

Malpractice Policy

Purpose: This policy provides guidelines for the actions we will take if we suspect malpractice in the completion of any Redline assessments associated with the formal certification of our delegates and our response in dealing with such matters.

1. Our policy will allow us to review our own procedures in light of a suspected or actual case of malpractice. We will act upon any reports we receive which may bring into doubt the integrity of an assessment, our training programme and quality assurance systems.
2. The appropriate authority defines malpractice as any deliberate activity, neglect, default or other practice that compromises the integrity of the assessment process and/or the validity of certificates, by either the trainee or the instructor. Examples include, but are not limited to:
 - Fabrication of work
 - Copying the work of another delegate
 - Collaborating with another delegate to produce work that is submitted as individual work
 - Impersonation of another trainee during the assessment
 - Improper assistance by the instructor and falsification of marks.

DfT will seek to take a stepped approach to compliance enforcement and, if necessary, prosecute for non-compliance with the relevant legislation.

3. Redline will seek to minimise malpractice through:
 - Advising our instructors of this policy
 - Advising clients and trainees of this policy and their responsibility for preventing malpractice
 - Utilising multiple question papers
 - Routine analysis and review of assessment performance against each course.
4. We will inform each of our clients, delegates and instructors what constitutes malpractice and the implications of malpractice:
 - Corporate/Individual Declaration (pre-attendance)
 - Course administration (classroom & elearning).
- Additional examples of malpractice for delegates and instructors are, but not limited to:
 - Taking extracts from another person's work, published, or not published without using quotation marks and/or acknowledging the source
 - Copying or using the work of another delegate.

6. Where malpractice from a delegate is suspected, a formal procedure is to be followed:

Stage 1

- The delegate will be notified of the issue and the possible consequences. The delegate will have the opportunity to present the case to the Training Manager/Head of Training & Elearning (TM/HTE) or nominated deputy

- The TM/HTE will be notified and investigate by:
 - Scrutinising the evidence
 - Discussing with the instructor
 - Discussing with the delegate
- The TM/HTE will make a decision and inform both the delegate and the instructor of the outcome. Sanctions included:
 - A warning
 - Fail graded with no opportunity for re-assessment
 - Fail graded with opportunity for re-assessment
- A record of the process, evidence and conclusion will be maintained for the duration of the certificate +3 months
- If the delegate disagrees then the delegate must move to Stage 2 of the process.

Stage 2

- The delegate must appeal the outcome of the decision within 5 days by submitting an appeal to the HTE or nominated manager, the HTE review will include:
 - Scrutiny of all documentation
 - Interview with delegate
 - Interview with instructor
 - Interview with internal quality assessor
- The HTE will make a decision and inform the delegate and instructor
- A record of the process, evidence and conclusion will be maintained for the duration of the certificate +3 months
- If the delegate disagrees then the delegate must move to Stage 3 of the process.

Stage 3

- Where the delegate disagrees with the outcome of the investigation, they must inform the HTE. The HTE will refer the issue to the CAA for their attention.
7. Where a client identifies the potential occurrence of malpractice amongst remote learners, Redline will seek their support to investigate the matter thoroughly using the process above as a guide.
 8. This policy is to be made available to all clients/delegates upon request and will be reviewed annually and/or when legislation changes.