

LIFT AND ESCALATOR INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION

QCF MALPRACTICE POLICY

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

It is our policy that assessment malpractice by staff, Learners or anyone associated with QCF qualifications 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 EAL 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 Organisation or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any Awarding Organisation or centre.

A failure by the LEIA 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, directly controlled assessment staff, or an individual appointed by the centre.

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 Organisation at their 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 Learner coursework/portfolios of evidence secure
- 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.

Learner Malpractice

Malpractice by a Learner 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 Learner 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 Learners to produce work that is submitted as individual Learner 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 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 Organisation

Sanctions against Learners:

(in order of severity)

1. warning;
2. repetition of a section;
3. repetition of 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 below.

Procedures for investigating alleged malpractice

An allegation of malpractice may be made by a Learner or employer through the LEIA QCF Appeals Procedure (document QCF-AppProc) or by a member of the Centre staff or its agents. All cases of malpractice shall be reported to the Centre Co-ordinator. The Centre Co-ordinator will obtain statements from those concerned, whether the malpractice is by staff or Learners.

Investigation by the Centre into alleged malpractice by Learners

The Centre Co-ordinator will conduct a full enquiry into the malpractice. If malpractice is deemed to have taken place then a full written report will be submitted to the Awarding Organisation with supporting evidence.

Learners accused of malpractice will be made aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice, and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.

Learners accused of malpractice must be given the opportunity to respond (preferably in writing) to allegations made.

Learners accused of malpractice shall be made aware of the avenues for appealing should a judgement be made against him or her. Full details of an Awarding Organisation's appeals procedure will be sent to the Learner if the judgement goes against the Learner.

The Learner will be informed in writing of the outcome of the Awarding Organisation's decision.

Investigation by the Centre into alleged malpractice by members of staff

Investigations into any alleged malpractice or irregularities against a member of staff must normally be carried out in the first instance by the Centre Co-ordinator

Investigations into alleged malpractice or irregularities against the Centre Co-ordinator must be carried out by the Head of Centre, and reported to the Awarding Organisation when completed.

Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must be made fully aware (preferably in writing) at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice, and the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.

Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must have the opportunity to respond (preferably in writing) to allegations made.

Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must be made aware of the avenues for appealing should a judgement go against him or her.

When investigating serious cases or alleged staff malpractice, it may be necessary for a member of the Awarding Organisation staff to be present at an interview with the staff member concerned. The member of staff being interviewed may be accompanied by a friend or union representative.

In accordance with the requirements of the Code of Practice and the Arrangements for the Statutory Regulation of External Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, a report on cases where members of staff are found to have committed malpractice, together with details of the action taken by the Centre Co-ordinator must be forwarded to the regulatory authorities and may be made available to other Awarding Organisations if the Awarding Organisation decides that the circumstances of the case are sufficiently serious to warrant such reports being made.

Reports

It is the responsibility of the LEIA Centre Co-ordinator, acting on behalf of the Awarding Organisation, to submit a full written report of an investigation and to provide the following where appropriate:

- A statement of the facts, a detailed account of the circumstances and details of any investigations carried out by the Centre.
- Written statement(s) from the assessors or other staff concerned.
- Written statements from the Learner(s) concerned.
- Any mitigating factors (e.g. relevant medical reports).
- Information about the centre's procedures for advising Learners of the Awarding Organisations' regulations.
- Any work of the Learner and any associated material (e.g. source material) which is relevant to the investigation.