QQI
Quality and Qualifications Ireland
Dearbhú Cáilíochta agus Cáilíochtaí Éireann

Reengagement Panel Report

Assessment of Capacity and Approval of QA Procedures

Part 1   Details of provider

1.1   Applicant Provider

Registered Business/Trading Name:	Chris Mee Safety Engineering
Address:	Euro Business Park, Little Island, Cork
Date of application:	17 June, 2019
Date of resubmission of application:	28 January, 2021
Date of site visit:	4 December, 2019
Date of reconvene meeting:	16 February, 2021
Date of recommendation to the Programmes and Awards Executive Committee:	8 April, 2020 and 8 April, 2021

1.2   Profile of provider

Chris Mee Safety Engineering was founded in 1996 to provide health and safety consultancy services. Since then, the service offering has expanded to include health and safety training, and a recruitment agency for health and safety professionals.

The company has been registered with QQI/FETAC since 2007, providing a range of minor component programmes relevant to the Health and Safety sector. These programmes include Health and Safety Representation, Safety and Health at Work, Manual Handling Instruction, Training Delivery and Evaluation and Building Energy Rating Assessment for Dwellings.

While all potential learners are catered for, the programmes offered fit in with the overall scope of training provided by CMSE. Experienced Health and Safety professionals are the majority learner cohort on programmes offered. CMSE offers other non-QQI accredited courses such as those leading to IOSH,

NEBOSH and PHECC awards, as well as their own non-accredited courses to clients all over Ireland. This leads to approximately 20,000 learners being taught by CMSE annually.

CMSE is an ISO certified company, holding certificates in ISO 9001, ISO 14001 and ISO 45001.

Part 2   Panel Membership

Name	Role of panel member	Organisation
David Denieffe	Chair	Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Registrar, IT Carlow
Alan O'Gorman	QA Expert	QA Officer, Waterford and Wexford ETB
Pamela Skerritt	Subject Matter Expert	Independent Consultant
Lorraine Halpin	Head of a similar type of Provider	Registrar, SQT Training Limited, Limerick
Amanda Russell	Report Writer	QA Officer, CCT College Dublin
Matthew Hurley	Report Writer (Reconvene Panel, Feb. 2021)	QA Officer, Bridge Mills Galway Language Centre

Part 3   Findings of the Panel

3.1   Summary Findings

The panel acknowledges the established good standing of CMSE, and CMSE's track record of certification. The reengagement process involved a comprehensive review by the panel of the provider's QA documentation and a site visit to CMSE in Cork. During the site visit, the panel engaged in discussions with CMSE leadership. CMSE's representatives engaged constructively with the panel throughout the discussions.

Following the original site visit, the panel recommended that QQI refuse to approve the draft QA procedures presented by CMSE's for reengagement pending mandatory changes. These are detailed in Section 7.1 of this report. The panel also offered a number of commendations to the provider.

The panel noted the work completed, to that date, by CMSE to develop its QA system; however, there were a number of areas that needed to be addressed before approval could be recommended. In particular, the panel noted the challenges in developing a quality management system which encompasses the policies, procedures, guidelines and requirements of the numerous agencies with which the provider is engaged.

As part of the process of reengagement, evidence of a critical self-review was not apparent to the panel. To address this, the panel believed that a thorough gap analysis developed with reference to QQI Core Quality Assurance Guidelines would aid CMSE in developing the further documentation required to

support quality assurance, including:

• Quality Improvement Plan (QIP)
• Process Mapping
• Overview of QA – 1 page linking to QQI guidelines
• Enhanced Learner Handbook
• Strengthened procedural detail in some policies included in the QA manual, setting out clearly the expectations of all parties including management and instructors. This would include the support of tutors and the trainer observation form.

The panel reconvened on 16 February, 2021, after undertaking a desk review of the revised documentation submitted by CMSE in respect of the mandatory changes detailed in Section 7.1.

The panel noted the significant process of development undertaken by CMSE to address the mandatory changes, including the appointment of a Quality and Training Manager, a Quality Co-ordinator, and an external, independent Quality Champion. Additionally, an Academic Council and Programme Review and Development Committee were established. Despite the challenges presented by such significant changes in staffing and governance, the revised documentation submitted by CMSE comprehensively addressed the concerns identified by the panel at the site visit in 2019.

