

Good Practice in Adventure Activities within the Education Sector

A working document for inspectors of the Adventure Activities Licensing Authority

Version Two 10 June 2002

Good Practice in Adventure Activities within the Education Sector

Version Two: 10 June 2002

1. Licensing Authority preamble.

- 1.1 **This is a working document for inspectors of the Adventure Activities Licensing Authority. It is used by them when inspecting Local Education Authorities, schools and other educational establishments. It is a list of topics which providers of adventure activities may wish to consider when drawing up their own guidelines. It should not be considered in isolation to a provider's other safety systems and should not be taken out of context.**
- 1.2 **Good and Best Practice. This guidance represents what is currently considered by the Licensing Authority to be good practice. This term is used to mean those standards and procedures which are considered by the Licensing Authority to satisfy the Licensing Regulations (AALR 1996) when applied to a particular relevant case in an appropriate manner. Following this guidance is not compulsory and providers are free to take other equally effective action. Following this guidance will normally be enough to comply with the Licensing Regulations. Licensing Authority inspectors may refer to this guidance as illustrating good practice. Best practice therefore is used to mean a standard of risk control above the legal minimum.**
- 1.3 Adventure activities in the education sector have a very good safety record, despite a small number of high profile tragedies. These rare incidents need to be put into the context of the enormous benefits experienced by generations of our young people as a result of their involvement in adventure activities. The aim of this paper is to propagate good practice so that these activities may continue.

Every educational establishment needs to know what their role is in complying with the statutory duty they have under the various pieces of Health & Safety legislation. Once everyone is clear about who is responsible for what, then a policy can be adopted to enable this duty to be properly discharged.

- 1.4 Individuals at all levels within the organisation, from classroom assistant up to Director of Education , or Chair of Governors have a duty of care. This includes ensuring that the educational potential of out-of-school activities, particularly those loosely described as ‘adventurous activities’, are realised within acceptable margins of safety.
- 1.5 The guidance contained in this paper derives from the experience of the Adventure Activities Licensing Authority, its Head of Inspection Services, and its inspectors, gained over almost 6 years of work with the licensing scheme. None of the guiding principles are new. However, there is new material which hopefully clarifies some aspects of guidance that is already in the public domain, but which may have been misunderstood in recent years.
- 1.6 **The core texts remain Health and Safety of Pupils on Educational Visits (HASPEV), published by the DfEE in 1998 and the DfES Guidance document Health and Safety: Powers and Responsibilities (DfES/0803/2001)**

Relevant references are made to HASPEV throughout this guidance document. There is explicit cross-referencing to paragraphs 11 – 27, and 173, although other sections will also be particularly relevant for some trips. What follows, therefore, should be seen as being **in addition** to HASPEV, not as an alternative. This guidance deals primarily with the new material, and so is not in itself comprehensive. A ‘stand alone’ version combining both texts is being drafted.

2. Who is Legally Responsible for the Safety of Pupils?

- 2.1 Under Health and Safety at Work legislation it is always the employer who is responsible, i.e. is the duty holder. Even though individual schools may appoint individual teachers it is who employs them that is important. It may be the LEA, or in foundation or independent schools for example, it may be the school’s Board of Governors. In all cases it is of primary importance to identify who the employer is.
- 2.2 The employer’s responsibilities extend to their employees (teachers, classroom assistants, etc), and also to those who may be affected by their employees’ actions. This final group includes pupils within those schools.
- 2.3 Health and Safety, Responsibilities and Powers appeared in December 2001 and provides clarity on the legal issues of responsibility. It is available on the DfES web-site: <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/visits> .

3. Further Guidance from DfES

- 3.1 In September 2001, the DfES announced that it would be producing additional guidance to expand and supplement HASPEV with particular attention to adventure activities delivered by schools to their own pupils. The first part of this has now been published and is referred to in 1.3 above.
- 3.2 Drafts of the remaining sections were also put onto the DfES website under the heading of “work in progress” for comment and consultation.

4. Background.

- 4.1 Even a cursory glance at the accident statistics on school trips reveals that most accidents did not involve activities that one would generally consider to be ‘high risk’. Appendix 2 looks at the period from 1985 to 2001.
- 4.2 This realisation has given rise to some new thinking and some new practices within the education sector. These are set out below, and are cross-referenced to HASPEV sections in bold.

5. Where the LEA is the employer.....

....and therefore the duty holder, it has the clear responsibilities outlined in HSPEV paragraphs 18 and 173.

The practical implementation of many duties is commonly delegated to an Outdoor Education Advisor (OE Advisers or OEA), or an equivalent person, who will have an overview of adventure activities.

