



POLICY NO. 89

POLICY AND PROCEDURE ON ASSESSMENT MALPRACTICE

Issue Date: May 2016

Approved by: Approved by SLT on
15 June 2016

Review Date: May 2019

POLICY STATEMENT NO 89

TITLE:

POLICY AND PROCEDURE ON ASSESSMENT MALPRACTICE

INTRODUCTION/OVERVIEW:

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.

New College Stamford does not tolerate actions (or attempted actions) of malpractice by:

- Students
- Members of Staff

STATEMENT:

Student Malpractice

Attempting to or actually carrying out any malpractice activity is not permitted. The following examples of malpractice by students; this list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered.

- 1 Plagiarism by copying and passing off, as the student's own, the whole or part(s) of another person's work, including artwork, images, words, and computer generated work, with or without the originator's permission and without acknowledging the source.
- 2 Collusion by working collaboratively with other students to produce work that is submitted as individual learner's work. Students should not be discouraged from teamwork, as this is an essential key skill for many sectors and subject areas, but they must detail the contribution they made to the work produced.
- 3 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.
- 4 Failing to abide by the instructions or advice of an assessor, a supervisor, an invigilator or the Exam Board's conditions in relation to assessment/examination, test rules or regulated security.
- 5 Misuse of assessment/examination material.
- 6 Introduction and/or use of unauthorised material contra to the requirements of supervised assessment/ examination/test

conditions, for example: notes, study guides, personal organisers, calculators and dictionaries (when prohibited), personal stereos, mobile phones and other similar electronic devices.

- 7 Obtaining, receiving, exchanging, or passing on information which could be assessment/examination/test related (or the attempt to) by means of talking or written papers/notes during supervised assessment/ examination/test conditions.
- 8 Behaving in such a way as to undermine the integrity of the assessment/examination/test.
- 9 The alteration of any results document, including certificates.
- 10 Cheating to gain an unfair advantage.

Teaching Staff Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice by centre staff. The list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered:

- 1 Failing to keep mark schemes secure.
- 2 Alteration of mark schemes.
- 3 Alteration of grading and assessment criteria (subject to IV changes).
- 4 Assisting students 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.
- 5 Producing falsified witness statements; for example for accepting evidence the learner has not generated.
- 6 Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the students own, to be included in a student's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework.
- 7 Misusing the conditions for special student requirements, for example where students 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.
- 8 Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.
- 9 Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of the assessment.
- 10 Failing to keep assessment/examination/testpapers secure prior to the assessment/examination/test.

- 11 Obtaining unauthorised access to assessment/examination/test material prior to an assessment/examination/test.
- 12 **Higher Education** - A separate policy relates to Student Malpractice by students on HE courses, but this policy relates to Staff Malpractice by college staff involving HE programmes.
Consequently, this policy is written in line with Expectation B6 of the QAA Code of Practice.

GUIDELINES:

New College Stamford requires its lecturers to ask students to declare that their work is their own. This may require students signing the statement of authenticity supplied by the relevant examination body.

- Lecturers will inform students of New College Stamford's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice (see Notice to Candidates).
- Lecturers will explain to students the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources including websites.
- Students should not be discouraged from conducting research; indeed evidence of relevant research often contributes to the achievement of higher grades. However, the submitted work must show evidence that the student has interpreted and synthesized appropriate information and has acknowledged any sources used.
- Lecturers will introduce procedures for assessing work in a way that reduces or identifies malpractice, e.g. plagiarism, collusion, cheating etc. These procedures may include
 - i) Periods of supervised sessions during which evidence for assignments/tasks/coursework is produced by the learner.
 - ii) Altering assessment assignments/tasks on a regular basis.
 - iii) Using oral questions with students to ascertain their understanding of the concepts, application within their work.
 - iv) Lecturers getting to know their students' styles and abilities.
 - v) Lecturers ensuring access controls are installed to prevent students from accessing and using other peoples' work when using networked computers.

IMPACT ASSESSMENT:

This policy has been assessed and considered for impact upon people who share the following protected characteristics and factors: race, gender and gender identity, disability (including learning difficulty), religion and belief, sexual orientation, age, pregnancy, maternity and marital status.

**EQUALITY IMPACT
ASSESSMENT SUMMARY:**

This policy has been impact assessed and has identified the following:

- Negative impacts (N)
- Appropriate actions/mitigations to address the negative impacts have been put in place (N/A)
- Positive impacts (Y)

For further detail of the impacts and associated actions, please see the EIA which is attached to the filed copy of this document.

LINKED POLICIES:

Plagiarism and Cheating Policy

MONITORING PROCEDURE:

Dealing with Student Malpractice

- 1 It is the responsibility of the appropriate Director and the Examinations Officer to carry out an investigation into allegations of malpractice.
- 2 The alleged incident must be reported to the Exam Board following the incident when appropriate.
- 3 If malpractice is discovered or suspected, the Director of Learning must make the responsible person(s) fully aware (preferably in writing) in accordance with the College Disciplinary Code at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven. In the case of a 16-18 student, their parents/guardians may also be informed.
- 4 If malpractice is discovered, AAT must be contacted with 48 hours of the discovery.

Reporting Malpractice to Examination Boards

Further guidance on centre staff and candidate malpractice can be found in the Joint Council for Qualifications booklet – Suspected Malpractice in examinations and Assessments. This booklet gives examples of malpractice and the outcomes of Investigations by Awarding Bodies. This booklet is available in the Exams Office.

Malpractice should be reported to the relevant Awarding Body by the Examinations Officer.

DATE FOR REVIEW:

May 2019

RESPONSIBILITY:

Directors of Learning

ENDORSED BY SLT:



Principal

15 June 2016

Date

Plagiarism on BTEC Courses

As a result of the change in the assessment regulations from September 2014 there has been some concern about their impact on plagiarism and how we treat it.

BTEC's view is that it is the college disciplinary procedure that will impose any sanction on a student who cheats.

Thus, if a student cheats by copying from another student's work or copies off the internet without referencing or plagiarises in any way then they should be required to produce the assignment again and should be punished under the college disciplinary procedure. A reasonable but comparatively short period of time should be given for the student to produce the assignment again and this will be regarded as a first submission. Pearson Edexcel will not allow a student's grade to be capped. Thus, if the student fails on the first marking and it is their original work, it is completed within the time period set and the tutor and lead IV believe that the student could improve it without extra help then the student can resubmit. Also at level 3, the student may be allowed to retake under the usual rules.

1 May 2015