

EASTLEIGH COLLEGE

ASSESSMENT MALPRACTICE PROCEDURE

This procedure covers all forms of malpractice including plagiarism.

Aim:

- To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or learners.
- To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively.
- To standardise and record any investigation of malpractice to ensure openness and fairness.
- To impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on learners or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven.
- To protect the integrity of this centre.

In order to do this, the centre will:

- Seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and the student handbook to inform learners of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice.
- Show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources.
- Ask learners to declare that their work is their own.
- Ask learners to provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used.
- Conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the relevant Assistant Principal and all personnel linked to the allegation. It will proceed through the following stages:

Investigation of malpractice by centre staff:

- The line manager will conduct an investigation into the alleged malpractice and report findings to the Quality Nominee.
- If malpractice is found the Quality Nominee will invoke the Code of Conduct and inform the awarding body as appropriate.
- If malpractice is not found to have taken place, but a training need is identified, the Quality Nominee will invoke a programme of support and training for the assessor.

Investigation of malpractice by learners:

- The Internal Quality Assurer will conduct an investigation into the alleged malpractice and report findings to the Quality Nominee.

If malpractice is found the Quality Nominee will invoke the College Disciplinary Procedure and inform the awarding body as appropriate.

The investigation will:

- Make the individual fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.
- Give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made by providing an advocate or other support as identified.
- Inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgment made.
- Document all stages of any investigation.

Where malpractice is proven, this centre will apply actions or penalties in line with the College Disciplinary Procedure.

Definition of malpractice by learners

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion:

- Plagiarism of any nature (see separate section on plagiarism).
- Collusion by 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.

Definition of malpractice by centre staff

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion:

- Improper assistance to candidates.
- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made.
- Failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure.
- Fraudulent claims for certificates.
- Inappropriate retention of certificates.
- Assisting learners in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves centre staff producing work for the learner.
- 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 be included in a learner's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework.
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as a note-taker or scribe, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment.
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.
- Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment.

Plagiarism: Teacher and assessor procedure and guidance for malpractice

This procedure has been produced in accordance with: AQA, CCEA, City & Guilds, Edexcel, OCR and WJEC Plagiarism in Examinations Guidance for Teachers/Assessors. The complete guidance note can be found on the Joint Council Website: <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-examinations>

For students studying an approved HE programme in partnership with the University of Portsmouth any academic misconduct will initially be dealt with following College procedures. Following this, the University of Portsmouth academic misconduct procedure will be followed.

Introduction

1. This guidance note is written for the staff who have responsibility for assessing candidates' coursework or portfolio work.
2. It is the duty of all who are assessing candidates as well as those who have an interest in the setting, marking and administration of assessed work, to do whatever they can to address plagiarism.

3. Plagiarism is considered as malpractice and will be dealt with in accordance with the College Policy for Student Discipline and Code of Conduct and Awarding Body procedures.

Defining plagiarism

The Joint Council's Guidelines for Dealing with Instances of Suspected Malpractice defines plagiarism as: *"The failure to acknowledge sources properly and/or the submission of another person's work as if it were the candidate's own."*

Plagiarism refers to copying from published texts whether these are in print or on the internet, but it can also refer to copying from manufactured artefacts, or essays or pieces of work previously submitted for examinations. The term "work" in the above definition would include the original ideas, as well as the actual words or artefacts produced by another.

Awarding Bodies do not include paraphrasing under the definition of plagiarism. Instead assessors should reflect the incidence of any paraphrasing in the way they apply the mark scheme.

Plagiarism does not include copying from another candidate. This is a different form of malpractice and will be dealt with in accordance with the Colleges Code of Conduct.

Preventing and dealing with plagiarism

In order to prevent plagiarism teachers and assessors must incorporate an awareness-raising session on academic honesty in the induction process for new students.

Teachers and assessors must be vigilant in detecting plagiarism (the use of software to detect plagiarism should be used where practically possible i.e. in some H.E programmes where staff have access to University programmes). Learners should be required to sign work to verify that it is their own work. Learners suspected of plagiarism must be confronted. Where work is submitted for summative or final assessment purposes and the suspicion must be explored formally under the disciplinary process. Plagiarism should be reported to the internal verifier and faculty quality assurance manager. The faculty quality assurance manager will be responsible for reporting plagiarism to awarding bodies if this is appropriate.

This procedure will be reviewed two yearly by VP – Quality and presented to SMT for approval

Reviewed by Curriculum Managers 28.02.20 – fit for purpose will be re-reviewed in July 20 as part of full quality review.
Re-reviewed by VP – Quality – no revisions proposed
Approved by SMT