As far as adventure activities are concerned, the LEA should also:

- 5.1 Undertake and maintain an audit of the nature and extent of adventure activities being delivered in their name, and by whom.
- 5.2 Arrange for an up-to-date register of competent leaders to be kept. This may be held centrally by the local authority, or locally by individual schools.
- ⌘ It will be a factual record of any recognised awards held and verified.
 - ⌘ The matrix in Appendix 1 will help employers to decide on appropriate levels of competence for leaders.
 - ⌘ Typically, the register will be a current record, for each individual leader, of those activities/levels for which approval has been given.
- 5.3 Provide additional training and assessment. It is necessary to ensure that leaders on the register keep up with modern techniques, expectations and good practice.
- 5.4 Review the register of approved leaders on a regular basis, and remove from it those people who are no longer current.
- 5.5 Make available a further list of people (technical advisors) who are able to offer advice on specialist subjects. Again, Appendix 1 will help LEA's decide on appropriate levels of competence for these technical advisors. Commonly, the OE Adviser will be able to act as the technical advisor for at least some activities.
- ⌘ the principle role of technical advisors is to offer general support and assistance to the LEA, to schools, to head teachers and to group leaders in the delivery of adventurous activities.
 - ⌘ they will be a source of information on good practice, enabling learning to take place safely. Employers may also use advice directly from NGB's. Maintaining regular contact with NGB's, for example via their in-house publications, will also help.
 - ⌘ technical advisers may also be required to advise employers on the suitability of staff as leaders of adventurous activities.

- 5.6 Monitor the activities of its employees. Although the level and frequency of monitoring will vary, and will depend on individual circumstances, it should never be zero. Within the context of adventure activities this should include:
- ⌘ reviewing the work of the outdoor education adviser (or equivalent person), and the functioning of schools and their school visits co-ordinator, where these exist.
 - ⌘ observation of some off-site visits. This will generally be by the outdoor education adviser (or equivalent). Visits can be used to sample the effectiveness of the LEA's general policies on school visits; to ensure that the LEA's expectations and employer's responsibilities are being met; and to identify and correct deficiencies.
 - ⌘ observation of some off-site visits by someone of technical adviser status. These visits can be used to check on the on-going competence of leaders.
- 5.7 Monitor and review incidents, accidents and complaints; and revise procedures as appropriate to prevent recurrences.
- 5.8 Ensure that everyone, particularly leaders, knows how to respond to incidents, accidents and emergency of differing severity. These responses should be practised from time to time and should include some practical, scenario-based training.
- 5.9 Provide written guidance on school visits (see **Paragraph 18.1 in HASPEV**). For adventure activities, this will involve setting standards and defining practices which schools and employees are required to follow. This guidance should be such that it helps the school to establish the difficult balance of achieving an acceptable level of safety without unnecessarily restricting highly beneficial activities. Over the years, the Licensing Authority has been presented with many written safety documents. From a study of these, the following advice is offered:

Effective written guidance on standards of safety in adventurous activities:

- needs to be based on a good understanding of the risks to safety (See section 8.5 on risk assessment)
- should aim to be positive and enabling, not restrictive or defensive.
- should aim to be clear; to embrace straightforward language; and to focus on those areas which have the greatest impact on safety, eg ensuring that staff are competent. In most cases, it need not be a lengthy document.
- should aim to be a working document which reflects current work practices.
- can refer to nationally accepted standards of good practice as published elsewhere – it need not reiterate them.
- will normally benefit from input by technical advisers
- is a means to an end, not an end in itself. Unless it helps to promote that end, it is of little practical value.

5.10 Although many of the above duties (5.1 – 5.9) are commonly delegated to an outdoor education adviser, or equivalent competent person, the employer retains overall responsibility for the effectiveness of this function.

5.11 Careful reading of this guidance and its appendices, in conjunction with existing advice contained in HASPEV will help an LEA to meet its statutory obligation, and help to provide a challenging environment in which young people can learn and develop in safety.

6. *Where the School Governing Body (i.e. the Board of Governors, Trustees etc.) is the employer.....*

...and therefore the duty holder, it has the clear responsibilities outlined in **HSPEV paragraphs 19,20 and 173**. The practical implementation of many duties is commonly delegated to the Head Teacher (or an equivalent competent person). Additionally, as far as adventurous activities are concerned, the Governing Body should also

- 6.1 Undertake and maintain an audit of the nature and extent of adventure activities being delivered at the school, and by whom.
- 6.2 Arrange for an up-to-date register of competent leaders to be kept.
 - ✦ *The matrix in Appendix 1 will help governors to decide on appropriate levels of competence for leaders.*
 - ✦ *Typically, the register will be a current record, for each individual leader, of those activities/levels for which approval has been given.*
 - ✦ *It will also be a factual record of any recognised awards held and verified.*
- 6.3 Provide additional training, and assessment if necessary, to ensure that leaders on the register, and still leading, keep up with modern techniques, expectations and good practice.
- 6.4 Review the register of approved leaders on a regular basis, and remove from it those people who are no longer current.
- 6.5 Compile a further list of people (technical advisors) who are able to offer advice on specialist subjects. In the case of maintained schools, it is likely that the LEA, through its outdoor education adviser, will be able to help with this.
 - ✦ *Again, Appendix 1 will help governors decide on appropriate levels of competence for these technical advisers.*
 - ✦ *their principle role is to offer general support, assistance, and guidance to governors, to head teachers and to group leaders in understanding and fulfilling their responsibilities in the delivery of adventurous activities at the school.*

