

Accreditation, Malpractice and Plagiarism Policy

Accreditation for Community Learning programmes is currently achieved in partnership with NCFE, Pearson and RSPH.

Accreditation will be arranged under the following terms:

- Accreditation will only be arranged for learners enrolled on our MIS system and who have provided the tutor with proof of ID.
- In exceptional cases a learner may be entered for another subject only with the agreement of the Programme Lead or the Service Manager
- If accreditation is required it must be part of a pre-approved programme that has the authorisation of the management team.
- All learners must complete a course on the subject being tested and demonstrate the required level of competence and attendance.
- After an agreed introduction period, the tutor and learner will agree if the learner will continue to accreditation. This will be based on attendance, achievement and timely completion of work. In the case of any disagreement the Programme Manager and / or Centre Manager will review.
- For functional skills - all learners need to undertake a practice test under timed conditions, achieving a 'pass' score, or demonstrate sufficient evidence that they are working at the required level. Evidence of this should be retained.
- Accreditation dates should be agreed with a member of the management team and details provided to the nominated person for registration. Information needs to be provided in a timely manner meeting the subjects and awarding organisation's guidelines.
- If learners are unsuccessful, re-sits and resubmissions will not be offered until further learning has taken place.
- For all programmes tutors and learners must comply with the instructions provided by the Internal Quality Assurer and the awarding organisation.
- Any requests for reasonable adjustments and special considerations must be made in writing to the Programme Lead/Service Manager giving learner details and supporting evidence.
- If applicable, learners should be given predicted assessment outcomes but advised that these are subject to internal and external verification procedures.
- Progression needs to be discussed with learners and recorded on the register. Information needs to be provided to the Programme Lead to assist with allocation of places and determining course provision.
- Tutors are responsible for arranging prompt collection and distribution of learners' certificates. The front desk will arrange to post out certificates if required.
- Distribution and collection of certificates must be logged.

For Food Hygiene

- Accreditation will only be arranged for learners who are enrolled on our MIS system and who have provided the tutor with proof of (photographic) ID.
- Only learners who have attended the full day's training can be entered for the exam.
- The exam will take place at the end of the day's training
- Results will be communicated with learners as soon as they are supplied by RSPH
- Distribution of certificates must be logged.
- Allegations will be reported to RSPH

Plagiarism

The following dishonest practice will not be tolerated by the Service:

- Taking someone else's work, ideas or images and claiming it as your own.
- Using the computer or information from a data device to reproduce work which you then claim as your own.
- Acting unfairly, dishonestly or cheating.
- Colluding with others to cheat or deceive.

If found or suspected of doing any of the above the tutor will highlight concerns to the learner and request a resubmission. If it continues the matter will be referred to the management team who will consider action and the awarding organisation informed.

Assessment malpractice

This consists of acts which undermine the integrity and validity of assessment. They may include some of the attached, however, the list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered at the discretion of management.

- Impersonation
- Fabrication of results or evidence
- Failure to follow instructions
- Misuse of assessment, examination material.
- Introduction of unauthorised materials
- Alteration of any results document
- Cheating to gain an unfair advantage.
- Where appropriate, acts of plagiarism and / or assessment malpractice will be subject to the CLS Disciplinary and Behaviour Policy and the awarding organisation informed.

Appeals Process

If a learner is dissatisfied with an assessment decision made by an assessor/tutor s/he has the right to appeal that decision. The main reasons for appeals are likely to be:

- The learner does not understand why the assessment decision has been made because of lack of or unclear feedback from the assessor/tutor.
- The learner believes the assessor/tutor has missed, misjudged or misinterpreted some of the evidence put forward for assessment.
- The learner is dissatisfied with the amount of opportunities offered to demonstrate competence.
- The learner experiences bias/discrimination in the assessment process in terms of equal opportunities.

Where the learner does not agree with the assessment decision the learner should locate the point of disagreement with reasons and reference the evidence to their work/portfolio.

There are three stages to the appeals procedure:

1. The learner appeals directly to the assessor/tutor who has carried out the assessment. The assessor will advise the candidate of the decision, in writing, within 10 working days.
2. If the learner is not satisfied with the decision made in stage 1, s/he can proceed to stage 2 by appealing to the Internal Quality Assurer/Programme Lead. All appeals will be acknowledged within 5 working days and investigated to establish facts and evidence supporting the appeal. If an appeal is considered justified, remedial action will be taken.
3. Learners who have exhausted stages 1 and 2 of the appeals process and are still not satisfied with the decision may proceed to stage 3. This appeal must be in writing to the Awarding Body and must be accompanied by copies of all the documentation used in stages 1 and 2. The learner will be liable for costs incurred from the Awarding Organisation.

The Awarding Body decision will be final.

Review date: November 2021