

Involved parties:

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

- **13<sup>th</sup> of April** - EQA visit for approval for the award by [Redacted] – there were some actions resulting from the visit around internal systems and detail within Skill Scans used at recruitment. At this visit it was outlined the Employers we would be targeting for recruitment, which as approved (seen in EQA report Appendix B)
- **21<sup>st</sup> April** - all actions resolved by EQA and full approval given.
- **20<sup>th</sup> May** –[Redacted] emailed Educ8, identifying that the job roles in the recruitment leaflets (previously agreed by[Redacted]) were not appropriate. This email went to the incorrect IQA, who had not dealt with the approval visit and was forwarded to the correct IQA on 7<sup>th</sup> June.
- **7<sup>th</sup> June** - [Redacted] responded to above [Redacted] email, welcoming feedback and support
- **9<sup>th</sup> July** - [Redacted] clarified the need for 'Independence' in the Advocacy role and to amend recruitment literature.

At this point, we were comfortable that the learners we had recruited were indeed Independent. Assessment with learners on programme continued.

- **21<sup>st</sup> October** – Independent Advocacy City and Guilds sector network meeting took place, attended by [Redacted]
- During this meeting guidance was provided outlining that the learners should not be attached to another service (a recording of this meeting is available). Many questions were raised during this and it was the first-time clear guidance was provided to the network regarding attachment to another service. The new document providing much clearer guidelines is Appendix C
- **8<sup>th</sup> of November** –[Redacted] sent an email to [Redacted] raising concerns following the sector meeting that, on reflection of the new guidance document, there were potentially learners who were attached to a service, that may not fit in with this new guidance.
- **8<sup>th</sup> November** - [Redacted] responded and said she would need to escalate the issue and requested Educ8 cease assessment, which we did. However, we continued T&L and as we hoped this would be resolved favorably very quickly. Mitigations were proposed to C&G to try to resolve this by us – none of which were discussed or taken forward.
- **3<sup>rd</sup> December** – Educ8 received a telephone call, followed by an email stating learners might not be suitable to continue the programme. However, C&G would review and provide a formal decision.
- **6<sup>th</sup> December** - [Redacted] escalated to [Redacted] and was informed that this would be escalated further by C&G to a subject specialist and to[Redacted]. We offered to provide feedback on each learner and their role individually and state why we thought they could sufficiently meet the standards. This was not taken up.
- **17<sup>th</sup> January** – requested update from[Redacted] as we had heard nothing further.

- **2<sup>nd</sup> February** - Educ8 received notification from City & Guilds that the learners would need to be removed from programme.
- **7<sup>th</sup> Feb** - Following a request from Educ8 for unit accreditation to recognise the work already completed by the learners, this was declined by C&G.
- Educ8 immediately drew up an action list, as seen in Appendix D
- **14<sup>th</sup> Feb** - Following internal discussions we began contacting learners, details of which can be seen in Appendix E & F