While a number of items of Specific Advice (detailed in Section 7.2) were noted to guide the provider in particular areas going forward, the panel nonetheless has confidence in CMSE's ability to continuously enhance its QA processes. The panel is therefore pleased to recommend to QQI *Approval* of CMSE's QA procedures.

3.2 Recommendation of the panel to Programmes and Awards Executive Committee of QQI

	Tick <u>one</u> as appropriate
Approve Chris Mee Safety Engineering's draft QA procedures	✓
Refuse approval of Chris Mee Safety Engineering's draft QA procedures **pending mandatory changes** set out in Section 6.1 (If this recommendation is accepted by QQI, the provider may make a revised application within six months of the decision)	
Refuse to approve Chris Mee Safety Engineering's draft QA procedures	

Part 4 Evaluation of provider capacity

4.1 Legal and compliance requirements:

	Criteria	*Yes/No/ Partially*	*Comments*
4.1.1(a)	**Criterion:** *Is the applicant an established Legal Entity who has Education and/or Training as a Principal Function?*	**Yes**	CMSE provided a Certificate of Incorporation with its application. CMSE has an established track record of providing accredited programmes of Education and Training.
4.1.2(a)	**Criterion:** *Is the legal entity established in the European Union and does it have a substantial presence in Ireland?*	**Yes**	CMSE is a legal entity in the EU, with a presence in Cork & Dublin.
4.1.3(a)	**Criterion:** *Are any dependencies, collaborations, obligations, parent organisations, and subsidiaries clearly specified?*	**Yes**	The provider has not indicated its involvement in any form of collaborative provision, nor has it identified any dependencies or obligations.
4.1.4(a)	**Criterion:** *Are any third-party relationships and partnerships compatible with the scope of access sought?*	**Yes**	As per the QA manual, CMSE currently does not engage with external partnerships, use second providers or sub-contract the provision of programmes and has no immediate plans to so do. There is no indication that its relationships with other awarding bodies will impact on delivery of programmes leading to QQI awards.
4.1.5(a)	**Criterion:** *Are the applicable regulations and legislation complied with in all jurisdictions where it operates?*	**Yes**	The evidence provided in support of CMSE's application is indicative of compliance with Irish/EU legislation.
4.1.6(a)	**Criterion:** *Is the applicant in good standing in the qualifications systems and*	**Yes**	CMSE has been registered with QQI (formerly FETAC) since 2007 and there have been no

	education and training systems in any countries where it operates (or where its parents or subsidiaries operate) or enrols learners, or where it has arrangements with awarding bodies, quality assurance agencies, qualifications authorities, ministries of education and training, professional bodies and regulators.		issues identified with the provider.

Findings

The panel is satisfied that the legal and compliance requirements outlined in Section 4.1 are currently being met by CMSE.

CMSE has a track record of engagement with FETAC (since 2007). The provider submitted a statement of compliance and documentation with its application for reengagement that is indicative of adherence to the legal and compliance requirements of QQI.

4.2 Resource, governance and structural requirements:

	Criteria	*Yes/No/ Partially*	*Comments*
4.2.1(a)	**Criterion:** *Does the applicant have a sufficient resource base and is it stable and in good financial standing?*	**Yes**	CMSE provided financial statements for 2017, confirmation from Revenue 2015 – 2017 and a current Certificate of Insurance to demonstrate the case.
4.2.2(a)	**Criterion:** *Does the applicant have a reasonable business case for sustainable provision?*	**Yes**	As an established provider, CMSE has demonstrated a history of sustainable business provision although the volume of QQI provision has reduced over the past number of years.
4.2.3(a)	**Criterion:** *Are fit-for-purpose governance, management and decision making structures in place?*	**Yes**	At the time of the initial site visit in 2019, the panel felt there was a lack of clarity in the governance structures in the evidence provided. In particular, the responsibilities of all parties to the QA procedures needed to be set out.

