

## **Staff Malpractice Policy**

### **Introduction**

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding staff malpractice at the institute.

### **Examples of Malpractice**

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- . Tampering with students' work prior to external moderation/verification
- . Assisting students with the production of work outside of the awarding/validating body guidance
- . Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or other statements

The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regard to examinations.

- . Assisting students with exam and/or assignment/questions outside of the awarding/validating body guidance
- . Allowing exam students to talk, use a mobile phone or go to the toilet unsupervised
- . Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place.

### **Staff Malpractice Procedure**

Investigations into allegations will be coordinated by the Principal who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out within ten working days of the reporting of the alleged offence. The person responsible for coordinating the investigation will depend on the programme being investigated. The investigation will involve establishing the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true. Where appropriate, the staff member concerned and any potential witnesses will be interviewed and their version of events recorded on paper.

The member of staff will be:

- . informed in writing of the allegation made against him or her
- . informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- . informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven
- . given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations
- . given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- . given the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required)
- . informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him/her
- . informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice will be shared with the relevant awarding or validating body.

If work is submitted for moderation/verification or for marking which is not the student's own work, the awarding/validating body may not be able to give that student a result.

### **Staff Malpractice Sanctions**

Where a member of staff is found guilty of malpractice, the institute may impose the following sanctions:

- 1) Written warning: Issue the member of staff with a written warning stating that if the offence is repeated within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied
- 2) Training: Require the member of staff, as a condition of future involvement in both internal and external assessments to undertake specific training or mentoring, within a particular period of time, including a review process at the end of the training
- 3) Special conditions: Impose special conditions on the future involvement in work by the member of staff
- 4) Suspension: Bar the member of staff in all involvement in the administration and/or teaching of assessments/examinations for a set period of time
- 5) Dismissal: Should the degree of malpractice be deemed gross professional misconduct, the member of staff could face dismissal from his/her post



## **Appeals**

The member of staff may appeal against sanctions imposed on them. Appeals will be conducted in line with the student appeals Policy.