

Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

This policy applies to Quelltex training courses. It can be read in conjunction with all other policies shown on our site: <https://www.quelltex.co.uk/contact-us.html>

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 employees what constitutes malpractice.
- We will inform learners and employees 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
- Instructors/assessors are trained on how to recognise malpractice
- Team meetings will be used to assess the risk of malpractice through the design of summative assessment activities

A standard, time limited, sequenced and documented process for both Quelltex 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 the instructor;
2. Paul Quellin will be notified of the issues. Paul Quellin will begin an investigation by

- Scrutinising evidence
 - Discussing with the instructor/assessor
 - Discussing with the learner
3. Paul Quellin will make a decision and inform both the learner and instructor of the relevant sanction. Sanctions include, but are not limited to:
- A warning
 - A Fail grade given to the summative assessment with an opportunity for resubmission
 - Discussion with the employer of the candidate which may result in 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, all record of which will be found on the relevant TCR for trainers and IQA processes.

Stage 2

1. If the learner disagrees with the outcome of the investigation by PQ and/or the sanction to be applied, they must submit an appeal to the non delivering trainer (either Malcolm Squires or Mags Nolan).
2. The 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. MN/MS makes a decision and informs the learner, instructor/assessor and IQA.
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 IQA administration manager who will refer the issue to the CAA.

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
- 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
- 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.

Examples of malpractice by employees/sub-contractors

- 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.

Policy written January 2020, By: Diane McGhee

To be reviewed no later than January 2022

V.020a. Jan 2020