- ⌘ *they will be a source of information on good practice, enabling learning to take place safely. Governors and similar employers may also use advice directly from NGB's. It is also helpful if teachers and leaders are able to maintain regular contact with NGB's, for example via their in-house publications.*
- ⌘ *technical advisers may also be required to advise governors on the suitability of staff as leaders of adventurous activities, and on their inclusion on the register.*

6.6 Monitor the activities of the school's employees. Although the level and frequency of monitoring will vary, and will depend on individual circumstances, it should never be zero. Within the context of adventure activities should include mean:

- ⌘ *reviewing the work of the school visits co-ordinator (or equivalent person).*
- ⌘ *observation of some off-site visits by the visits co-ordinator (or equivalent) to sample the effectiveness of the school's general policies on school visits, and check that the school's expectations of the visit are being met.*
- ⌘ *observation of some off-site visits by someone of technical adviser status to sample the effectiveness of the school's systems for ensuring (on-going) leader competence.*

6.7 Monitor and review incidents, accidents, near-misses and complaints; and revise procedures as appropriate to prevent recurrences.

6.8 Ensure that everyone, particularly leaders, knows how to respond to incidents, accidents and emergency of differing severity. These responses should be practised from time to time and should include some practical, scenario-based training.

6.9 Provide written guidance on school visits (see Paragraph 18, 19 in HASPEV). For adventure activities, this will involve setting standards and defining practices which employees (and contractors) are required to follow. This guidance should be such that it helps the school to establish the difficult balance of achieving an acceptable level of safety without unnecessarily restricting highly beneficial activities. Consequently the document must be in a form which can be clearly understood by staff. This is not the place for a document which is legally precise but correspondingly in-comprehensible. Nor is it the place for ambiguous generality. Over the years, the Licensing Authority has been presented with many written safety documents. From a study of these, the following advice is offered:

⌘ Effective written guidance on standards of safety in adventurous activities:

- *should aim to be positive and enabling, not restrictive or defensive.*
- *should aim to be clear; to embrace straightforward language; and to focus on those areas which have the greatest impact on safety, eg ensuring that staff are competent. In the case of an individual school, it certainly does not need to be a lengthy document.*
- *should aim to be a working document which reflects current work.*
- *can refer to nationally accepted standards of good practice as published elsewhere – it need not reiterate them.*
- *will normally benefit from input by technical advisers*
- *is a means to an end, not an end in itself. Unless it helps to promote that end, it is of little practical value.*

6.10 Although many of the above duties (6.1 – 6.9) are commonly delegated to the Head Teacher, or an equivalent competent person, the Governing Body (as the employer) of an independent school for example retains overall responsibility for the overall effectiveness of this function.

- 6.11 Careful reading of this guidance and its appendices, in conjunction with existing advice contained in HASPEV, will help the school's Governing Body to meet its statutory obligation and help to provide a challenging environment in which young people can learn and develop in safety.

7. Advice for Head teachers (irrespective of who the employer is)

- 7.1 Head teachers are unlikely to be familiar with the complexities of adventure activities and will often need to rely on advice. This advice may come from within the school, from the LEA (e.g. the outdoor education adviser) or from an external acknowledged expert such as a technical advisor.
- 7.2 In every case, the head teacher should be responsible for making the final decision to allow or refuse an off-site visit based, in part, on advice from an OE Adviser and perhaps others. (So, for example, if an OE Adviser were not to approve of a certain visit the Head-teacher would be ill-advised to let it go ahead.) **The employer must make it clear to head teachers which visits require additional input.**
- 7.3 **The employer is responsible for the health and safety of teachers and pupils during an off-site visit. Employers may not delegate this responsibility, although they may delegate the implementation of their policies and procedures. In implementing policies Head-teachers are required to follow the employers requirements.**

It is common for head teachers to delegate the implementation of at least some functions to one or more of the following:

- ⊕ a school educational visits co-ordinator (EVC), who may advise on the suitability of all off-site visit, and/or
- ⊕ another senior member of staff such as a deputy head, or a head of department, who may be nominated to give final approval on the head teacher's behalf, and/or
- ⊕ some other senior member of staff who may be manifestly experienced and competent to advise on a particular visit or type of visit.

- ⌘ individual group leaders. In this case, group leaders are commonly required to prove or affirm compliance with relevant parts of their employer's guidance.

7.4 It is unlikely to be good practice for the same person to both plan and approve the same visit. For example it is quite common in primary schools for the head teacher to organise visits. In a case where the, it may be advisable for the head-teacher to discuss arrangements with another senior colleague, a governor, or even a technical adviser before proceeding with arrangements.

