



Assessment Malpractice Policy

Definition of Assessment Malpractice:

Assessment malpractice is defined as acts of cheating or activities which compromise the integrity of the assessment or examination process including but not limiting to copying, assisting or providing answers to the candidate(s) or allowing unauthorised access to examination materials in advance and/or tampering or allowing tampering with candidate's assessments or course work including, but not limited to, plagiarism, collusion, recycling, impersonation.

Aim:

- To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff, or learners
- 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 and qualifications.

In order to do this, EDLounge will:

- use 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 including websites. Learners will not be discouraged from conducting research. However, the submitted work must show evidence that the learner has interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and has acknowledged any sources used.
- introduce procedures for assessing work in a way that reduces or identifies malpractice, e.g. plagiarism, collusion, cheating, etc.

These procedures may include:

- periods of supervised sessions during which evidence for assignments/tasks/coursework is produced by the learner altering assessment assignments/tasks/tools on a regular basis
- the assessor assessing work for a single assignment/task in a single session for the complete cohort of learners
- using oral questions with learners to ascertain their understanding of the concepts, application, etc. within their work
- assessors getting to know their learners' styles and abilities, etc.
- ensuring access controls are installed to prevent learners from accessing and using other people's work when using networked computers.

EDLounge will investigate in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the Head of EDLounge and Assessment and all personnel linked to the allegation.

It will proceed through the following stages:

- Investigation by Programme Leader
- Investigation by Quality Assurance Manager
- Investigation by Head of EDLounge.

The investigation will:

- make the individual fully aware at the earliest opportunity (preferably in writing) of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven
- give the individual the opportunity (preferably in writing) to respond to the allegations made
- 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 the following penalties / sanctions:

- Repeat work involved
- Re-assess previous units with regard to investigating previous malpractice
- Repeat of all work
- Removal from programme.

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 including copying and passing off, as the learner's own, the whole or part(s) of another person's work, including artwork, images, words, computer generated work (including Internet sources), thoughts, inventions and/or discoveries whether published or not, with or without the originator's permission and without appropriately acknowledging the source
- Collusion by working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work. Learners will not be discouraged from teamwork, as this is an essential key skill for many subject areas, but the use of minutes, allocating tasks, agreeing outcomes, etc. are an essential part of team work and this must be made clear in the submission of 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 learners inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the learners' 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 an amanuensis, 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.

This policy will be reviewed every 12 months by the Head of EDLounge and Quality Assurance Manager.

Version No	Purpose / Change	Lead	Inception/ Review Date	Next Review Date
1	Document Inception	Cara Radford EDLounge Manager	April 2018	April 2019
2	Document review update	Mick Farrar Quality Manager	April 2019	April 2020
3	Document review update			