

Malpractice and Plagiarism Policy

Policy Statement

Malpractice, which includes maladministration, is defined as a deliberate act, default or practice to deceive or falsify records in order to obtain a qualification, result or certificate. Committing malpractice breaches regulations set by awarding organisations thus compromising the integrity of the assessment and damaging the authority, reputation and credibility of awarding organisations and the training provider.

Maladministration is defined as an 'act of inefficient or dishonest administration in situation where the individual or group in charge is unjust, dishonest, or ineffective in their leadership.

Peak Consultants Ltd. is committed to investigate and report all suspected cases of malpractice to the awarding organisation in all cases that fail to abide by regulations that may constitute malpractice and take appropriate action in order to maintain the integrity and validity of awards and our reputation and image as a trustworthy and reliable training provider.

Peak Consultants Ltd. will not tolerate actions (or attempted actions) of malpractice or maladministration. The malpractice and plagiarism policy exists to enable Peak Consultants Ltd. to work with awarding organisations to reduce instances of malpractice through effective detection of irregularities, and by imposing appropriate penalties and sanctions.

Examples of learner malpractice (the list is not exhaustive):

1. Plagiarism by copying and passing off, as the learner's own, the whole or part(s) of another person's work, whether published or not, with or without the originator's permission and without appropriately acknowledging the source.
2. Making a false declaration of authenticity in work submitted for internal or external assessment.
3. Collusion by working with others to produce work that is submitted as individual work. Learners should not be discouraged from teamwork, as this is an essential key skill for many sectors and subject areas, but individual roles must be clearly identified.
4. Impersonation in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test.
5. Failing to abide by the instructions or advice of a trainer/assessor or an invigilator or the awarding organisation's rules and regulations.
6. Cheating to gain an unfair advantage, the alteration of any results document, including certificates.

Examples of staff malpractice (the list is not exhaustive):

1. Failing to keep an awarding organisation mark schemes secure, alteration of any mark schemes or grading; producing falsified witness statements, for example, for evidence a learner has not generated.
2. Assisting learners in the production of work for an assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves the assessor or trainer producing work for the learner.
3. Allowing evidence that is known not to be the learner's own, to be included for internal or external assessment.
4. Falsifying records/certificates.
5. Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
6. Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements/access arrangements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as a scribe, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment.
7. Fraudulent certificate claims.
8. Failing to keep assessments/examination/test papers secure prior to the assessment/examination/test.

Review frequency: Annual

Lead Officer: Quality Assurance

Senior Manager Responsible: Director

9. Entering fictitious candidates for examinations or assessments or otherwise subverting the assessment or certification process with the intention of financial gain (fraud).
10. Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed components where there is no actual evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks awarded.
11. Fabricating assessment and/or internal quality assurance records or authentication statements.

Staff and learners will be informed of the Malpractice and Plagiarism Policy regarding via induction processes.

Peak Consultants Ltd will take positive steps to prevent and reduce instances of malpractice by:

1. Showing learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources including websites.
2. Introducing procedures for assessing work in a way that reduces or identifies malpractice
 - Effective internal quality assurance
 - Identifying periods of supervised study where assessment evidence is produced by learners, as required
 - Altering assessment assignments/tasks/tools on a regular basis
 - Using oral questions with learners to ascertain their understanding and verify their evidence.

All cases of suspected or confirmed malpractice must be reported to the awarding organisation. Failure to do so constitutes malpractice in itself. The Directors of Peak Consultants Ltd. are responsible for investigating and reporting all cases of suspected or actual malpractice to the awarding organisation and conducting a full and thorough investigation.

- The Directors will report suspicions or actual incidents to the appropriate awarding organisation immediately.
- Individuals involved in the alleged or actual malpractice will be informed in writing, making them fully aware of the nature of alleged malpractice and its possible consequences at the earliest opportunity.
- The individual(s) involved in the alleged malpractice will be given the opportunity to respond in writing to the allegations made. They will also be informed of the appeal process and possible penalties or sanctions if allegations are upheld.
- Upon conclusion of a full investigation the Directors will inform the awarding organisation of the result.
- If malpractice is proven Peak Consultants Ltd. may apply its own sanctions in addition to any imposed by the awarding organisation. Sanctions could include being removed from the program with no reimbursement of fees.

Individual(s) will be informed of the decision and sanction(s) imposed because of an allegation, to which they have a right to appeal using the Appeals Policy.

Review frequency: Annual

Lead Officer: Quality Assurance

Senior Manager Responsible: Director