:

7.5 **In addition to issues identified in paras 21 – 23, and 173 of HASPEV**, head teachers must also address themselves to the following before approving visits involving adventure activities,

7.5.1 The technical competence of the leader.

- ⌘ This is the principle key to safe participation, and is generally validated in one of two ways:
 - *through the holding of a relevant nationally recognised qualification, typically from an NGB, or*
 - *through a statement of competence from a suitably experienced and qualified technical adviser. Appendix 1 of this guidance outlines what the Licensing Authority mean by “suitably qualified”.*
- ⌘ Best practice (supported by evidence from past incidents) suggests that validating competence is necessary whatever the leader is being required to do, or is offering to do. This is **almost irrespective of how low-risk the task may appear to be**. What is important is that whatever a leader is asked to do in the course of an off-site visit they have been satisfactorily trained, inducted and assessed for it.

7.5.2 The suitability of the leader (or fit person criteria).

⌘ Although technical competence is necessary, it is not in itself sufficient. Before a teacher is approved, and deployed as a leader of adventurous activities, a more wide-ranging assessment of overall suitability to lead the visit is likely to be needed.

- *Such an assessment will commonly be carried out by the Headteacher , and/or some other person(s) within the school.*
- *It will usually involve a period of monitored induction and appraisal.*
- *The leader should be informed of the outcome of this induction process so that he or she is clear at any time about their status as a leader, or aspirant leader. Ideally, a record of the process should be kept.*
- *Some skills may be transferable from one off-site situation to others, and this fact may be taken into account in the assessment.*
- *As a guide to the sufficiency of this process, head teachers may find it helpful to ask themselves what equivalent assurances they would normally seek of a teacher's competence to work safely before deploying them to other potentially hazardous and specialised school environments, such as a science laboratory, or gymnasium or playing field.*

7.5.3 The suitability of the proposed visit.

⌘ This is commonly judged on the basis of a formal, written request for approval for each individual visit or a group of related visits. See section 8.4 below.

7.5.4 Monitoring.

⌘ Even where the LEA is the employer, schools will retain at least some responsibility for monitoring selected visits from time to time to sample the level of compliance with the school's general expectations.

7.5.5 Acknowledgement of Risk.

- ⌘ Schools are encouraged to share with parents and participants, through a process of ‘informed consent’, the nature and extent of any residual risk associated with the trip or any significant part of it.
- ⌘ This ‘acknowledgement of risk’ does not absolve the employer of any of its responsibilities but merely helps parents (and if applicable, pupils) to make an informed judgement about participation.

8. Advice for Group leaders

- 8.1 The requirements of **HASPEV paragraph 24** are a good general guide for group leaders of visits involving adventurous activity.
- 8.2 Some of the employer responsibilities in **HASPEV para 173** may be delegated to the group leader by virtue of their expertise, their familiarity with the local situation on the ground, and the need to retain local control. This should be agreed between the employer and the group leader.
- 8.3 In addition, group leaders should note:
- ⌘ **The competence of staff deployed to lead visits is the primary factor in ensuring safe practice.** Virtually all other safety management systems flow from this. It is important that employers and employees alike do not lose sight of this.
 - ⌘ **It is unreasonable for a teacher or leader to be deployed for specialist tasks for which they have not been trained and assessed.** For example, a chemistry teacher would not be deployed to teach gymnastics, or vice versa.
 - ⌘ This principle extends to off-site visits.
- 8.4 **Approval of visits.** “Don’t bring me problems; bring me solutions”

- ⌘ Commonly it will be the group leader who applies for approval. The visits co-ordinator or head teacher will find it easier to approve the trip if the application:
 - *takes the group leader through a process of assessing risks*
 - *highlights how the School's or LEA's guidance has been followed*
- ⌘ **HASPEV Form One, on page 45 provides a basic template for this process**
- ⌘ Final approval will generally come from the Head teacher. Some visits may require the LEA or the Governing Body to also be satisfied with the arrangements. **The employer must make it clear to head teachers which visits require their input.**

8.5 Supervision.

- ⌘ During the visit, the group leader is responsible for deploying other teachers, leaders, assistants etc so as to optimise the effectiveness of supervision.
- ⌘ In the case of a number of teachers/leaders/supervisors looking after a larger group, the leader may consider a division into sub-groups, each with its own leader. **This approach may be particularly relevant near water or steep ground where experience suggests that closer supervision and smaller groups are needed to manage the risks.**
- ⌘ In any situation, the bigger the group size, the more competent and experienced the leader needs to be.

- ⌘ All group leaders (indeed all teachers, supervisors, or leaders) should be clear that they have been assessed/approved as competent to lead or supervise before agreeing, or offering, to take responsibility for young people undertaking specialist adventurous activity at any level.
- ⌘ Regularly reassessing the risks and responding to changes is often the most important part of the process. That, and concentrating on the task in hand.

