

Academic Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Relating to: Curriculum

Document reference: SHCPolCur01

Document owner: Deputy Principal

Date of approval: 26 March 2026

Date of next review: 26 March 2027

Academic Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

This policy aligns with the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) *Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures* and the *General Regulations for Approved Centres*.

Malpractice includes any act, default or practice that breaches awarding body requirements, compromises assessment integrity or public confidence, or damages the reputation or credibility of an awarding body or the centre. The policy is also aligned with the QAA regulatory framework for Higher Education – the *UK Quality Code*.

This policy aims to ensure that:

- The risk of academic malpractice by staff or students is identified and minimised.
- Any incident of alleged academic malpractice is promptly and objectively responded to.
- Appropriate sanctions are imposed on students or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of academic malpractice are proven.
- Conflict of interest in relation to assessment and/or examination practice is avoided.
- All notifiable incidents of malpractice or maladministration are reported to awarding bodies using the appropriate paperwork
- Centre-level malpractice, including systemic breaches or failures, is identified and addressed in line with JCQ (and non-affiliated AO) requirements.
- Generative AI is used only as a supportive tool for learning.
- AI tools are not used to replace critical thinking or independent work.

Staff Responsibility

All members of staff are required to work within the terms of this Policy to ensure the integrity and validity of assessment, the certification of qualifications and prevent damage to the authority of those responsible for conducting the assessment and certification.

Staff must ensure that they:

- Are aware of and comply with the Awarding Organisation and college requirements for internal and external assessment including access, examination, and invigilation arrangements.
- Comply with Awarding Organisation administration processes and report any instances of maladministration.
- Take part in induction and assessment updating activities.
- Inform students of the Academic Malpractice and Maladministration Policy.
- Design assessment opportunities that limit the opportunity for academic

malpractice.

- Check the validity of students' work.
- Ensure all examination and assessment staff (invigilators, readers, scribes, assessors etc.) are familiar with the JCQ Instructions for Conducting Examinations (ICE).
- Declare any conflict between personal, professional, or business interest that will influence assessment practice.
- Record and report any conflicts of interest to the awarding body where required.
- Co-operate fully with an enquiry into an allegation of academic malpractice.
- Comply with the College, partner University and Awarding organisation policies on the use of generative AI

Tutor Responsibility

Tutors must ensure that they:

- Seek to avoid potential academic malpractice by using the induction period and published information to ensure students are aware of and understand the policy on academic malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of academic malpractice.
- Show students the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources.
- Ask students to declare that their work is their own and wherever possible submit work through software that checks for plagiarism.
- Ensure students receive and understand the JCQ Information for candidates – AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments) document before completing assessments and reinforce the rules on permitted and non-permitted use of AI.

Investigating Alleged Academic Malpractice

Any alleged incident of academic malpractice will be investigated in line with the relevant college policies relating to student or staff behaviour.

The College will:

- Conduct an investigation in an open, fair, and equitable manner.
- Ensure that any investigator or information gatherer is independent of the allegation
- Refer the investigation directly to the University Partner as appropriate.
- Make the individual fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged academic malpractice and of the possible consequences should academic malpractice be proven.
- Give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.

- Inform the individual of the appeals process against any judgment made.
- Document all stages of any investigation, following JCQ information-gathering procedures including secure handling, confidentiality, and structured reporting.
- Report suspicions or actual incidents of academic malpractice to the Awarding Organisation within the specified timeframe as per their policy.
- Where academic malpractice is proven, the College will apply sanctions in accordance with the Awarding Organisation and/or the College's procedures.
- Where safeguarding concerns arise, the College may report legitimate concerns to the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO).

Definitions

Centre Malpractice

- Centre malpractice refers to systemic failures, repeated breaches of assessment rules, inadequate procedures, or poor oversight that compromise assessment integrity and may lead to centre-level sanctions.

Definition of Academic Malpractice by Students

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of academic malpractice may be considered:

- Plagiarism – the presentation of another person's work by another or using the work of others without properly acknowledging the source, with or without their permission.
- Cheating – obtaining access to the work of another person by deceitful means for use in examination or other assessment.
- Collusion – the unauthorized and unattributed collaboration of students or others in a piece of assessed work.
- Falsification – an attempt to present fictitious or distorted data, evidence, references, experimental results, or other material contributing to a piece of assessed work.
- Deceit – seeking to gain an advantage through the misrepresentation or non-disclosure of relevant information.
- Commissioning – using a person or persons to undertake an assessment which is then submitted in whole or part of a submission. This includes the use of Artificial Intelligence to generate part or all of an assessment unless explicitly authorised within the assignment or assessment brief.
- Misuse of Artificial Intelligence (AI) – using AI tools to generate content that is then presented as the student's own work, failing to acknowledge AI contributions when required, or using AI in any way that breaches JCQ or awarding-body rules.
- Any unpermitted use of AI, including generating content, ideas, code or structure that is submitted as original work, will be treated as

malpractice.

- Possession of unauthorised materials during any assessment, including electronic devices, AI-enabled tools, notes or prohibited items, in line with JCQ regulations.

Definition of Academic Malpractice by Staff

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered:

- Improper assistance to students, including providing or suggesting the use of AI tools in a way that compromises the authenticity of student work or breaches JCQ rules on AI use.
- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work where there is insufficient evidence of the students' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made.
- Failure to keep student coursework/portfolios of evidence secure.
- Fraudulent claims for certificates.
- Inappropriate retention of certificates.
- Failure to follow Awarding Organisation policies and procedures for administering the internal or external assessment processes.
- Assisting students in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves staff producing work for the student.
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the student has not generated.
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the student's own, to be included in a student's submitted work.
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- Misusing the conditions for special student requirements.
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.
- Fraudulent certificate claims, which is claiming for a certificate prior to the student completing all the requirements of assessment.
- Failing to keep assessment and/or examination papers secure prior to the assessment/examination.
- Obtaining unauthorised access to assessment and/or examination material prior to an assessment and/or examination.
- Failing to report any known issues of potential malpractice during examinations.
- Providing knowingly inaccurate or misleading information during any stage of assessment or investigation
- Allowing the use of generative AI in contradiction to the awarding University or Organisation.