Following a review of revised documentation in 2021, the panel is pleased with the development of the Academic Council, Programme Review and Development Committee and Results Approval Panel, as well as Terms of Reference for these bodies. The panel is of the view that these developments are a positive step forward for CMSE in the ongoing enhancement of its QA system. |
| 4.2.4(a) | **Criterion:** *Are there arrangements in place for providing required information to QQI?* | **Yes** | There is evidence of processes in place to provide QQI with information as required. |

Findings

The panel is satisfied CMSE meets the financial requirements.

In relation to 4.2.2(a), the panel noted at the original site visit in 2019 that while CMSE has a proven record of sustaining provision, there has been a significant decline in demand for its QQI awarded programmes due to legislation changes relating to some of its programmes. It would have been beneficial for the panel to see where QQI fits in the context of CMSE's overall longer-term strategy.

In relation to 4.2.3 (a), the panel encouraged CMSE, when it met the provider at the site visit, to complete a gap analysis to identify the shortfalls in this area. A clear separation of commercial and academic decision making needed to be identified with responsibilities clearly delineated.

At the time of the initial site visit, the panel noted that CMSE supplied Terms of Reference for its Education and Training Committee on request prior to the site visit; however, during the site visit, CMSE indicated that the Committee would sit twice a year, notwithstanding the fact that it also acts as the Results Approval Panel, and it was indicated that CMSE has six certification dates per year. Therefore, the panel required the Terms of Reference of the new Education and Training Committee and any connected committees to be revised and made more fully reflective of its (their) function(s).

In the interim period — which included a one-off extension of three months at the start of the COVID-19 pandemic to reflect the time required by providers to transition to an online working environment — extensive work was undertaken of the provider's governance structure. An Academic Council, Programme Review and Development Committee and Results Approval Panel were developed, and comprehensive Terms of Reference were provided for each. In light of these significant enhancements, the panel is satisfied that CMSE has addressed the initial concerns identified under this area of QA.

4.3   Programme development and provision requirements:

	Criteria	Yes/No/ Partially	Comments
4.3.1(a)	**Criterion:** *Does the applicant have experience and a track record in providing education and training programmes?*	**Yes**	CMSE has been registered with QQI (formerly FETAC) since 2007 and has been delivering further education and training programmes since then. It also has accreditation from a number of non-QQI awarding bodies.

| 4.3.2(a) | **Criterion:** *Does the applicant have a fit-for-purpose and stable complement of education and training staff?* | **Yes** | CMSE uses a cohort of independent contractors to deliver its programmes. Although a staffing policy was documented, the panel at the original site visit required a more robust recruitment policy, with clear indicators regarding the supports for trainers.

The panel is satisfied that the revised documentation submitted by the provider adequately addresses the issues outlined in this area of QA.

However, the panel noted an item of Specific Advice (detailed in Section 7.2) in relation to the Trainer Charter documentation, which the panel recommends should be updated to be inclusive and reflective of all awarding bodies. |
| 4.3.3(a) | **Criterion:** *Does the applicant have the capacity to comply with the standard conditions for validation specified in Section 45(3) of the Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act (2012) (the Act)?* | **Yes** | The panel is satisfied that CMSE has the capacity to comply with the standard conditions for validation. |
| 4.3.4(a) | **Criterion:** *Does the applicant have the fit-for-purpose premises,* | **Yes** | CMSE has training centres in both Cork and |

	facilities and resources to meet the requirements of the provision proposed in place?		Dublin. It also offers training nationwide. An External Venue Audit Checklist is utilised to ensure venue suitability.
4.3.5(a)	**Criterion:** *Are there access, transfer and progression arrangements that meet QQI's criteria for approval in place?*	**Yes**	CMSE noted that due to the short duration of its programmes, requests for transfer and progression arrangements are an extremely rare occurrence. The QA Manual outlines the provider's procedure; however, at the time of the original site visit, the panel required a more comprehensive RPL policy and procedure for learners. Following a review of CMSE's revised documentation, the panel recommends further development of CMSE's RPL Procedure, particularly in relation to how the process unfolds on a step-by-step basis. The panel noted an item of Specific Advice in respect of this, which is detailed in Section 7.2.
4.3.6(a)	**Criterion:** *Are structures and resources to underpin fair and consistent assessment of learners in place?*	**Yes**	The provider has clear and up to date policies and procedures in place including internal verification and external

