



Insulation Environmental Training Trust
Ltd
IETTLO

Assessment Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

August 2019
Renewal date August 2020



Assessment Malpractice and Maladministration

Malpractice refers to any deliberate act or practice which compromises, or threatens to compromise the process and integrity of assessment, and as a result the validity of the result or certificate awarded.

Assessment processes and outcomes can also be put at risk through maladministration; whilst malpractice is a deliberate act, maladministration may be accidental or a result of incompetence or a simple mistake.

The purpose of this policy is to reduce the risk of malpractice and/or maladministration by:

- increasing awareness and understanding of the actions that constitute malpractice and/or maladministration by learners, trainers, assessors and other staff
 - to reduce the risk of breach of regulations through ignorance;
 - to aid detection of any irregularities
- explaining how learners and staff will be made aware of this policy;
- identifying strategies to be employed to minimize the risk of learner malpractice
- describing how instances of alleged malpractice will be dealt with.

IETTLO will not tolerate actions (or attempted actions) of malpractice by staff, assessors or learners. IETTLO is committed to investigating all cases of suspected malpractice. Where cases of suspected malpractice are proven, IETTLO is fully committed to taking appropriate action, including applying punitive measures and reporting suspected malpractice in order



to maintain the integrity of assessment and certification.



All staff have a professional duty to ensure that they uphold this policy. Whilst the policy sets out general principles in addition staff must also ensure that they abide by the specific assessment requirements for each qualification as laid down by IETTLO.

Examples of Staff Malpractice

This list below is not exhaustive and the IETTLO at its discretion may consider other instances of malpractice. A more comprehensive list including examples of maladministration is provided in the Appendix of this policy.

- 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;
- 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 producing work for the learner;
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated;
- Allowing evidence to be included for assessment which is known by the staff member not to be the learner's own;
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation;
- Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements;
- 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;

Examples of Learner Malpractice

This list below is not exhaustive and IETTLO at its discretion may consider other instances of malpractice.

- A breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding body in relation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations;
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments;
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates, beyond what is permitted;
- Copying from another candidate (including the use of ICT to aid the copying);
- Allowing work to be copied e.g. posting written coursework on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment;
- Disruptive behaviour in the examination room or during an assessment session (including the use of offensive language);
- Exchanging, obtaining, receiving, passing on information (or the attempt to) which could be examination related by means of talking, electronic, written or non-verbal communication;
- Making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of controlled assessments, coursework or the contents of a portfolio;
- The inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or portfolios;
- Impersonation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one's place in an examination or an assessment;
- Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from published sources or incomplete referencing;



- Bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material;
- Behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.

Actions to Implement the Policy

Informing Learners

IETTLO will communicate the Learner Assessment Malpractice Policy to learners through the following means:

- Group Tutorials during the induction period;
- Assessors have responsibility for ensuring that learners are made aware of this policy before undertaking any assessed work which has the potential to contribute to the awarding of a qualification.

Implementing Assessment Practices

Assessors have responsibility for implementing assessment practices that reduce the opportunity for malpractice, including for example:

- Periods of supervised sessions during which evidence for assessments is produced by the learner;
- Altering assessment assignments/tasks/tools on a regular basis;
- Using oral questions with learners for a single assignment/task in a single session for the complete cohort of learners;
- Ensuring access controls which prevent learners from accessing and using other people's work when using networked computers;
- Requiring learners to sign to declare that their work is their own when submitting assessments.



Procedure for dealing with allegations of malpractice

1. Reporting suspected malpractice

All IETTLO staff and assessors have a responsibility for reporting any suspected incidences of staff or learner malpractice through the appropriate channels. Learners will be made aware of the procedure for reporting any allegations of suspected malpractice via the Learner Assessment Malpractice Policy.

In addition allegations of suspected malpractice may be made by external moderators, verifiers, examiners and reported to IETTLO via the awarding organisation.

Allegations made by IETTLO staff and assessors

- Allegations of suspected staff / learner malpractice to be made to the IETTLO Responsible Officer.

Allegations made by learners

All IETTLO staff and assessors have a responsibility to ensure that any allegations made to them in their professional capacity are taken seriously and reported through the correct channels:

- Allegations of suspected staff malpractice and/or learner malpractice to be reported to the Responsible Officer.

IETTLO will consider allegations that are made verbally but will request in all cases that allegations are put in writing with any supporting evidence that is available.

IETTLO accepts the responsibility to report any suspicion of learner or staff assessment malpractice to the appropriate awarding organisation. The only exception to this relates to assessment malpractice in coursework or controlled assessment which is discovered prior to the learner signing the



declaration of authentication. In these cases the incident need not be reported to awarding bodies, but will be dealt with in accordance with the IETTLO's disciplinary. Any work which is not the learner's own will not be given credit; in addition a note will be added to the cover sheet to detail any assistance that has been given.

Investigation of suspected malpractice

If assessment malpractice is suspected by **IETTLO staff and assessors** there will be a process of investigation, usually commissioned by the Responsible Officer, to establish the full facts and circumstances of any allegations or evidence.

The Responsible Officer will usually nominate an investigating officer. In order to avoid conflicts of interest investigations into suspected malpractice should not be delegated to the manager of the section, team or department involved in the suspected malpractice.

Possible Actions Taken by IETTLO

In cases where it is believed, following an investigation and hearing, that there is clear evidence of malpractice:

- The appropriate awarding body will be informed by IETTLO of the allegation of malpractice and they will be given the supporting evidence;
- IETTLO will take disciplinary action commensurate with the seriousness of the malpractice. There will be a right of appeal against any formal disciplinary warning or dismissal.

In any instances where suspected malpractice will be reported to awarding bodies IETTLO will provide the individual/s with a completed copy of the form or letter used to notify the awarding body of the malpractice.

