



LEIA EDUCATIONAL TRUST

DISTANCE LEARNING COURSE MALPRACTICE POLICY¹

The aim of this policy is to communicate the commitment of the LEIA Educational Trust through the Education and Training Committee of the Lift and Escalator Industry Association (LEIA) and staff members to the avoidance of assessment malpractice in all training opportunities given by the Committee.

It is our policy that assessment malpractice by staff, Candidates or anyone associated with learning opportunities given by the Committee is not tolerated and, if proven, will result in sanctions against an individual or organisation.

Criteria

To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or candidates.
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 candidates or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven.
To protect the integrity of the centre and BTEC qualifications

Definitions

Malpractice

Any act, default or practice which:

- compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate; and/or
- damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre.

A failure by the centre to investigate allegations of suspected malpractice in accordance with the requirements in this document also constitutes malpractice.

Centre Staff Malpractice

Malpractice committed by a member of LEIA staff or contractor, Company Contact or an individual appointed in another capacity by a centre such as an invigilator.

Examples of Centre Staff Malpractice are set out below. These examples are not an exhaustive list and as such do not limit the scope of the definitions set out in this document. Other instances of malpractice may be identified and considered by the centre or awarding body at their 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

¹ This Policy document is based upon 'Reasonable Adjustment and Special Considerations Policy for Edexcel Vocational Qualifications' published by EdExcel ([EdExcel website](#))

- Inappropriate retention of certificates.
- Assisting candidates 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 candidate.
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the candidate has not generated.
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the candidate's own, to be included in a candidate's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework.
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- Misusing the conditions for special candidate requirements, for example where candidates 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 candidate completing all the requirements of assessment.

Candidate Malpractice

Malpractice by a Candidate in the course of any assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments or coursework, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the writing of any assessment paper.

Examples of Candidate Malpractice are set out below. These examples are not an exhaustive list and as such do not limit the scope of the definitions set out in this document. Other instances of malpractice may be considered by the Centre at its discretion.

- Collusion by working collaboratively with other candidates to produce work that is submitted as individual candidate work.
- Plagiarism and 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.
- Theft of another's work.
- The deliberate destruction of another's work.
- The alteration of any results documents, including certificates.

Sanctions for proven cases of malpractice

In the event of a proven case of malpractice, the following sanctions will apply:

Sanctions against the Centre

To be determined by the Awarding Body

Sanctions against Candidates:

(in order of severity)

1. warning;
2. loss of marks gained for a section;
3. loss of all the marks gained for a unit;
4. disqualification from the unit;
5. disqualification from all units in one or more qualifications taken in the series;
6. disqualification from the whole qualification;
7. disqualification from all qualifications taken in that series;
8. barred from entering for assessments for a set period of time.

Application of sanctions will be in accordance with the procedures given in the LEIA Educational Trust Malpractice Procedures (document DL-MProc).

This policy is fully supported by the LEIA Education and Training Committee and was adopted on the date given below.

Signed

Date

Chair of the LEIA Education and Training Committee

Review Date