



Staff Malpractice Policy

Reference	
Document Title:	Staff Malpractice Policy
Version:	1.2
Status:	Final
Date:	30 April 2021
Next Review:	April 2022
Classification:	Internal
Approval:	Academic Board
Approval Date	10 August 2021
Prepared By:	Quality Assurance
Received By:	Board of Directors/ College Oversight Board
External Referents:	<i>Pearson: Centre guidance: Dealing with malpractice and maladministration 2021</i> <i>JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2020 – 2021</i>

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Policy	2
3. Definition and Example of Malpractice	2
4. Procedure	3
4.1. <i>Identification</i>	<i>3</i>
4.2. <i>Consideration by Head of Programmes and Academic Monitoring</i>	<i>3</i>
4.3. <i>Investigation</i>	<i>3</i>
4.4. <i>Outcomes</i>	<i>4</i>



1. Introduction

- 1.1. This policy governs the conduct of staff in respect of assessments and related matters, seeking to establish a clear process to be followed to identify and minimise the risk of unacceptable academic practice;
- 1.2. A counterpart to the student Academic Misconduct Policy, these guidelines are similarly designed to ensure that LCC is committed to the highest standards of integrity when it comes to academic work and teaching and learning;
- 1.3. The policy safeguards the academic standards of College programmes, by ensuring that staff malpractice plays no role in learning or assessment;
- 1.4. LCC regards any form of intentional assessment malpractice as unacceptable. Members of staff who, after investigation, are found to have committed malpractice will be subject to disciplinary action.

2. Policy

- 2.1. All staff have a professional duty to uphold the principles of fair assessment and not engage in malpractice;
- 2.2. Any conduct that compromises, or makes an attempt to compromise, the integrity of any qualification at LCC will not be tolerated;
- 2.3. Serious consequences, consistent with the disciplinary procedure in the Staff Handbook, will follow for any member of staff who is found, following investigation, to have been involved in malpractice.

3. Definition and Example of Malpractice

- 3.1. JCQ defines 'Malpractice', as any act, default or practice which is a breach of the regulations or which:
 - 3.1.1. gives rise to prejudice to candidates; and/or
 - 3.1.2. compromises public confidence in qualifications; and/or
 - 3.1.3. compromises, attempts to compromise, or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate; and/or
 - 3.1.4. damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre.
- 3.2. The following list comprises examples of staff malpractice. It is not exhaustive, however, and there may be other examples:
 - 3.1.5. Producing work for a student for assessment
 - 3.1.6. Assisting a student with work where the assistance goes beyond normal teaching duties and contributes directly to the student's assessed work;
 - 3.1.7. Falsifying student records or certificates;
 - 3.1.8. Altering a student's marks without prior expressed permission of the Chair of Assessment and Progression Board;
 - 3.1.9. Unauthorised issuance of certificates;
 - 3.1.10. Facilitating or knowingly permitting impersonation in examinations or other assessments.



- 3.1.11. Changing College policies, forms or documents by stealth without the normal Committee processes or procedures;
- 3.1.12. Plagiarism, as defined in the Academic Discipline Policy, in documentation or lecture materials at LCC or within academic journals;
- 3.1.13. Acting in an unfairly discriminatory manner in assessment (on the grounds of legally protected characteristics), or facilitating others to do the same;
- 3.1.14. Failure to report to the Line Manager of known academic concerns/offences by students or other staff, as defined in the Academic Discipline Policy;
- 3.1.15. Failure to keep secure student coursework, answer booklets or other material that should not be disclosed to students;
- 3.1.16. Bribery of anyone involved in the assessment process;
- 3.1.17. Threats, intimidation or blackmail of anyone involved in the assessment process.

4. Procedure

4.1. Identification

- 4.1.1. Where a suspicion of assessment malpractice is identified by College staff, the individual shall report the matter to the Head of Programmes and Academic Monitoring (HoPAM) in the first instance as a matter of urgency by email.

4.2. Consideration by Head of Programmes and Academic Monitoring

- 4.2.1. A decision should be made by the HoPAM as to whether there is a prima facie case of malpractice in the relevant work or conduct.

4.3. Investigation

- 4.3.1. Should the HoPAM determine that a prima facie case of malpractice exists, s/he shall report the case to the Registrar, who will then appoint an Investigating Officer with no prior involvement in the matter;
- 4.3.2. Where there is no prima facie case, the matter shall be dismissed with no record on the member of staff's record;
- 4.3.3. The Registrar will write to the member of staff formally informing them of the allegation, including any prima facie evidence and stating the identity of the Investigating Officer, together with the possible consequences and any other relevant information;
- 4.3.4. The investigation will then take place in a manner pre-determined by the Investigating Officer which is proportionate to the nature of the suspected malpractice;
- 4.3.5. Whichever procedure is chosen, the member of staff will always be given the opportunity to challenge the allegation(s) made against him/her;
- 4.3.6. Investigations will normally be conducted through the following stages:
 - 1. The Investigating Officer will gather all available evidence connected to the allegation, conducting interviews with staff or students (or other witnesses) as appropriate;
 - 2. The Investigating Officer will formally meet with the member of staff either within a hearing or a formal and minuted meeting;
 - 3. The Investigating Officer will then make a determination on the allegation, presented in the form of a formal report.



4.4. Outcomes

- 4.4.1. Should the Investigating Officer find that there is no case to answer, the case will be dismissed with no record on the member of staff's record.
- 4.4.2. In cases where the Investigating Officer upholds the allegation, in full or in part, the Report shall be presented to the HR Manager or HR Officer who may take disciplinary action in accordance with the procedure within the Staff Handbook, proportionate to the seriousness of the malpractice.

End