			authentication processes. However, at the time of the site visit, the panel felt there was a need for more clarity within the Learner Handbook to include information on *inter alia* appeals, progression, late submission and RPL. As noted in Section 4.3.5(a), the panel is of the view that further development is needed of the provider's RPL procedure. Additionally, the panel has identified an item of Specific Advice relating to the use of the term "corrective action" in the provider's *Appeals* process (Training Centre Handbook, p.25). The panel recommends changing this to "an action for review."
4.3.7(a)	**Criterion:** *Are arrangements for the protection of enrolled learners to meet the statutory obligations in place (where applicable)?*	**N/A**	N/A

Findings

The panel acknowledges CMSE's experience and track record of providing further education and training programmes.

At the time of the site visit in 2019, the panel believed the completion of the gap analysis (using the template supplied by QQI for use by providers in preparation for reengagement) would assist in identifying the shortfalls in polices in the programme development and provision.

4.3.2(a) – The panel recognises CMSE's stated good relationship with a number of qualified trainers who deliver its programmes. However, following the site visit, the panel required an updated recruitment policy and a policy on the supports offered to off-site trainers.

4.3.5(a) / 4.3.6(a) – CMSE presents all potential learners with a Learner Handbook, as an introduction to the provider and the learners' programme. However, following the site visit, the panel believed the Learner Handbook should be updated to provide more clarity on the learner journey through CMSE's programmes, including on such things as appeals, progression, late submission, RPL, access, transfer and progression.

Following a review of CMSE's revised documentation, the panel is largely satisfied that CMSE has addressed the concerns identified under this area of QA. Notwithstanding this, the panel has noted a number of items of Specific Advice, detailed in Section 7.2, pertaining to CMSE's Trainer Charter documentation, RPL procedure, and the wording in its Appeals process.

4.4 Overall findings in respect of provider capacity to provide sustainable education and training

CMSE is an established education and training provider, which offers programmes through several accrediting bodies, incorporating several quality systems.

The panel noted CMSE's intention to create an overarching quality system to incorporate all requirements for its programmes. As noted, following the site visit in 2019, the panel recommended that CMSE complete a thorough gap analysis to help ensure an enhanced quality system and address the deficiencies identified.

The panel identified some areas where *mandatory changes* were necessary and was confident these could be addressed by CMSE within the allocated period. These are listed in section 7.1 of this report.

The panel would like to commend CMSE on the extensive work undertaken to address the *mandatory changes,* and has confidence in its capacity to provide sustainable education and training going forward.

QQI
Quality and Qualifications Ireland
Dearbhú Cáilíochta agus Cáilíochtaí Éireann

Part 5   Evaluation of draft QA Procedures submitted by Chris Mee Safety Engineering

The following is the panel's findings following evaluation of Chris Mee Safety Engineering quality assurance procedures against QQI's Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines (April 2016) and Topic Specific QA Guidelines. Sections 1-11 of the report follows the structure and referencing of the Core QA Guidelines.

1   GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT OF QUALITY

Panel Findings:

QQI's Core Guidelines (2016) require a provider's system of academic governance to be independent of commercial considerations. (CSQAG, p.6) At the site visit with the provider in 2019, the panel found that the documentation provided did not indicate a clear separation of commercial and academic decision-making. The role of the Central Services and Training Manager had responsibility for the development of programmes, acting as Chair on the Education and Training Committee and was also a member of the SMT. As such, the panel felt there may be a crossover between commercial and academic activities.

Consequently, the panel had concerns regarding the actual or perceived conflict of interest that may arise from the presented governance structure.

The panel recommended that a mapping of quality assurance processes throughout the company would demonstrate the roles and responsibilities for implementation of policy and procedure, decision making and follow up. A clearer indication of how quality is embedded through the organisation was required.

The developments within CMSE's governance structure, as set out in the revised documentation submitted, now provide for a clearer distinction between commercial and academic decision-making powers, and the panel is pleased to see the greater level of externality present, particularly within the Programme Review and Development Committee and the Results Approval Panel. The panel is satisfied that mandatory changes required under this area of QA have been appropriately addressed.

