



Malpractice Policy

Suspected candidate or staff malpractice must be investigated and acted on, in line with awarding body requirements. Further details regarding malpractice processes are contained within the associated Malpractice Procedures document.

Document Control Information	
Reviewed by the Academic Board:	February 2025
Approved by the Learning and Teaching Committee:	February 2025
Date of Next Review:	February 2026

The Board of Management (or any person/group with delegated authority from the Board) reserves the right to amend this document at any time should the need arise following consultation with employee representatives.

Introduction

It is imperative that Glasgow Kelvin College, the Awarding Bodies and other key partners work together to protect the credibility of the qualifications system. To do this, the College will ensure that its processes and qualifications are designed to minimise any potential for malpractice in the planning of assessments, assessing and authenticating candidate evidence.

Glasgow Kelvin College will take all reasonable steps to prevent any malpractice or maladministration. This includes the development, implementation and monitoring of policies and procedures to minimise any opportunity for malpractice including in relation to:

- design of assessments
- security of assessment materials
- assessment delivery and completion of assessments
- authentication of candidate evidence; and
- management of candidate assessment data

This document sets out the College procedures for dealing with suspected cases of malpractice in internally assessed qualifications. These procedures are necessary for maintaining the integrity of the Awarding Body qualifications. The document also explains the systems and procedures that should be implemented and followed to prevent malpractice and handle allegations of malpractice appropriately.

This document:

- defines candidate and centre malpractice in the context of internally assessed qualifications
- sets out the responsibilities of the College and the Awarding Body in relation to malpractice
- describes how to proceed in cases where there is reason to suspect malpractice

These procedures apply to all Awarding Body qualifications, including those that are subject to statutory regulation or Ofqual. Glasgow Kelvin College is committed to safeguarding its reputation for the quality and credibility of its qualifications. All allegations of malpractice will be investigated consistently, fairly and impartially.

The College will be a data controller in respect of much of the information it holds in the course of an investigation and will ensure that any sharing of personal data in the course of an investigation complies with the Data Protection Act 1998, the Information Commissioner's Data Sharing Code of Practice, and Glasgow Kelvin College Data Protection Policy. The college is also a Scottish public authority listed in Schedule 1 of the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002. The College is required to consider information requests it receives under the Freedom of Information (Scotland) Act 2002 and the Environmental Information (Scotland) Regulations 2004 (subject to any exemptions that might apply).

Candidates and staff are made aware of their rights and responsibilities and what constitutes malpractice or maladministration in internally assessed qualifications: at induction; in the staff and learner handbook; in various College policies and procedures; appropriate staff training; Student Advice; Administration Office; and the signed enrolment form/contract that confirms their understanding and acceptance of this. Candidates are made aware that they have the right to appeal to the College and ultimately to the Awarding Body to review a malpractice decision.

Definition

The term “malpractice” covers any deliberate actions, neglect, default or other practice that compromises the assessment process or the integrity of an Awarding Body qualification, the validity of an Awarding Body certificate, or the reputation and credibility of the Awarding Body. Some instances may occur because of ignorance of the College’s criteria and procedures, or because of carelessness or forgetfulness in applying them. As this may in itself constitute malpractice, this document covers both misconduct and maladministration.

Candidate malpractice

The Awarding Body “*Guide to Assessment*” will assist staff in designing assessments, assessing and authenticating candidate evidence to minimise the risk of candidate malpractice. Further information is included in subject-specific documentation, such as Unit Assessment Support Packs and HN exemplars.

Malpractice by a candidate in internal assessment can occur, for example, in:

- the preparation and authentication of assessment materials
- the preparation or presentation of practical work
- the compilation of portfolios of internal assessment evidence
- conduct during an internal assessment

The following are **examples of candidate malpractice**, but staff should be vigilant to other instances of suspected malpractice that may undermine the integrity of qualifications.

Examples could include:

- Plagiarism — failure to acknowledge sources properly and/or the submission of another person’s work as if it were the candidate’s own.
- Collusion with others when an assessment must be completed by individual candidates.
- Copying from another candidate (including using ICT to do so) and/or working collaboratively with other candidates on an individual task.
- Personation — pretending to be someone else.
- Inclusion of inappropriate, offensive, discriminatory or obscene material in assessment evidence.
- Frivolous content — producing content that is unrelated to the assessment.
- Unauthorised aids — physical possession of unauthorised materials (including mobile phones, electronic “sharing” devices, notes etc) during a controlled assessment.
- Misconduct — inappropriate behaviour during an assessment that causes disruption to others. This includes shouting and/or aggressive behaviour or language, and having a prohibited electronic device that emits any kind of sound in the assessment room.
- Breaching the security of assessment materials in a way which threatens the integrity of any exam or assessment.

The **range of sanctions for candidate malpractice** could include (but is not limited to):

- a written warning
- revision of marks
- cancellation of award(s)
- disqualification from future entries

Instances of student malpractice will be considered on an individual basis and may be dealt with under the Student Disciplinary process when appropriate.

Centre malpractice

Malpractice, **which includes maladministration and non-compliance**, means any act, default or practice which is a breach of the Awarding Body requirements and/ or which:

- Compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of the Awarding Body qualification or the validity of a result or certificate; and/ or
- Damages the authority, reputation or credibility of the Awarding Body or any officer, employee or agent of the Awarding Body.

Instances of malpractice arise for a variety of reasons:

- Some incidents are intentional and aim to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment (non-compliance).
- Some incidents arise due to ignorance of the Awarding Body requirements, carelessness or forgetfulness in applying the requirements (maladministration).

The following are **examples of centre malpractice**, but the Awarding Body reserves the right to consider other instances of suspected centre malpractice which may undermine the integrity of their qualifications.

Examples of centre malpractice include:

- Misuse of assessments, including repeated re-assessment contrary to requirements, or inappropriate adjustments to assessment decisions.
- Excessive direction from assessors to candidates on how to meet national standards.
- Failure to assess internally assessed unit or course assessment work fairly, consistently and in line with national standards.
- Managers or others exerting undue pressure on staff to pass candidates who have not met the requirements for an award.
- Failure to apply specified Awarding Body assessment conditions in assessments, such as limits on resources or time available to candidates to complete their assessments.
- Insecure storage of assessment instruments, materials and marking instructions.
- Failure to comply with requirements for accurate and safe retention of candidate evidence, assessment and internal verification records
- Failure to comply with the Awarding Body procedures for managing and transferring accurate candidate data.
- Deliberate falsification of records in order to claim certificates.
- Failure by the College to notify, investigate and report to the Awarding Body allegations of suspected centre malpractice.
- Failure to take action as required by the Awarding Body or to co-operate with an investigation in relation to concerns of malpractice.
- For qualifications subject to regulation by the Awarding Body Accreditation or Ofqual, failure by the College to notify, investigate and report to the Awarding Body allegations of suspected candidate malpractice.
- Deliberately withholding information about circumstances that may compromise the integrity of any Awarding Body qualification and/or credibility of the Awarding Body.

The **range of sanctions** by Awarding Bodies for **centre malpractice** could include (but is not limited to):

- a written warning
- application of requirement actions to enable certification to proceed
- withdrawal of approval to offer specific qualifications
- withdrawal of centre approval status