

Malpractice Policy

Malpractice definition– is the intentional practice of cheating in an exam, plagiarism, fabrication of results or work or impersonation of another learner during an exam (including CBT) by learners, and can also be committed by instructors through given improper assistance to learners during assessments, inventing or changing marks for exams, facilitating or allowing impersonation or falsely issuing certificates.

Scope

This policy applies to any training programmes delivered by **skypeople**. It should be read in conjunction with all other policies in the **skypeople** HR Policy Booklet

Our commitment

Valid and reliable assessment occurs when learners present authentic and current evidence of their knowledge, understanding and skills which are assessed by assessors against specified standards.

The purpose of this policy is to limit the threat to the integrity of those assessment decisions.

Our procedures

We will inform learners and instructors what constitutes malpractice.

We will inform learners and instructors of the implications of malpractice.

We will regularly review our procedures and documentation to minimise the risk of malpractice.

We will ask our learners to confirm the authenticity of all evidence submitted for assessment by signing an authenticity statement.

Where malpractice is suspected, a formal procedure is to be followed.

Malpractice procedures

- Learners will be provided with examples of malpractice during induction
- Learners will be provided with information to support their use of appropriate referencing of sources
- Instructors/assessors will be trained on how to identify malpractice
- Team meetings will be used to assess the risk of malpractice through the design of summative assessment activities
- Learners will sign a declaration of authenticity when any evidence is submitted for summative assessment.

A standard, time limited, sequenced and documented process for the centre and learner to follow when malpractice is suspected.

Where malpractice from a learner is suspected:

Stage 1

1. The individual will be notified of the issues and possible consequences. This will be added to the assessment feedback sheet. The learner will have the opportunity to present a case to a **skypeople** manager
2. The **skypeople** manager will be notified of the issues. The **skypeople** manager investigates by
 - Scrutinising evidence
 - Discussing with the instructor/assessor
 - Discussing with the learner
3. The **skypeople** manager makes a decision and informs both the learner and instructor/assessor and a sanction. Sanctions include:
 - A warning
 - A Fail grade given to the summative assessment with no opportunity for resubmission
 - A Fail grade given to the summative assessment with an opportunity for resubmission
 - Exclusion from the programme
4. A record of the process, the evidence and the conclusion will be maintained and contribute to the Programme Review and Evaluation.

Stage 2

1. If the learner disagrees with the outcome of the investigation by the **skypeople** manager and/or the sanction to be applied, they must submit an appeal to the Head of Training (HoT)
2. The HoT review will include
 - a scrutiny of all documentation
 - an interview with the learner
 - an interview with the Instructor/assessor
 - an interview with the IQA
3. The HoT makes a decision and informs the learner, instructor/assessor and **skypeople** manager
4. A record of the process, the evidence and the conclusion will be maintained and contribute to the Programme Review and Evaluation.

Stage 3

Where the learner disagrees with the outcome of the investigation, they must notify the HoT who will refer the issue to the CAA for a final decision

Possible examples of Malpractice by Learners

- Plagiarism of any nature, for example
 - Taking extracts from another person's work, published or unpublished without using quotation marks and/or acknowledging the source
 - Using ideas of another person without acknowledgement
 - Copying or using the work of another learner without their permission
 - Purchasing essays or downloading them

- Working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work
- Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying)
- Deliberate destruction of another's work
- Fabrication of results or evidence
- False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework
- 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/test.

Possible examples of malpractice by Instructors

- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or practical observations) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made
- Failure to keep candidate's evidence secure
- Fraudulent claims for certificates
- Assisting learners in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the learner's own, to contribute to assessment decisions for a learner