2   DOCUMENTED APPROACH TO QUALITY ASSURANCE

Panel Findings:

When the panel met with the provider in 2019, it recognised the challenging requirement of developing a quality system to encompass several accreditation bodies and their requirements. The panel noted that CMSE maintains quality-related documents for the assurance of standards and provision as per the company's ISO 9001 certification.

However, the panel felt the documentation provided did not fully encompass QQI's Core Statutory Guidelines, with further information required on how decisions are made by the provider regarding how procedures are developed. The documentation lacked a clear approach delineating the roles and responsibilities of the team and the relevant committees.

The revised documentation submitted by the provider was viewed by the panel as providing significantly more clarity in relation to the roles and remit of CMSE's staff and committees, as well as closer alignment to QQI's Core Guidelines. The panel is satisfied that the mandatory changes in this area have been appropriately addressed.

3 PROGRAMMES OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Panel Findings:

CMSE has a proven track record of providing education and training programmes. It currently has 9 validated QQI programmes. The development and provision of programmes is driven by market demand, customer request, learner feedback, trainer comments and legalisation demand. Following the site visit in 2019, the panel was concerned about the actual or perceived conflict of interest that may arise from the role of the Central Services and Training Manager in the development of programmes and the commercial responsibility that this role also held.

The panel noted CMSE's intention to publish its QA Manual on the website. The panel discussed the learner's academic journey from admission through to certification and, as referred to in Sections 4.3.5(a) / 4.3.6(a) of this report, found that the policies and procedures in the Learner Handbook should be enhanced to reflect all aspects of the learner's requirements.

CMSE ensures all learners have an opportunity to provide feedback at the end of their programme and can contact their Training Administration through its CRM system. It also seeks feedback from trainers. CMSE programmes also benefit from internal and external verification, assessment sampling and programme auditing.

The panel recognises the significant steps which have been taken to address the aforementioned issues; in particular, the actual or perceived conflict of interest in the development of programmes, and the need for enhancement of the Learner Handbook to be more reflective of learner requirements. While the panel is largely satisfied with the changes which have been made in respect of these concerns, the panel recommends that further development of CMSE's RPL Procedure would be beneficial. An item of Specific Advice is detailed in Section 7.2 in respect of this.

4 STAFF RECRUITMENT, MANAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

Panel Findings:

Unfortunately, due to conflicting events the panel were only able to meet with the Central Service and Training Manager and the HR & Training Quality Coordinator at the site visit and did not get the opportunity to meet with any trainers/instructors. Therefore, the panel was unable to secure sufficient evidence to confirm that the documented procedures around staff management and development are carried out in practice.

As an established training provider, CMSE appears to have a well-established cohort of trainers. The panel felt a policy and procedure regarding the induction of trainers is required, to ensure they are aware of the quality culture of CMSE and how they are supported before, during and after the programme.

The panel acknowledges the extensive trainer and trainer induction documentation submitted by the provider in its revised documentation. The panel is of the view that the provider's Trainer Charter could be further enhanced by referencing all awarding bodies with which CMSE is affiliated. An item of Specific Advice is detailed in Section 7.2 in respect of this.

5	TEACHING AND LEARNING

Panel Findings:

CMSE demonstrated a commitment to self-monitoring through its documentation, ensuring learner and trainer feedback is sought for programme enhancement.

As the panel was unable to meet with any trainers on the day of the site visit, they were restricted with limited consideration possible of the various delivery and pedagogical practices to be utilised.

The panel did note that a Trainer Observation Form was provided. However, this appeared to primarily focus on housekeeping, admin and branding issues and not on content delivery, pedagogical practices or modes of delivery. The panel asked that this Trainer Observation form be amended to provide a focus on content delivery, pedagogical practices and modes of delivery.

A reworked Trainer Observation Form was included in the provider's revised documentation, and now includes sections relating to content and delivery. The panel is satisfied that its concerns in this area have been appropriately addressed.

6	ASSESSMENT OF LEARNERS

Panel Findings:

CMSE presented its policy on the fair and consistent assessment of learners. The presented policy appeared to satisfy the criteria associated with the assessment of learners. While the unavailability of training staff meant the panel did not explore the full implementation of these procedures at the site visit, the panel was nonetheless of the view that the documentation submitted by CMSE appropriately and comprehensively outlined the provider's approach to assessment.