9 Risk Assessment.

- ⌘ Risk Assessment is extensively covered in **HASPEV – specifically in paragraphs 37 – 46**, but also throughout the document.
- ⌘ Assessing risks is a process, not a document. It is not the assessment that is important, but actions taken as a result. Taking the appropriate action is more important than writing it down.
- ⌘ HASPEV reflects Health and Safety legislation and stresses that the responsibility for this process lies with the employer not the employee. However, group leaders and individual teachers are likely to be the most appropriate people to make an assessment of the specific risks associated with a particular visit.
- ⌘ It may **not** be necessary or helpful to record these assessments on each and every occasion.
- ⌘ Where evidence of the risk assessment process is required, it can take a variety of forms, such as:
 - *a statement that the standard operating procedures apply, and are in place for the visit/activity. These may have been produced by a National Governing Body, an LEA or the school itself, or*

- *a list of specific additional arrangements that are considered necessary because of the circumstances specific to the particular visit, or*
- *a visit approval application form designed to lead the group leader through the process of assessing the risks (see 8.4 above), or*
- *one of many other formats which individual authorities, schools, or leaders have found helpful in encouraging a systematic approach to the management of risk and the protection of young people.*

Appendix 1

A1

Technical competence - qualification matrices

A1.1

This appendix includes matrices which show nationally recognised qualifications ~~which are available from national awarding bodies relating only to those activities~~ which are within the remit of the Adventure Activities Licensing Regulations. For other activities it would be reasonable to follow similar principles and practices.~~and~~

A1.2 In each case, holding the award will normally demonstrate adequate technical competence at the level indicated.

A1.3 For technical advisers, the pre-requirement for giving advice of a technical nature is also benchmarked for each level of activity.

A1.6 The term **‘leader’** is used in Sections A2 and A3 below as a generic term, and is intended to cover coach, instructor, tutor, teacher or any other similar title in common usage.

A1.7 The term **‘employer’** is used to represent the person or body (the ‘duty holder’) that has the statutory duty for protecting the health and safety of all involved. In most, but not all cases, this will be the Local Authority, or the School’s Board of Trustees, or Governors.

A2 *Technical Advisers*

- A2.1 The 'technical adviser' column in the attached matrices will help the employer decide whether they have adequate access to competent advice.
- A2.2 Merely holding the right level of technical qualification is in itself **not** sufficient. When deciding on the suitability of persons to give technical advice, having adequate experience is also important; a person who holds the technical qualification but has little relevant practical experience is unlikely to be competent to advise.
- A2.3 Conversely, someone with extensive relevant practical experience who does not hold the qualification in the matrix could still be competent to advise. Employers who rely on such a person will need to satisfy themselves of this, and be able to point to evidence supporting their judgement.
- A2.4 In particular, where the crucial 'technical advice' being sought is an assessment of the competence of others, employers will need to answer the question: "What makes this person (the technical adviser) suitable for this task?"
- A2.5 As far as their role in providing statements of competence is concerned, a technical adviser is typically someone who

 could carry out the assessment of the leader, at a similar level, for the relevant national governing body, **or**

 personally holds a qualification at least one level above that for which a statement is being made, **or** ideally

 meets both of the above criteria.
- A2.6 For some activities, it is not possible to point to a single, nationally recognised qualification. Common examples include coasteering, gorge scrambling and challenge courses, for which no awards exist. For off-road cycling and high ropes courses existing awards have not, at the time of writing, gained universal acceptance. There may be others.

A2.7 In some cases, a suitable technical adviser may need a combination of qualifications from more than one national organisation, allied to a wide range of experience of the activity itself and/or the venue. In some cases, complementary advice from more than one person may be necessary for completeness.

A2.8 Indeed, the need for technical advisers to hold awards from more than one national governing body is anticipated in, for example, the matrices for trekking. Here, there is a requirement in some cases to hold ‘on foot’ qualifications in addition to awards specific to the activity.

A3 *Activity leaders*

A3.1 For those activities within the remit of the Adventure Activities Licensing Regulations, the matrices set out nationally available qualifications which will normally demonstrate the technical competence at the level indicated. It would be reasonable to adopt similar principles and practices for other activities. In some cases where no nationally accepted standards are available the Licensing Authority have drawn up guidance checklists. These are available on the Authority’s web-site (www.aala.org.uk).

A3.2 Nowadays it is expected that leaders and instructors will not only **be** competent, but that employers will also be able to provide clear **evidence** of that competence. For the leader this means holding either:

a relevant NGB award, (or an acceptable equivalent)

an explicit statement of competence from a technical adviser following a formal process of in-house training and assessment,

an explicit statement of competence from a technical adviser verifying adequate relevant experience, both personal and instructional,

an explicit statement of competence from a technical adviser verifying observation of one or more sessions run satisfactorily, together with an understanding of the appropriate response to a range of foreseeable emergency situations

any combination of these

A3.5 What is important here is that the technical adviser is satisfied that the leader's technical competence at that level has been proved, as far as is reasonably practicable.

A3.6 A statement of competence is generally more restrictive than the parallel (or pertinent) national award. Good practice indicates that:

restrictions (which may refer to specific sites, geographical areas, levels of operation, types and sizes of group etc.) should be explicit in the statement,

statements may have expiry dates.

statements are not normally transferable to other employment.

statements will normally be signed by the technical adviser.