Incidents of **learner assessment malpractice** will be investigated in a similar manner by the Responsible Officer. As with staff malpractice potential conflicts of interest will be avoided by nomination of an investigating officer who is external to the management of the learner



and/or particular curriculum area.

Investigations will proceed through the following stages:

- The learner will be informed about the issues, possible consequences and right of appeal;
- Collection of evidence related to the alleged malpractice;
- The review of evidence and production of a report;
- A formal meeting between the Responsible Officer and the learner against whom an allegation has been made
- Any suspected cases of Malpractice will be reported to the awarding organisation.

Possible Actions Taken by IETTLO

In cases where it is believed that there is clear evidence of malpractice:

- The appropriate awarding body will be informed by IETTLO of the allegation of malpractice and they will be given the supporting evidence;

In any instances where suspected malpractice will be reported to awarding bodies IETTLO will provide the individual/s with a completed copy of the form or letter used to notify the awarding body of the malpractice.

Retention of Evidence

All candidate work, assessments and verification records that are relevant to any investigation will be retained for 6 years from the date of the investigation concluding. The records and documentation involving investigations that are either a criminal or civil claim will be retained for 6 years after the case has been heard.

The records and documentation of appeals to the awarding organisation against the outcome of a malpractice investigation will be retained for 6 years from the appeal.



Examples of Malpractice

Staff/Assessor Malpractice Breach of Security

Breaking the confidentiality of question papers or materials, and their electronic equivalents, or the confidentiality of candidate scripts or their electronic equivalents:

It could involve:

- failing to keep examination material secure prior to an examination;
- discussing or otherwise revealing secure information in public, e.g. internet forums;
- failing to supervise adequately candidates who have been affected by a timetable variation;
- permitting, facilitating or obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination;
- failing to retain and secure examination papers after an exam in cases where the life of the paper extends beyond the particular session. For example, where an examination is to be sat in a later session by one or more candidates due to a timetable variation;
- tampering with candidate scripts or controlled assessments or coursework after collection and before despatch to the awarding body/examiner/moderator;
- failing to keep student computer files which contain controlled assessments or coursework secure.



Deception

Any act of dishonesty in relation to any examination or assessment, but not limited to:

- inventing or changing marks for internally assessed components (e.g. coursework) where there is no actual evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks being given;
- manufacturing evidence of competence against national standards;
- fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements;
- entering fictitious candidates for examinations or assessments, or otherwise subverting the assessment or certification process with the intention of financial gain (fraud).

-

Improper assistance to candidates

Giving assistance beyond that permitted by the specification to a candidate or group of candidates, which results in a potential or actual advantage in an examination or assessment

For example:

- assisting candidates in the production of controlled assessments or coursework, or evidence of achievement, beyond that permitted by the regulations;
- sharing or lending candidates' controlled assessments or coursework with other candidates in a way which allows malpractice to take place;
- assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers;
- permitting candidates in an examination to access prohibited materials (dictionaries, calculators etc.);
- assisting candidates granted the use of an oral language modifier,



a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader, a scribe or a Sign Language Interpreter beyond that permitted by the regulations.

Maladministration

Failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of controlled assessments, coursework and examinations or malpractice in the conduct of the examinations/assessments and/or the handling of examination papers, candidate scripts, mark sheets, cumulative assessment records, results and certificate claim forms, etc.

For example:

- failing to ensure that candidates' coursework or work to be completed under controlled conditions is adequately monitored and supervised;
- failure to use current assignments for assessments;
- failure to train invigilators adequately;
- failing to issue to candidates the appropriate notices and warnings;
- failing to post notices relating to the examination or assessment in all rooms where examinations and assessments are held;
- not ensuring that the examination venue conforms to awarding body requirements;
- the introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room, either during or prior to the examination; (N.B this precludes the use of the examination room to coach candidates or give subject-specific presentations, including power-point presentations, prior to the start of the examination.)
- failing to ensure that mobile phones are placed outside the examination room and failing to remind candidates that any mobile phones or other unauthorised items found in their possession must be handed to the invigilator prior to the examination starting;
- failure to supervise effectively the printing of computer based



- assignments when this is required;
- failing to retain candidates' controlled assessments or coursework in secure conditions after the authentication statements have been signed;
- failing to maintain the security of candidate scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body or examiner;
- failing to despatch candidate scripts / controlled assessments / coursework to the awarding bodies or examiners or moderators in a timely way;
- failing to report an instance of suspected malpractice in examinations or assessments to the appropriate awarding body as soon as possible after such an instance occurs or is discovered;
- failing to conduct a thorough investigation into suspected examination or assessment malpractice when asked to do so by an awarding body;
- the inappropriate retention or destruction of certificates.

Candidate Malpractice

For example:

- the alteration or falsification of any results document, including certificates;
- a breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding body in relation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations;
- failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments;
- collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates, beyond what is permitted;
- copying from another candidate;
- disruptive behaviour in the examination room or during an assessment session (including the use of offensive language);



- exchanging, obtaining, receiving, passing on information (or the attempt to) which could be examination related by means of talking, electronic, written or non-verbal communication;
- making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of controlled assessments, coursework or the contents of a portfolio;
- allowing others to assist in the production of controlled assessments, coursework or assisting others in the production of controlled assessments or coursework;
- the misuse, or the attempted misuse, of examination and assessment materials and resources (e.g. exemplar materials);
- being in possession of confidential material in advance of the examination;
- the inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or portfolios;
- impersonation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one's place in an examination or an assessment;
- plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from published sources or incomplete referencing;
- theft of another candidate's work;
- bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material;
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick where a candidate uses a word processor;
- behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.