

ASSESSMENT MALPRACTICE and MALADMINISTRATION POLICY

1. Policy Statement

Malpractice consists of those acts which undermine the integrity and validity of assessment, the certification of qualifications and/or damage the authority of those responsible for conducting the assessment and certification. This refers to acts and omissions made by staff or students involved with the assessment process. Maladministration refers to those practices which create the same but are done without malice or intention.

2. Scope

This policy and procedure relates to college staff malpractice and maladministration and applies to all internal assessments, and internal and external examinations. Where awarding bodies have their own published procedures these will take precedent over the college policy.

3. Responsibilities

All staff have a responsibility to give full and active support for the policy by ensuring:

- 3.1 the policy is known understood and implemented.

4. Actions to Implement and Develop Policy

- 4.1 Curriculum managers should, at the appropriate time, introduce new members of staff to this policy.
- 4.2 Course teams use robust internal moderation/verification procedures
- 4.3 Course teams should use the induction period, or other appropriate time, to introduce learners to this policy.

5. Definitions and Examples

5.1 College staff malpractice: Any deliberate action by a member of staff that has the potential to undermine the integrity of the assessment process.

The following are examples of malpractice by centre staff; this list is not exhaustive and other examples of malpractice may be considered by the College at its discretion.

- 5.1.1 Improper assistance to candidates.
- 5.1.2 Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (course work or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made.
- 5.1.3 Fraudulent submissions that could lead to false claims for certificates.
- 5.1.4 Inappropriate retention of certificates.
- 5.1.5 Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated.
- 5.1.6 Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the learner's own, to be included in a learner's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework.
- 5.1.7 Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- 5.1.8 Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as amanuensis, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment.
- 5.1.9 Failing to keep assessment/examination/test papers secure prior to the assessment/examination test.
- 5.1.10 Falsifying records/certificates. For example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.

5.2 Learner malpractice: Any action by the learner that has the potential to undermine the integrity and validity of the assessment of the learner's work.

The following are examples of malpractice by learners; this list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by the College at its discretion:

- 5.2.1 Plagiarism of any nature; in which case reference should be made to the Plagiarism Policy
- 5.2.2 Collusion by working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work.
- 5.2.3 Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying).

- 5.2.4 Deliberate destruction of another's work.
- 5.2.5 Fabrication of results or evidence.
- 5.2.6 False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework
- 5.2.7 Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination.
- 5.2.8 **Maladministration** is any non-deliberate activity, neglect, default or other practice that results in the College or learner not complying with the specified requirements for delivery of the qualifications as set out in the relevant codes of practice, where applicable

6. Procedures used to deal with the above

- 6.1 Where the College discovers or suspects an individual, or individuals, of malpractice the Awarding body will be informed in line with their policy. The Centre will conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation.
- 6.2 Such an investigation will be initially undertaken by the Curriculum Faculty Head and Director of Quality, who will interview all personnel linked to the allegation.
- 6.3 The College will make the individual(s) aware (preferably in writing) at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of possible consequences should malpractice be proven.
- 6.4 The investigation will proceed through the following stages:
 - 6.4.1 Preliminary investigation, conducted by the appropriate Director, into the allegation to determine whether a full investigation is necessary. If the allegation appears to have substance, then all assessments by this member of staff should be halted until the investigation is complete.
 - 6.4.2 Should it be determined that a full investigation is necessary it shall be conducted by an independent Investigation Officer appointed by the Assistant Principal of Quality.
- 6.5 During the investigation the College will give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.
- 6.6 All stages of the investigation shall be documented by the person leading the investigation and reported to the Assistant Principal of Quality who will decide if further action is needed.

- 6.7 The individual will be informed of the avenues for appealing against any judgments made.
- 6.8 The Investigation Officer shall produce a report of their findings for the attention of the Deputy Principal
- 6.9 For cases of staff malpractice, the Director of HR and the Deputy Principal will decide whether to invoke the Staff Disciplinary Procedure.
- 6.10 For cases of student assessment malpractice, reference should be made by the Investigation Officer to the other relevant policies: Student Disciplinary Policy
- 6.11 In the case of Maladministration by a member of staff, the line manager will decide the most appropriate course of action, necessary to remedy the situation and to prevent further occurrence. Continued occurrences of maladministration, made by the same member of staff or team, will be referred to HR for appropriate follow up, in accordance with College policies.

7. Monitoring and Evaluation

- 7.1 Internal monitoring/verification of assessment activity within each Faculty will include malpractice and maladministration checks.
- 7.2 Evidence of both assessment and internal verification/moderation must be available for auditing by other Faculty and the Quality Division, under the responsibility of the Principal.

9. Related Policies/Procedures

All Quality policies

Version	Date	Description of changes made	Changed by
1	September 2017	Updated with Maladministration	Juliette Harrison
2	September 2018	Updated	Juliette Harrison
3	June 2019	Updated – addition of Awarding Body information required	Juliette Harrison