7 SUPPORT FOR LEARNERS

Panel Findings:

The panel acknowledged that the short duration of the provider's programmes means that learners tend to be professionals looking to develop their skillset, and, therefore, the learner support required is different from the traditional full time FET learner.

However, the panel noted a lack of policy position regarding the support of this cohort of learners in the draft QA Manual and recommended that completion of the gap analysis may enable further development in this area.

CMSE's revised documentation included an extensively enhanced Learner Handbook, and a Policy for Learner Support. The panel is of the view that CMSE's developments in this area of QA demonstrate its commitments to learners and the learner experience.

8 INFORMATION AND DATA MANAGEMENT

Panel Findings:

CMSE has developed an in-house record management system to maintain learner information.

At the conclusion of the site visit, the panel found that CMSE's Information and Data Management Policy may benefit from further enhancement following the completion of the gap analysis.

CMSE's revised documentation evidenced further development of its data management practices, with the submission of an overarching Information and Data Management Policy, as well as policies and procedures pertaining to Data Protection, Data Rights Management and Data Breach Management.

The panel is of the view that these developments satisfactorily address QQI's guidelines in this area of QA.

9 PUBLIC INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION

Panel Findings:

CMSE indicated it will publish its draft QA Manual on its website upon completion of the reengagement process.

Information pertaining to QQI programmes on the website offers details on relevant NFQ level, award type and course content.

The panel noted information regarding reasonable accommodation is now available on its website and is sent to learners in the Learner Handbook at the point of enquiry.

In its revised documentation, CMSE submitted an overarching Communications Policy, which outlines the standards and guidelines for the organisation's internal and external communications.

10 OTHER PARTIES INVOLVED IN EDUCATION AND TRAINING (incl. Apprenticeships)

Panel Findings:

The provider did not indicate its involvement in any form of collaborative provision, and the panel is otherwise satisfied that QQI's guidelines under this dimension of QA have been addressed.

11	SELF-EVALUATION, MONITORING AND REVIEW

Panel Findings:

Although CMSE noted it had completed a critical review of its practices prior to submission of its original application for reengagement, the panel found that there was no evidence to support this within the documentation provided.

At the site visit in 2019, CMSE presented a range of practices for the collection and monitoring of information, but the panel felt that the policies developed did not demonstrate how this information is utilised to enhance the quality system.

Upon review of CMSE's revised documentation, the panel acknowledges the extensive work undertaken to address the concerns identified at the site visit, and that this work is demonstrative of critical self-analysis. The panel is satisfied that its concerns regarding this dimension of the provider's QA system have been adequately addressed.

Evaluation of draft QA Procedures - Overall panel findings

Following the site visit with CMSE in December 2019, the panel acknowledged the established good standing of the provider and the constructive engagement of staff with the panel throughout the discussions. Nonetheless, the panel felt further development and enhancement of the QA system were required and believed CMSE would greatly benefit from time to revise its QA documentation. The panel's recommendation to QQI was, therefore, to refuse approval of CMSE's QA procedures pending mandatory changes, which are set out in Section 7.1 of this report.

Following a review of revised documentation submitted by the provider, the panel commends the level of work carried out during the interim period and believes it will be of significant benefit to CMSE in the overall enhancement of its QA. The panel is therefore pleased to recommend to QQI *Approval* of CMSE's QA procedures.

Part 6 Conditions of QA Approval

6.1 Conditions of QA Approval

N/A

Part 7 Mandatory Changes to QA Procedures and Specific Advice

7.1 Mandatory Changes

Following the initial site visit in December 2019, the panel identified a number of mandatory changes for the provider as follows:

1. CMSE's governance structures need to be reviewed to:

    a. Demonstrate independence within the governance units for a clear separation between academic and commercial decision making.

    b. Provide for a clear separation between those that engage in programme modification/development and those that approve proposals.

    c. Illustrate governance structures with a clear diagram/flow chart.

    d. Provide Terms of References (TORs) reflective of the remit for the Education & Training Committee.

    e. Create roles and responsibilities for members of those governance units and how the units are connected to one another.

