

QUALIA ACADEMY PLAGIARISM AND MALPRACTICE POLICY

1. Scope and Purpose

Qualia Academy 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. It should be read 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 Qualia Academy and applies to all internal assessments, and internal and external examinations. Where awarding bodies or validating industry specific provider have their own published procedures these will take precedent over the academies policy.

The main objectives of the policy are:

- 1.1** To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice/maladministration by staff or students
- 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 bodies
- 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 Qualia Academy 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 Qualia Academy (Centre)

Should 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 Tutor/ 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 malpractice/Maladministration and outcomes.

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

Responsible for malpractice checks when internally verifying work.

2.5 Quality Manager

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

2.6 Head of Academy (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 academies 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.
- Academic theft guidelines to be fair and tailored to circumstances within reason. With the AO, EPAO superseding (Academic Theft appendix 1)

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

4 Identifying malpractice/maladministration (Academic Theft appendix 1)

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

- reported by a coach or examiner via a report where the behaviour of an individual has had a disruptive effect on other candidates
- reported by an examiner or assessor, 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

In cases where malpractice is identified or suspected, the Student and/or Staff Discipline Policies would apply. The Student Discipline Policy, which is distributed and discussed with all students during induction and guidance, outlines the consequences of such conduct.

5 Dealing with malpractice/maladministration

5.1 Where the Academies discovers or suspects an individual, or individuals, of malpractice it will conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation.

5.2 Such an investigation will be initially undertaken by an Lead IQA (LIQA), who will interview all personnel linked to the allegation.

5.3 The Academy will make the individual(s) aware (preferably in writing) at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice/maladministration and of possible consequences should malpractice/maladministration be proven.

5.4 The investigation will proceed through the following stages:

5.4.1 Preliminary investigation, conducted by the appropriate AP, into the allegation to determine whether a full investigation is necessary. If the allegation is against a member of staff and appears to have substance, then all assessments by this member of staff should be halted until the investigation is complete.

5.4.2 Should it be determined that a **full investigation** is necessary it shall be conducted by an independent Investigation Officer appointed by the Principal Curriculum and Quality. A wider scrutiny of both current and historical evidence relating to the situation will be undertaken. For allegations against staff this is to not only establish the route cause but also the possible effects on learners past and present.

5.5 During the investigation the Academy will give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.

5.6 All stages of the investigation shall be documented by the person leading the investigation and reported to the relevant Awarding Organisation by the Quality Manager.

5.7 The individual will be informed of the avenues for appealing against any judgments made.

5.8 The Investigation Officer shall produce a report of their findings for the attention of the Principle.

5.9 For cases of staff malpractice/maladministration, HR and the Principal will decide whether to invoke the Staff Disciplinary Procedure.

5.10 For cases of student assessment malpractice, reference should be made by the Investigation Officer to all other relevant policies

5 Possible Actions Taken by the Academies

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

6 Associated Documents (Linked policies etc.)

- Quality Assurance Framework
- Assessment & Academic Appeals Procedure
- Student Disciplinary Procedure
- Staff Disciplinary Procedure
- Awarding Body Investigation Guidelines
- EPAO Investigation Guidelines
- Ofqual/Welsh Government General Conditions of Recognition (Nov 2012)
- NVQ code of practice 2006 (qualifications in the NQF)
- Ofqual Dealing with significant cases of suspected malpractice by those involved with the delivery of qualifications 2006
- Regulatory principles of the Qualifications and Credit Framework 2008

7 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, under the responsibility of the Principal of Teaching and Learning.

The Quality Manager will review these procedures annually.

Appendix 1 Actions for Academic Theft from peer (AO and EPAO follow their own policies)

Severity of Plagiarism offence	Descriptions	Actions
<p>First offence in the first semester of the first year.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No penalties or disciplinary action taken. Student to book referencing session with tutor and mentor. To be noted on learner progress file 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.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>First Offence</p>	<p>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)</p> <p>Highlighted work is not referenced and may not be included in bibliography.</p>	<p>Interview with course leader and manager* and written warning issued. (*Quality Lead and Principle). To be noted on learner progress file as. Student to book referencing session with tutor and or mentor. Work to be resubmitted but capped at a pass.</p>

<p>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.</p> <p>Second offence of lower amount (less than 50%)</p>	<p>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)</p> <p>Highlighted work is not referenced and may not be included in bibliography.</p>	<p>Interview with course leader and manager* and written warning issued. (*Quality lead and Principle). To be noted on learner progress file as. Student to book referencing session with tutor and or 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)</p> <p>A fail is recorded. Student to write new assignment in summer retrieval capped at a pass.</p>
<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 lead and Principle)</p> <p>Third time offender of academic theft.</p>	<p>Disciplinary hearing following the academies' disciplinary process. Outcome could be expulsion from course.</p>

Severity of Plagiarism offence for commercial	Descriptions	Actions
---	--------------	---------

training		
Theft of images or footage with a view of fraudulently completing practical assessment of commercial training.	The work is not authentic, the learner does not demonstrate commercial competency. The insurance for practice would be void due to lack of skill set being present and risk of harming professional reputation high.	<p>A fail is recorded, the student is required to resubmit with a 1000 word assignment outlining the potential risks and business impact (inclusive of health and safety plus copyright infringement outcome). A pass will be required to continue onto second practical.</p> <p>A second submission with a video showing the treatments being performed. At an additional fee of 25% of the course costs to cover administration.</p>

Learner Signature:

I have read and understood the above policy.

Name

Signature

Date

Document Management:

Owner: Kirsty Watson

Effective Date: 27/01/2021

Review Date: 27/01/2022

Document reference: V2:PMP2021

Change History Record

Version control	Substantive change narrative	Author of substantive change	Date of substantive change
V1:PMP2020	1 st published	Kirsty Watson	27/01/2020
V2:PMP2021	2 nd assessed and published	Kirsty Watson	27/01/2021
V2:PM P2021	Reviewed and no changes	Kirsty Watson	27/01/2022