
Corporate Flight Training Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Scope

This policy applies to training programmes based on the CAA syllabi.

Our commitment

Valid and reliable assessment occurs when trainees present authentic and current evidence of their knowledge, understanding and skills which are assessed by assessors against specified standards.

The purpose of this policy is to limit the threat to the integrity of those assessment decisions.

Our procedures

We will inform trainees and employees what constitutes malpractice.

We will inform trainees and employees of the implications of malpractice.

We will regularly review our procedures and documentation to minimise the risk of malpractice.

We will use the Programme Handbook and this Quality Manual to provide information about malpractice and its implications.

We will ask our trainees to confirm the authenticity of all evidence submitted for assessment by signing an authenticity statement.

Where malpractice is suspected, a formal procedure is to be followed.

Malpractice procedures

- Trainees will be provided with examples of malpractice during induction and in the Programme. Trainees will be provided with information to support their use of appropriate referencing of sources.
- Instructors/assessors will be trained on how to identify malpractice
- Team meetings will be used to assess the risk of malpractice through the design of summative assessment activities
- Trainees will sign a declaration of authenticity when any evidence is submitted for summative assessment.

A standard, time limited, sequenced and documented process for the centre and trainee to follow when malpractice is suspected.

Where malpractice from a trainee is suspected:

Stage 1

1. The individual will be notified of the issues and possible consequences. This will be added to the assessment feedback sheet. The trainee will have the opportunity to present a case to the SGI who will be notified of the issues.
2. SGI investigates by
 - Scrutinising evidence
 - Discussing with the instructor/assessor
 - Discussing with the trainee
3. SGI makes a decision and informs both the trainee and instructor/assessor and a sanction. Sanctions include:
 - A warning
 - A Fail grade given to the summative assessment with no opportunity for resubmission
 - A Fail grade given to the summative assessment with an opportunity for resubmission Exclusion from the programme
4. A record of the process, the evidence and the conclusion will be maintained and contribute to the Programme Review and Evaluation.

Stage 2

1. If the trainee disagrees with the outcome of the investigation by the SGI and/or the sanction to be applied, they must submit an appeal to the HT.
2. HT review will include
 - a scrutiny of all documentation
 - an interview with the trainee
 - an interview with the instructor/assessor
 - an interview with the IQA
3. HT makes a decision and informs the trainee, instructor/assessor and SGI.
4. A record of the process, the evidence and the conclusion will be maintained and contribute to the Programme Review and Evaluation.

Stage 3

Where the trainee disagrees with the outcome of the investigation, they must notify the HT/SGI who will refer the issue to the awarding organisation in compliance with their requirements.

Examples of Malpractice by Trainees

Plagiarism of any nature, for example:

Taking extracts from another person's work, published or unpublished without using quotation marks and/or acknowledging the source

Using ideas of another person which acknowledgement

Copying or using the work of another trainee without their permission

Purchasing essays or downloading them

Working collaboratively with other trainees to produce work that is submitted as individual trainee 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.

Examples of malpractice by employees

Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made

Failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure

Fraudulent claims for certificates

Assisting trainees in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment

Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the trainee has not generated

Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the trainee's own, to contribute to assessment decisions for a trainee

Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the trainee completing all the requirements of assessment .

We will formally review this policy in January 2022. However, we will keep this policy under review until then, and we welcome feedback on our approach

Yasmin Milner

Head of Training



Corporate Flight Training

January 2020