A3.7 Not all activities are covered by the Licensing Regulations and may therefore not be mentioned in the following matrix. When considering these, employers may need to seek the advice of a competent person with extensive experience of the particular activity when deciding on the qualities required of a leader. These might include:

general experience

local knowledge

qualifications (where they exist)

in-house training and assessment

practical induction

- A3.8 Most NGB's require a personal log to be kept with details of relevant individual and instructional experience. Many employers take a similar approach to help their technical advisers to assess a leader's experience before issuing a statement of competence.
- A3.9 To those without a broad general experience of the outdoors, apparently low-key outdoor activities (eg sledging, swimming, paddling on the beach, etc) may seem quite 'safe'. However, such assumptions are not always supported by the facts, and the quality of supervision is likely to be as instrumental in ensuring safety as it is for activities where the hazards are more obvious.
- A3.10 As a consequence, employers should have similar mechanisms in place for ensuring that leaders and supervisors of these 'low-key' activities are also competent.
- A3.11 Technical advice about the general competence of supervisors could be sought from a range of people. These include:
- a school's Visits Co-ordinator (or equivalent),
 - some other experienced member of the school staff,
 - the LEA Adviser (or equivalent),
 - or some external consultant or expert.

But whoever it is, the competence question in A2.4 will still need to be answered (i.e. “what makes this person suitable for the task?”)

Abbreviations used in the matrices

ABRS	Association of British Riding Schools
BASI	British Association of Ski Instructors
BCU	British Canoe Union
BELA	Basic Expedition Leadership Award (CCPR)
BHS	British Horse Society
BMG	British Association of Mountain Guides
CIC	Cave Instructor Certificate (NCA)
CCPR	Central Council of Physical Recreation
ESC	English Ski Council
LCMLA	Local Cave and Mine Leader Assessment (NCA)

MLTE	Mountain Leader Training England
MIA	Mountain Instructor Award (MLTUK)
MIC	Mountain Instructor Certificate (MLTUK)
ML	Mountain Leader Award (MLTUK /MLTS/MLTW) or Mountainwalking Leader Award (MLTE)
MLTS	Mountain Leader Training Scotland
MLTUK	Mountain Leader Training United Kingdom
MLTW	Mountain Leader Training Wales
NCA	National Caving Association
NVQ	National Vocational Qualifications
RYA	Royal Yachting Association
SCOW	Ski Council of Wales
SCU	Scottish Cyclists Union
SI	Senior Instructor (BCU & RYA)

SNSC	Scottish National Ski Council
SVQ	Scottish Vocational Qualifications
SPA	Single Pitch Award (MLTE)
SRA	Scottish Rafting Association
TSI	Trainee Senior Instructor (BCU)
WGL	Walking Group Leader award (MLTUK et al)

The following matrix is based on Guidance to the Licensing Authority on the Adventure Activities Licensing Regulations (1996).

Caving

Hazard level

Group instructor/

Technical Advisor

leader

Cave/mine systems with pitches over 18 m	CIC holder (or S/NVQ Level 4)	CIC holder (or S/NVQ Level 4)
Cave/mine systems with pitches less than 18 m	As above, or LCMLA Level 2 (or S/NVQ Level 3)	As above
Cave/mine system without pitches	As above, or LCMLA Level 1 (or S/NVQ Level 2)	As above
Show cave/tourist mines - adventure trips beyond public areas with made- up lit paths	As above, depending on level of activity	As above

Climbing

Hazard level

Group instructor/ leader

Technical Advisor

Winter climbing	MIC or BMG Carnet holder or Aspirant Guide	MIC or BMG Carnet holder
Rock climbing - multipitch	As above or MIA (or S/NVQ Level 3)	As above or MIA
Ghyll scrambling, gorge walking or sea level traversing	As above or in-house assessed depending on level of activity (or S/NVQ Level 3)	As above
Rock climbing - single pitch	As above or SPA or Rockclimbing Leader (N Ireland) or Site specific training (Scotland) (or S/NVQ Level 2)	As above
Other climbing, abseiling or scrambling on man-made structures or	As above or in-house assessed, depending on level of activity	As above

Notes:

1 The above information is based on information extracted from a matrix for Mountaineering in the MLTUK National Guidelines. This embraces both climbing and much of trekking as these terms are defined in the Regulations. In cases of doubt on interpretation, refer to the MLTUK guidelines.

2 'Winter' means when winter conditions, including snow and ice, prevail or are forecast. This cannot be defined by a portion of the year. Summer means any conditions not covered under 'winter'.

Trekking - on-foot

Hazard level

*Group instructor/
leader*

Technical Advisor

Mountain country - Winter	MIC or BMG Carnet holder or Aspirant Guide or Winter ML	MIC or RMG Carnet holder
Mountain country - Summer	As above or MIA or Summer ML or European ML (or S/NVQ Level 3)	As above or MIA and Winter ML
Open country	As above, or WGL	As above.
Lowland country	As above or BELA or in-house assessed (or S/NVQ Level 2)	As above or Summer ML

Notes

1 The above information is based on information extracted from a matrix for mountaineering in the MLTUK National Guidelines. This embraces both climbing

and much of trekking as these terms are defined in the Regulations. In cases of doubt on interpretation, refer to the MLTUK guidelines.

