UNIVERSITY OF DERBY
BUXTON

Plagiarism and Assessment Malpractice Policy

Aim:

• To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or students.

• 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 students or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven.

• To protect the integrity of this centre and all relevant qualifications.

In order to do this, the centre will:

• seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and the student handbook to inform students of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice

• show students the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources.

• ask students to declare that their work is their own.

• ask students to provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used.

• conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the Head of Centre and all personnel linked to the allegation.

It will proceed through the following stages:

• make the individual fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.

• give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.

• inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgment made.

• document all stages of any investigation.

• Where malpractice is proven, this centre will follow the appropriate disciplinary processes.

Purpose/Scope of the above policy:

• To ensure that centres have policies and procedures in place to deal with malpractice.

• To ensure that issues are dealt with in an open, fair and effective manner.

• To ensure that centres provide appropriate deterrents and sanctions to minimise the risk of malpractice.

Definitions/Terminology:

• Student malpractice: any action by the student which has the potential to undermine the integrity and validity of the assessment of the student's work. For example, plagiarism, collusion, cheating, etc.

• Assessor malpractice: any deliberate action by an assessor which has the potential to undermine the integrity of the relevant qualification.

• Plagiarism: taking and using another's thoughts, writings, inventions, etc. as one's own.

• Minor acts of student malpractice: handled by the Assessor by, for example, refusal to accept work for marking and the student being made aware of malpractice policy. Student resubmits work in question.

• Major acts of student malpractice: extensive copying/plagiarism, 2nd or subsequent offence, inappropriate for the assessor to deal with.

Responsibilities:

• Centre: should seek proactive ways to promote a positive culture that encourages students to take individual responsibility for their learning and respect the work of others.

• Assessor: responsible for designing assessment opportunities which limit the opportunity for malpractice and for checking the validity of the student's work.

• Internal Verifier: responsible for malpractice checks when internally verifying work.

• Quality Nominee: required to the relevant awarding body of any acts of malpractice.

• Heads of Centre or their nominees: responsible for any investigation into allegations of malpractice.

Procedures:

Addressing student malpractice:

Promote positive and honest study practices.

Students should declare that work is their own: check the validity of their work.

Use student induction and student handbook to inform about malpractice and outcomes.

Ensure students use appropriate citations and referencing for research sources.

Assessment procedures should reduce and identify malpractice.

Addressing staff malpractice: Staff induction and updating should include all awarding body requirements. Use robust internal verification and audited record keeping. Audit student records, assessment tracking records and certification claims.

Dealing with malpractice:

Inform the individual of the issues and of the possible consequences.

Inform the individual of the process and appeals rights.

Give the individual the opportunity to respond.

Investigate in a fair and equitable manner.

Inform the relevant awarding body of any malpractice or attempted acts of malpractice, which have compromised assessment. The relevant body will advise on further action required.

Penalties should be appropriate to the nature of the malpractice under review.

Gross misconduct should refer to student and staff disciplinary procedures.

Definition of Malpractice by Students. (This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion):

•plagiarism of any nature. •collusion by working collaboratively with other students to produce work that is submitted as individual student work.

• 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.

• impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test.

Definition of Malpractice by Centre Staff

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion:

• improper assistance to candidates

• inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the student's achievement to justify the assessment decisions made.

• failure to keep student coursework/portfolios of evidence secure.

• fraudulent claims for certificates.

• inappropriate retention of certificates

• assisting students 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 student

• producing falsified witness statements. For example for evidence the student has not generated.

• allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the student's own, to be included in a student's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework.

• facilitating and allowing impersonation.

• misusing the conditions for special student requirements. For example where students 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 student completing all the requirements of assessment.

Date: June 2018

This policy will be reviewed every 12 months -June meeting of the FE Quality Enhancement Committee