



Quality Assurance System

PL11 – Compliance for Examiners – Script Correction Policy

Rev 1.0

Compliance for Examiners – Script Correction Policy

Document reference number:	PL11	Revision Number:	V1.0
Document drafted by:	Quality Officer	Date drafted:	16/10/2023
Document approved by:	LASNTG	Date approved:	09/11/2023
Document adopted by:	LASNTG	Date document adopted:	09/11/2023
Issued by:	LASNTG	Date of Issue:	09/11/2023
Assigned Review Period	2 Years	Next Review Date:	09/11/2025
Responsibility for Review	Quality Officer	Date of withdrawal obsolete document	

Amendment History:

Date	Revision Number	Details of amendment
	1.0	New Document

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that the Course Director (CD)/Trainer delivers all requirements of the Programme, through the demonstration of competence, consistency and enthusiasm for their subject and communication in a positive way with course participants. Additionally, the CD/Trainer is required to meet a required standard when assessing the competence of learners and complying with Quality Standards in respect of required documentation. This policy aims to address documentation and/or assessment issues with a view to creating a culture of continuous quality improvement.

The following will be applied where there is continuous substandard attention to detail: -

1. The objective of the quality system is to ensure that a CD/Trainer makes no errors in correcting a learners work and completes the required documentation. There is the potential for the CD/Trainer to have errors or issues in any course and the role of the IV and EA is to detect such errors. When minor errors are detected the QA Officer or a designate informs the CD/Trainer of the issues and where appropriate they are corrected by the CD/Trainer and they are given feedback to prevent recurrence. It is considered however that where a CD/Trainer has recurring substandard attention to detail an escalation process should be in place.
2. For the purposes of this policy, substandard attention to detail is defined as: where the course material is returned to LASNTG
 - a. are marked erroneously to such an extent that more than 25% of all learner's result in an error of more than +/-3%.
 - b. or other notable quality issues such as significant errors or incomplete forms/paperwork.
3. In the event such substandard attention to detail arises, the QA Officer contacts the CD/Trainer to review/discuss the issues with the CD/Trainer explaining the implications of not meeting the required standards and then considers the CD/Trainer's response and informs them, as necessary, of the need to be recorded on the compliance list – See appendix 1.
4. The CD/Trainer remains on a compliance list for a period of 12 months, if there are no other such issues over this period, details will be recorded as inactive on the compliance list and any subsequent issue will be considered the first entry.
5. In the event of further issues during the 12-month period from being noted on the compliance list, the issue is escalated to the National Directorate for Fire and Emergency Management (NDFEM) for Fire Courses or their designate must be an area expert at SEE level or above or the Courseware Specialist in all other cases. This review may consider sanctions, including withdrawing the CD/Trainer for consideration in the delivery of any course, for a period of indefinitely depending on the nature of the issues arising.

6. The CD/Trainer may appeal this decision in writing to the LASNTG Secretary within 14 days of the date of sanction. The LASNTG Secretary reviews the appeal and a decision is made on the outcome of the appeal. Notification of this decision is issued to CD/Trainer within 14 days of the receipt of the appeal.

Appendix 1: Layout of Compliance List

Course Code	Course Name	Tutor	Course Director	RTC	Date	Non-Compliance Summary	Active	Action/Decision

Appendix 2: Examples of findings: -

Course 1: -

Safety Briefs not completed in full
 Miscalculations Manual Handling Written Assessment
 Miscalculations Written Assessment
 Learner No. 2 SA05 total for professional practice is written down as 42/50 however from marks circled total is 38/50. Learner No. 6 Error on skills assessment results sheet regarding SA05 & SA06.
 Learner No. 9 SA02 no scores circled under professional practice. Error on skills assessment results sheet regarding SA05 & SA06.

Course 2: -

Model answers, programme timetable, induction checklist and classroom lesson plan not included in course pack.
 Trainer signature not filled in on attendance sheet.
 Learner’s name not filled in on the last page of the written exam.
 End of course report not completed in full and not signed or dated by Course Director.
 Safety Brief Sheets and Risk Assessments not completed in full.
 Learner No. 2 overall result was changed from 84 to 83.
 Learner No. 6 overall result was changed from 91 to 90.
 Learner No. 10 overall result was changed from 98 to 99.

Course 3: -

No model answers, no induction checklist, no learner detail forms, no trainer feedback form, trainer reviewer signature missing on reflective logs. Exercise Brief Skills not completed in full.
 Learner No. 2 received 58/65 not 56/65.
 Learner No. 4, 10 & 12 SA02 marks out of 40 not written in.
 Learner No. 4, 10 & 12 SA03 marks out of 40 not written in.
 Learner No. 5 written assessment is marked out of 62 not 65.
 Learner No. 6 received 58/65 not 53/65.
 Learner No. 7,10 & 12 assessment criteria 60 not circled.
 All learner’s TI SA 05 - Space Creation Techniques (Exercise 4)- Assessment criteria marked as 50 which is not an option. Learners all should have 60/60.