

Delivery Models for the FPS to deliver Trailblazer Apprenticeships

Context: Under the new government reforms, in order for an employer to train an Apprentice, it is necessary for them to select a Training Provider from the online register (RoATP). This Register lists pre-approved providers who have indicated they can deliver a course to deliver on the published training standard.

Carl Hassell has detailed the requirements that have to be met in order to go on to the RoATP as an organisation. These are considerably more onerous than those required to deliver the existing Specialist Apprenticeship Programme.

Currently there is no-one registered to deliver the Piling Apprenticeship on the RoATP. However, there are a number of possible routes to getting a provider in place:

Member Provider

A Member sets themselves up as provider, takes on the responsibilities required by the RoATP and opens up their training course to Members. This requires that they have a training centre, access to staff and the necessary plant and equipment. Van Elle are pursuing this route. CITA and Procat are also potential providers.

Member support arrangement

This works similarly to the current SAP, however another organisation takes on the RoATP requirements and is then supported by the FPS Members to deliver the training. Currently CITB and NCC are being spoken to about the possibilities here. However, the issue here is that Members would need to register on the RoATP as a Supporting Provider, unless they are providing less than £100k of training support.

To achieve this would mean dividing the training load fairly equally between four or five Members in order to cover off the FPS own requirements and to have an arrangement in place with an organisation that is on the RoATP (e.g. CITB, Procat, NCC). Although technically possible, it is likely this option will be treated as an abuse of the rules. Alternatively, one or two Members would need to be willing to go on the RoATP as a supporter provider – they would need to operate within the cap of £500k of training per provider.

It would also be possible for the training organisation to directly employ trainers on a freelance basis, provided their employers were happy to permit this.

FPS as provider

The FPS could set itself up as a provider and register on the RoATP. This could either be achieved within the existing legal structure as a company limited by guarantee, or by setting up a subsidiary company – FPS Training Ltd. This would require compliance with the requirements – see Carl Hassell's document.

How would this model work?

This would require the FPS to put in place a management team for the delivery of the Trailblazer. At the most basic level this would need a full-time Training Manager working with some administrative support and a dedicated team of trainers with access to training facilities:

- FPS pays Member trainers to deliver training – this would have to be a direct contract with the trainer
- Members provide training facilities
- A set of policies for the management and protection of apprentices are agreed by contract with Employers placing apprentices
- Training Manager is responsible for ensuring
 - lesson plans, assessment plans etc required by Ofsted are in place and being adhered to
 - Safeguarding responsibilities are being met by the employer when not at the training facilities
 - Safeguarding responsibilities are being met when apprentices are attending a training facility.

What is required?

- Management team put in place
- SAP course needs to be adapted to the Trailblazer
 - Lesson plans, learning materials and QA schemes will need to be put in place
- Training capacity in the industry needs to be developed – i.e. CITB funded training to upskill trainers to deliver to the required standard.
- Policies developed and agreed by Members and placed into a training contract.
- Trainers formally engaged and facilities sourced (assuming SAP model is followed for this).

The management of the apprentices and delivery of the training will be subject to Ofsted inspection. This will create a significant challenge given the employers are not under the direct control of the FPS in relation to their apprentices.