

PLAGIARISM, MALPRACTICE & MALADMINISTRATION PROCEDURE

Contents

1. Scope and Purpose of this policy	3
2. Responsibilities	3
3. Definitions	4
4. Identifying malpractice/maladministration.....	6
5. Dealing with malpractice/maladministration (For HE see appendix 1)	6
6. Possible Actions Taken by the College	6
7. Associated Documents	6
8. Equality Statement	6
9. Monitoring Review and Evaluation	6
Appendix 1 Higher Education Students – Actions for Academic Theft.....	8

1. Scope and Purpose of this policy

Wiltshire College & University Centre considers any element of plagiarism and other forms of assessment malpractice and maladministration to be a serious issue, and this procedure defines malpractice/maladministration from both student and staff perspective, and how instances of this would be dealt with in conjunction with the relevant Staff and Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedures.

This procedure is applicable to all students and staff at all centres of the College and applies to all internal assessments, and internal and external examinations. *Where awarding organisations or validating HEI's have their own published procedures these will take precedent over the college policy.*

The main objectives of the policy are:

- 1.1 To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice/maladministration by staff or student
- 1.2 To respond effectively to any incident of alleged malpractice/maladministration promptly and objectively
- 1.3 To standardise the recording and reporting of any investigation of malpractice /maladministration to the relevant awarding organisations
- 1.4 To impose appropriate penalties/sanctions on staff or students where incident (or attempted incidents) of malpractice/maladministration are proven.
- 1.5 To protect the integrity of the College and the qualifications delivered

2. Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of all staff to give full and active support for the policy by ensuring the policy is known understood and implemented.

2.1 Students

In all assessed work candidates should take care to ensure the work presented is their own and fully acknowledges the work and opinions of others. Candidates should declare that work is their own. It is also the responsibility of the candidates to ensure that they do not undertake any form of cheating or other form of unfair advantage.

2.2 Wiltshire College & University Centre

The College will seek proactive ways to promote a positive culture that encourages learners to take individual responsibility for their learning and respect the work of others.

2.3 Lecturer / Assessor

Responsible for designing assessment opportunities which limit the opportunity for malpractice and for checking the validity of student's work. Use learner induction and learner handbook to inform about Plagiarism/Malpractice/Maladministration and outcomes.

2.4 Internal Verifier/Internal Quality Assurer (IV/IQA)

Responsible for malpractice/plagiarism checks when internally verifying work.

2.5 Head of Teaching, Learning & Assessment and/or Exams Manager

Required to inform Awarding Organisations of any acts of malpractice/maladministration.

2.6 Head of Centre (Principal) or their designated nominee

Responsible for any investigation into allegations of malpractice/maladministration

3. Definitions

3.1. **Malpractice** is any irregular conduct through deliberate activity, neglect or default on the part of a student or member of college staff, which gives unfair advantage to a candidate or group of candidates, or disadvantages other candidates. Malpractice may include a range of issues from the failure to maintain appropriate records or systems to the deliberate falsification of records in order to claim certificates. Failure by a centre to deal with identified issues may in itself constitute Malpractice.

- **Plagiarism** is where a student has included published material in submitted work, but has not cited the source, therefore, falsely claiming that the work is their own.
- **Plagiarism** is also including another students work in submitted work falsely claiming it is their own
- **Plagiarism** can also mean using the same assessed work in a different assessment. Students can **normally** only use work once for assessment.

For **Higher Education students**, academic theft is a serious academic offence, which has significant consequences. Plagiarism is academic theft. **See Appendix 1 for actions relating to Academic Theft (HE only) .**

3.2 **Maladministration** is any activity, neglect, default or other practice that results in the centre or learner not complying with the specified requirements for delivery of the qualifications and as set out in the awarding organisation requirements for approved centres and regulator documents.

3.3. **Examples** of actions that may constitute Malpractice/Maladministration are listed below. (These lists are not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice/maladministration may be considered)

Students	Staff	Centres
<p>Plagiarism, including the copying of work of another learner (including the use of ICT to aid copying).</p> <p>Collusion between two or more learners</p> <p>Deliberate destruction of another learner's work for assessment</p> <p>Fabrication of results or evidence</p> <p>False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework.</p> <p>Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or r to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test</p>	<p>Unfair discrimination in assessment (for example, on the grounds of age, sex, ethnicity, etc)</p> <p>Deliberate or wilful failure to assess in accordance with - the assessment criteria or other assessment requirements</p> <p>Assisting or prompting learners with the production of answers</p> <p>Obtaining unauthorised access to assessment material prior to or after assessment</p> <p>Failure to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to ensure the security of assessment</p> <p>Fraudulent certificate claims</p> <p>Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence)</p> <p>Failure to keep learner coursework/portfolios of evidence secure.</p> <p>Adding dates and signatures to coursework/portfolio evidence post assessment</p>	<p>Failure to provide appropriate facilities for the security of assessment and of assessment records</p> <p>Failure to keep externally set assessment papers secure prior to or after assessment</p> <p>Failure to keep learner, computer or other files secure</p> <p>Failure to provide assessment records of learners to awarding bodies or representatives of awarding bodies</p> <p>Failure to register learners with awarding bodies such that learners are prevented from obtaining the units or qualifications that they are taking.</p> <p>Consistent failure to follow actions resulting in external quality assurance visits</p> <p>Insufficient management of conflicts of interest. (Assessment of own staff, family members etc.).</p>