2. Policies and processes need to be amended to address the following:

    a. Develop a Quality Improvement Plan (QIP).

    b. Provide a clear overview of the overarching Quality Assurance System.

    c. Revise the Learner Handbook to be reflective of the learner's lifecycle with CMSE and to include RPL.

    d. Provide more detail within policies.

    e. Tutor support and development.

    The work on policies and procedures could be enabled through the conduct of a critical review of the policies and processes, using the template gap analysis provided by QQI.

The panel is satisfied that the concerns identified at the original site visit have been satisfactorily addressed. The panel is therefore pleased to be able to recommend to QQI *Approval* of CMSE's QA procedures.

7.2   Specific Advice

The following items of specific advice were identified at the reconvene meeting in February 2021, which the panel feels may help guide the provider going forward.

1. The panel is of the opinion that further development of the provider's RPL procedure is necessary, particularly in relation to how a request for recognition of RPL is managed, what evidence is required in an application, and how the process would play out on a step-by-step basis.

2. The panel is of the opinion that CMSE would benefit from a review of its Trainer Charter documentation to be inclusive and reflective of all awarding bodies with which CMSE is affiliated.

3. The panel recommends a change to the use of the term "corrective action", identified on p.25 of the Training Centre Handbook, which reads:

   "Any applicant wishing to appeal a decision may do so by contacting the Training Administrator, who will log the appeal as a corrective action…"

   The panel recommends a slight, but important, change to this phrasing, from "corrective action" to "an action for review".

Part 8   Proposed Approved Scope of Provision for this provider

NFQ Level(s) – min and max	Award Class(es)	Discipline areas
NFQ Levels 4 - 6	Minor Awards	Horticulture Healthcare Support Trade Union Studies Architectural Technology and Design Manual Handling Instruction Training and Development

Part 9   Approval by Chair of the Panel

This report of the panel is approved and submitted to QQI for its decision on the approval of the draft Quality Assurance Procedures of Chris Mee Safety Engineering.

Name:

Date: 24th March 2021

Annexe 1:   Documentation provided to the Panel in the course of the Evaluation

- Application form
- Evidence of type of legal entity
- Organisation chart
- Documentation relevant to financial viability and resources
- Public liability insurance details
- Current tax clearance certificate
- Quality Assurance Manual
- Learner Handbook
- Meetings Minutes for Academic Council, Programme Development and Review Committee, and Results Appeals Panel
- Trainer Contract and Charter
- Trainer Induction Programme and associated documentation
- Training Centre Handbook and Appendices
- Letter from the Managing Director
- Letter from the Group Quality & Training Manager
- Quality Improvement Plan

Annexe 2:   Provider staff met in the course of the Evaluation

Name	Role/Position
Ken Long	Training & Central Services Manager
Brian Purcell	HR & Training Quality Coordinator

Appendix: Provider response to the Reengagement Panel Report

CORK OFFICE
Euro Business Park, Little Island, Cork.

DUBLIN OFFICE
Parkway Business Centre, Ballymount Cross, Dublin 24.

t +353 21 497 8100   **e** info@cmse.ie
t +353 1 517 5270   **w** www.cmse.ie

Quality and Qualifications Ireland

19/03/2021

Dear Mr Denieffe,

I would like to acknowledge receipt of the QQI Reengagement Panel Report for Chris Mee Safety Engineering dated 02/03/2021. I would also like to thank you for providing us with the opportunity to formally respond to the report.

As an organisation aiming to become best in class in quality management and compliance with accrediting body standards into the future, we recognise that we are on a journey of continuous improvement and are strongly committed to achieving excellence in all that we do. We welcome your feedback and insight into ways in which we can further improve our management systems. Mapping of our quality management system to the QQI core guidelines and completion of the recommended gap analysis has assisted us greatly in enhancing our systems. The items of Specific Advice in Section 7.2 of the report have been noted and added to our quality improvement plan for follow up action.

We appreciate your recognition of the improvements implemented to date and the Panel's recommendation of *Approval* of CMSE's QA procedures to QQI.

Yours sincerely,

_____

Colette Horgan

Group Quality & Training Manager