

This is the Assessment Malpractice Policy and procedure of LVS Designs Training

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.

Scope

This policy and procedure relates to LVSDT staff and learners malpractice 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 centre policy.

Responsibilities

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

The policy is known, understood and implemented.

Actions to Implement and Develop Policy

1. The LVSDT Induction department should, at the appropriate time, introduce new members of staff to this policy.
2. LVSDT Induction department use robust internal moderation/verification procedures
3. LVSDT Induction department should use the induction period, or other appropriate time, to introduce learners to this policy.

Definitions and Examples

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 Centre at its discretion.

1. Improper assistance to candidates.
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.
3. Fraudulent submissions that could lead to false claims for certificates.

4. Inappropriate retention of certificates.
5. Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated.
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.
- 6.1 Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- 6.2 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.
- 6.3 Failing to keep assessment/examination/test papers secure prior to the assessment/examination test.
- 6.4 Falsifying records/certificates. For example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.

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 Centre at its discretion:

7. Plagiarism of any nature; in which case reference should be made to the Plagiarism Policy
8. By working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work.
9. Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying).
10. Deliberate destruction of another's work.
11. Fabrication of results or evidence.
12. False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework
13. 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.

Procedures used to deal with the above

1. Where the Centre discovers or suspects an individual, or individuals, of malpractice it will conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation.
2. Such an investigation will be initially undertaken by the Head of Department, who will interview all personnel linked to the allegation.

3. The Centre 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.

The investigation will proceed through the following stages:

4. Preliminary investigation, conducted by the appropriate Department, 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/learner should be halted until the investigation is complete
5. Should it be determined that a full investigation is necessary it shall be conducted by an independent Investigation Officer appointed by the Centre Manager.
6. During the investigation the Centre will give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.
7. All stages of the investigation shall be documented by the person leading the investigation.
8. The individual will be informed of the avenues for appealing against any judgments made.
9. The Investigation Officer shall produce a report of their findings for the attention of the Centre manager
10. For cases of staff malpractice, the head of centre will decide whether to invoke the Staff Disciplinary Procedure.
11. For cases of student assessment malpractice, reference should be made by the Investigation Officer to the other relevant policies: Conduct for internally set examinations Policy and Plagiarism Policy
12. Where the Investigating Officer report indicates that the student assessment is suspect or flawed, then the relevant policies should be consulted for appropriate penalties.

Monitoring and Evaluation

1. Internal monitoring/verification of assessment activity within each department will include malpractice checks.
2. Evidence of both assessment and internal verification/moderation must be available for auditing by the Quality Assurance Team and Compliance Assurance department, under the responsibility of the Centre Manager.