4. Identifying malpractice/maladministration

Cases of malpractice/maladministration can be identified in a number of different ways. They may be:

- Reported by a lecturer/assessor or examiner via a report where the behaviour of an individual has had a disruptive effect on other candidates
- Reported by a lecturer/ assessor or examiner, who may identify shared answers in an examination script or identical wording in a coursework assignment
- Identified by an internal verifier who may identify identical work in coursework assignments
- Identified by an external verifier, during a verification event

5. Dealing with malpractice/maladministration (For HE see appendix 1)

In cases where malpractice is identified or suspected, the relevant awarding bodies guidelines will be followed. Advice may be sought via the awarding Body (typically through the EQA) if required.

6. Possible Actions Taken by the College

The College may take internal disciplinary action in line with College Policy and Procedures. This action will be commensurate with the seriousness of the Malpractice/Maladministration and comply with appropriate employment legislation and awarding organisation requirements who may impose penalties or sanctions.

7. Associated Documents

- Assessment & Academic Appeals Procedure
- Staff Disciplinary Procedure
- Awarding Organisation Investigation Guidelines
- Ofqual
- NVQ code of practice

8. Equality Statement

It is intended that this policy is 'fair to all'. Where any part could potentially lead to unequal outcomes, the procedure then justifies why this is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.

9. Monitoring Review and Evaluation

Internal monitoring/verification of assessment activity will include malpractice/maladministration checks.

Evidence of both assessment and internal verification/moderation must be available for auditing by the Quality Team.

This document is managed by the Curriculum and Campus Admin Team Leader. The policy will be reviewed and amended as required, and at least annually the Head of Teaching, Learning & Assessment or appropriate substitute.

Appendix 1 Higher Education Students – Actions for Academic Theft

(HEIs follow their own policies)

Severity of Plagiarism offence	Descriptions	Actions
First offence in the first semester of the first year.	Cause for concern by marker that published work has been used and not referenced. Work has been copied from published work, less than 50% copied. Poor referencing.	No penalties or disciplinary action taken. Student to book referencing session with tutor, LRC or academic mentor. To be noted on promonitor as an action to improve referencing. This is considered poor academic work rather than academic theft. Work to fail, and to be resubmitted after referencing session. Normal resubmission rules apply.
Large amount of submitted work is copied but under 50%. Higher counts of similarity or other evidence of copying from published work or another student's work. First Offence	Cause of concern by marker that large chunks of submitted work is highlighted by Turnitin, or can be identified by marker that work has been copied (known written source for example) Highlighted work is not referenced and may not be included in bibliography.	Interview with course leader and manager* and written warning issued. (*Quality manager, HE manager, Head of Department, Deputy Head of Department or Assistant Principle). To be noted on promonitor. Student to book referencing session with tutor, LRC or academic mentor. Work to be resubmitted but capped at a pass.
Large amount of submitted work is copied but more than 50%. High counts of similarity or other evidence of copying from published work or another student's work. Second offence of lower amount (less than 50%)	Cause of concern by marker that large chunks of submitted work is highlighted by Turnitin, or can be identified by marker that work has been copied (known written source for example) Highlighted work is not referenced and may not be included in bibliography.	Interview with course leader and manager* and written warning issued. (*Quality manager, HE manager of Head of Department, Deputy Head of Department or Assistant Principle). To be noted on promonitor. Student to book referencing session with tutor, LRC or academic mentor, followed by 500 word reflective report of how to improve academic referencing, highlighting issues noted in own work (within 3 working weeks of written warning)

		A fail is recorded. Student to write new assignment in summer retrieval capped at a pass.
<p>100% of an assignment has been copied and falsely submitted as student's own work.</p> <p>Repeat offender (more than twice, see above) of more than 50% copied.</p>	<p>Marker has identified that work is 100% copied through Turnitin, which has been substantiated through an investigation by course leader and Manager* (*Quality manager, HE manager of Head of Department, Deputy Head of Department or Assistant Principle)</p> <p>Third time offender of academic theft.</p>	<p>Disciplinary hearing following the college's disciplinary process. Outcome could be expulsion from course.</p>