2 'Winter' means when winter conditions, including snow and ice, prevail or are forecast; this cannot be defined by a portion of the year. Summer means any conditions not covered under 'winter'.

Trekking - on horse or pedal cycle

Hazard level

Group instructor/

Technical Advisor

leader

Horse riding

Levels as in 'Trekking
on foot' matrix but
when horse riding

The appropriate on foot
qualification *and* one of:
BHS Tourism
Qualification for Ride
Leader, or ABRS Trek
Leaders Certificate

The appropriate on foot
qualification *and* one of:
Tourism Qualification for
Centre Manager, or
manager of a riding
establishment licensed by
local authority

Off-road cycling

Levels as in 'Trekking on Foot' matrix but when pedal cycling	The appropriate on foot qualification and in-house training or local award in off-road cycling.	The appropriate on foot qualification <i>and</i> Advisors in off-road cycling.
---	---	--

Notes

- 1 Two individuals, one with the relevant mountaineering qualification and the other with relevant expertise in horse riding or cycling would be acceptable in place of a single technical Advisor qualified in both disciplines.
- 4 At the time of publication of Guidance to the Licensing Authority (1996) there were no UK wide agreed qualifications for off-road cycling. The Licensing Authority have subsequently produced a guidance checklist which is available on their web-site (www.aala.org.uk).

Trekking - off-piste ski touring

<i>Hazard level</i>	<i>Group instructor/leader</i>	<i>Technical Advisor</i>
---------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------

Ski-mountaineering	BMG Carnet holder, or SNSC Mountain Ski Leader	BMC Carnet holder, or SNSC Mountain Ski Leader
Alpine skiing - Scotland - off-piste away from marked/serviced areas	As above, or Winter ML <i>and</i> one of: BASI II Ski Teacher, or SNSC Club Coach or Alpine Performance Coach Level 1, or ESC/SCOW Club Coach As above, or BASI II Ski Teacher, or BASI III Ski Instructor	As above
Alpine skiing - Scotland - off-piste but within the recognised boundary of serviced area shown on piste map		As above, or BASI I Ski Teacher

Nordic skiing - Scotland - off-piste (away from marked/serviced areas)	Winter ML and one of: BASI III relevant to discipline, or SNSC Nordic Ski Leader, ESC/SCOW Nordic Coach (Touring)., or ESC/SCOW Club Coach	BASI II Nordic Ski Teacher, or SNSC Mountain Ski Leader or Winter ML <i>and</i> ESC/SCOW Nordic Coach (Touring)
--	--	--

Nordic or alpine skiing - England and Wales	As above relevant to discipline for Scotland, or Winter ML <i>and</i> ESC/ SCOW Tour Leader	As above relevant to discipline for Scotland, or Winter ML and ESC/ SCOW Coach
--	--	---

Note

1 The above qualifications relate to nordic and alpine skiing. Nordic and alpine refer to the particular ski disciplines, not to geographical settings.

Watersports - canoeing and kayaking

Hazard level

*Group instructor/
leader*

Technical Advisor

Advanced sea

Level 3 Sea Coach SI

Level 5 Sea Coach

Sea with 5 star (Sea)

Coach Sea

(Advanced sea proficiency)

Sea - journeys

As above or Level 3 Sea

As above or Level 3 Sea

Coach *SI Sea*

Coach *SI Sea* with 5 star

(Sea) (Advanced sea proficiency)

Large lochs - journeys

As above or Level 3

As above or Level 3

(kayaks only, see below

Coach *SI Inland*

Coach *SI Inland* with

for open canoes)

5 star *(Advanced inland proficiency)*

Sea and large lochs -

As above or Level 2

As above or Level 3 Sea

Large lochs - journeys (open canoes)	Level 3 Canoe Coach SI Canoe with 5 Star Canoe (<i>advanced canoe proficiency</i>)	Level 4 Canoe Coach <i>Advanced senior instructor</i>
---	--	--

Advanced surf (> 1 metre)	Level 3 Surf Coach <i>SI</i> <i>Surf</i> (or until 1/4/98 a Coach <i>SI</i> with equivalent surfing ability)	Level 3 Surf Coach <i>SI Surf</i>
---------------------------	---	--------------------------------------

Surf	As above or Trainee Level 3 Surf Coach <i>TSI Surf</i>	As above or Level 3 Surf Coach <i>SI Surf</i>
------	--	--

Hazard level

*Group instructor/
leader*

Technical Advisor

Advanced white water (Grade III and above)	Level 3 Coach <i>SI Inland</i> with 5 Star (Inland) (<i>Advanced Inland Proficiency</i>)	Level 5 Coach <i>Coach Inland</i>
White water (Grade II)	As above, or Level 3 Coach <i>SI Inland</i>	As above or Level 3 Coach <i>SI Inland</i> with 5 Star (Inland) (<i>Advanced Inland Proficiency</i>)
Sheltered inland water	As above or Level 2 Coach <i>Instructor</i> or (appropriate S/NVQ Level 2 Canoeing Coach)	As above or Level 3 Coach <i>SI</i>

Notes

1 BCU introduced new names for their qualifications in 1996. Awards with the old names (shown above in italics) will be valid until the conversion is completed.

