National Advisory Committee had been refreshed and a new chair was in place;
- The vacant post of Scotland Manager had been filled;
- The policy for equality and diversity for learners was clearly explained;
- A master staff matrix monitors and records evidence of training including that for SCQF.

*Areas for development/action*

- The strategy for the use of CGLI's credit rating status in Scotland was not clear;
- There was a lack of clarity over CGLI's ongoing commitment to Scotland, the SCQF and credit rating.

## *Criterion 2 Robust Quality Assurance System*

### *Highlights*

- An audit plan for internal and external reviews over a 12-month period was in place and the audit committee and quality assurance committee worked together to ensure any actions from these are actioned;
- Internal and external reviews had been carried out and a subsequent action plan developed;
- The external review had been conducted by another CRB which highlighted a number of actions. The actions outlined were not yet implemented as the report was still in draft. These would be reported through the CGLI committee structure by the end of 2017 once the final report was received;
- The internal review showed a robust and thorough review of the QA system. This was also still in draft format but it was reported that an action plan would be formulated and monitored by the Regulatory Policy and Audit team.

### *Areas for development/action*

- Whilst the quality assurance process was clearly articulated during the visit, there were a number of different departments and individuals involved which means the system seemed fragmented;
- There was some confusion around the ownership of the different aspects of the new qualification and product review process which had been implemented in March 2017;
- The newness of the product review process and the recent appointment of the Scotland Manager meant that much of the evidence for credit rated programmes predated the revised process and it was considered that it would take some time before the organisation would be able to demonstrate the robustness of the new system;
- There were some issues of document control highlighted during the review. There was a documented process for developing, submitting and maintaining qualifications and learning programmes for Scotland however there was some confusion as to the latest version of this.

## *Criterion 3 Capacity and Commitment*

### *Highlights*

- Staff had attended training conducted by other CGLI staff and three members of staff had attended SCQFP run workshops. Some ILM staff had been previously trained when ILM was a CRB in its own right;
- Communication of credit rated programmes to staff is conducted through a range of methods including handbooks, support materials and electronic bulletins;
- Subject experts carry out the credit rating of qualifications and an independent setter and checker are deployed to review the programmes objectively.

### *Areas for development/action*

- There were many more learners based in Scotland registered on non-SCQF credit rated programmes than there were registered on credit rated programmes;
- SCQF information is available through City and Guilds and ILM websites however the information on the City and Guilds website is not easy to find and not very visible to learners;
- It was noted that there was room for improvement in the recording of the review of programmes to ensure an audit trail of changes implemented;

#### *Criterion 4 Third Party Credit Rating*

- CBI does not have third party credit rating authority.

#### *SCQF Credit rated programmes, Database accuracy and certification*

##### *Highlights*

- The list of credit rated provision supplied corresponded with the information on the SCQF database;
- A new certificate for ILM products was presented which differed from the previously submitted although the new format was still acceptable;
- City and Guilds sample certificates were in order.

##### *Areas for development/action*

- The sampling of credit rated programmes highlighted some inconsistencies in the completion of the paperwork;
- CGLI was unable to produce fully signed off paperwork for some of the programmes sampled, whilst it was appreciated that these were older programmes, no regular review in terms of the credit rating seemed to have taken place and no review had taken place at the time of City and Guilds taking over responsibility for these programmes as the CRB.

***Process Note: the full review report together with an action plan from the CRB responding to the areas highlighted for development/action are submitted to the SCQF Quality Committee which makes recommendations to the SCQF Board. The decision of the SCQF Board is based on the review of the report and of the appropriateness of the CRB's action plan in responding to the draft report.***

#### **SCQF Board decision and conditions/recommendations**

The Board concluded that there was a significant number of unresolved issues highlighted in this report which had previously been noted in monitoring reports and that the action plan submitted following this report was not sufficient to resolve these issues. It therefore decided that CGLI should be allowed to continue as a CRB for one year only whilst working towards demonstrating that they could meet the conditions and recommendations established by the Board. CGLI worked towards this setting out an action plan, meeting with SCQF Executive Officers, and reporting on progress on a regular basis to the SCQF Board.

As a result of this work, CGLI submitted a final update in February 2019. Directors of the Board agreed at their meeting in March 2019 that the work carried out by CGLI had addressed all the substantive issues that had been identified during this prolonged process and as a result the Board agreed that CBI could continue to act as an SCQFP Approved Credit Rating Body subject to annual monitoring by visit. There were no specific conditions or recommendations remaining at the end of this process.