2 Instructor qualifications referred to above must be relevant to the discipline being delivered, ie canoeing or kayaking.

3 BCU star gradings given as an indication of level of competence required; not pre-requisites.

4 Surf qualifications are for repeated manoeuvring through waves on recognised surf beaches; sea qualifications cover access through surf for sea journeys etc.

5 White water grades as defined by International Canoe Federation.

Watersports - rafting

<i>Hazard level</i>	<i>Group instructor/ leader</i>	<i>Technical Advisor</i>
White water (Grade II and above)	Raft Trip Leader (or S/NVQ Level 3)	Raft trip leader (or S/NVQ Level 3)
Grade I river	As above or Raft Guide (or S/NVQ Level 2)	As above
Controlled sites - white water	As above or in-house site specific training	As above

Notes

- 1 The above qualifications relate to white water rafting using inflatable rafts. At the time of publication of this guidance, there are no national qualifications for improvised rafts or for inflatable rafts on other waters.
- 2 Controlled sites means short lengths of river, managed and with a safety infrastructure, eg Tryweryn (N Wales), Holme Pierrepont (Nottingham) and Teeside (Cleveland).
- 3 White water grades as defined by International Canoe Federation.

Watersports - small boat sailing

Hazard Level

Group Instructor/

Technical Advisor

leader

Sea/tidal waters - coastal journeys	Advanced Instructor Coastal (or S/NVQ Level 3 Coach)	Senior Instructor Coastal <i>and</i> Advanced Instructor Award (or S/NVQ Level 3 Supervisor <i>and</i> Level 3 Coach)
Sea/tidal waters - from a harbour or suitable beach	As above or Instructor Coastal (or S/NVQ Level 2 Coach)	As above, or Senior Instructor Coastal (or S/NVQ Level 3 Supervisor)
Inland waters	As above or Instructor Inland (or S/NVQ Level 2 Coach)	As above, or Senior Instructor Inland (or S/NVQ Level 3 Supervisor)

Note

1 Instructor qualifications should be relevant to craft used, ie dinghies or keelboats.

Watersports – Keel Boats.

<i>Hazard Level</i>	<i>Group Instructor/ leader</i>	<i>Technical Advisor</i>
Keel boats (subject to MCA Code of Practice)	See MCA	See MCA
Keel boats (not subject to MCA Code of Practice)	RYA Keel Boat Instructor	RYA Senior Instructor

Watersports - windsurfing

Hazard level

*Group instructor/
leader*

Technical Advisor

Sea/tidal waters

Instructor Level 1 Open

Instructor Level 2 Sea

Sea (or S/NVQ Level 2

and RYA Windsurfing

Coach)

Principal, or Trainer

Level 2, or S/NVQ

Level 3 Supervisor

(windsurfing), or

S/NVQ Level 3 Assessor

(windsurfing)

Inland waters

As above, or Instructor

As above, or Instructor

Level 1 Inland (or

Level 2 Inland *and* RYA

S/NVQ Level 2 Coach)

Windsurfing Principal

Appendix 2: Summary and analysis of School Trip Fatal Accident Records Between May 1985 and November 2001

	Date	Venue or description	Number of casualties	UK	Abroad	Adults	Pupils	Road Traffic Accidents	Winter Sports	Drowning	Murder	Fall from Height	Adventure Activity
1	May-85	Land's End	4	4			4			4			
2	Apr-88	Austria sledging	4		4		4		4			4	
3	Mar-93	Lyme Bay	4	4			4			4			4
4	Nov-93	M40 Minibus crash	13	13		1	12	13					
5	May-95	Grand Union Canal	1	1		1				1			
6	Jun-96	Buckden	1	1			1					1	1
7	Jul-96	Brittany Youth Hostle	1		1		1				1		
8	Jul-97	Buckinghamshire	1	1			1			1			
9	Jul-97	Shell Island	1	1			1			1			
10	Jul-97	Albertville, France	3		3		3	3					
11	Jun-98	Dinas Rock	1	1		1				1			1
12	Jun-99	Le Touquet, France	1		1		1			1			
13	Sep-99	Portsmouth Harbour	1	1			1			1			1
14	Jan-00	Nevada, USA	1		1		1		1				1
15	Oct-00	Stainforth Beck	2	2			2			2			2
16	Feb-01	Austria, toboggan ride	1		1		1		1				1
17	Apr-01	Valloire	1		1	1			1				1
18	Jul-01	Vietnam	1		1		1					1	1
19	Jul-01	Dieppe	1		1		1			1			
20	Jul-01	Malvern Hills	1	1			1			1			
21	Aug-01	South Africa	1		1		1						1
22	Nov-01	Blackpool	1	1			1			1			
		Total	46	31	15	4	42	16	7	19	1	6	14