

LONDON PROACTIVE Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Definition of Malpractice

Malpractice is essentially any activity or practice which deliberately contravenes regulations and compromises the integrity of the internal or external assessment process and/or the validity of certificates and associated achievement. It covers any deliberate actions, neglect, default or other practice that compromises, or could compromise:

- the assessment process
- the integrity of a regulated qualification
- the validity of a result or certificate
- the reputation and credibility of LONDON PROACTIVE and/or Active IQ, or the qualification or the wider qualifications community

Malpractice may include a range of issues from the failure to maintain appropriate records or systems, to the deliberate falsification of records in order to claim certificates.

For the purpose of this policy this term also covers misconduct and forms of unnecessary discrimination or bias towards certain groups of learners.

Examples of malpractice

The categories listed below are examples of centre and learner malpractice. Please note that these examples are not exhaustive and are only intended as guidance on our definition of malpractice:

Definition of Maladministration

Maladministration is essentially any activity or practice which results in non-compliance with administrative regulations and requirements and includes the application of persistent mistakes or poor administration within LONDON PROACTIVE (e.g. inappropriate learner records).

Examples of maladministration

The categories listed below are examples of centre and learner maladministration. Please note that these examples are not exhaustive and are only intended as guidance on our definition of maladministration:

Student Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice by students. The list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by the college at its discretion.

- Cheating in an examination: Copying from the work of other learners, obtaining help from other learners in a way that contravenes the regulations for the examination, bringing into the examination any unauthorised materials, or referring during the examination to any unauthorized material, or any form of impersonation.

- **Plagiarism:** This means copying work from any other source published, in a manner not authorised by the regulations for assessment and presenting the copied work as if it were the learner's own work. Work presented by a learner in assessment must be the learner's own, and where exceptions are permitted, any such exceptions must be clearly identified and the source fully acknowledged (including downloads from any internet site).
- **Fabrication of information:** This is the presentation of any false or fabricated information, results or conclusions in any form of assessment, including practical or field work studies, oral presentations, unpublished work, and including the work of fellow learners, interviews and reports from work placements, etc.
- **Collusion:** This is the deliberate and intentional collaboration, without official approval, between two or more learners in the development and production of work that is eventually submitted by each learner, in a substantially similar and/or identical form; and is presented by each learner to be the outcome of his or her individual efforts.

Staff Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice by centre staff. The list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by the college at its discretion:

- failing to keep any awarding body mark schemes secure
- alteration of any awarding body mark schemes
- alteration of any awarding body's assessment and grading criteria
- assisting learners 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 centre staff producing work for the learner
- producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the learner's own, to be included in a learner's assignment/task/portfolio/ coursework facilitating and allowing impersonation
- misusing the conditions for special learner requirements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as an amanuensis, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment
- failing to keep learner computer files secure
- falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud
- fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing
- all the requirements of assessment
- failing to keep assessment/examination/test papers secure prior to the assessment/examination/test

Examples of maladministration

The categories listed below are examples of centre and learner maladministration. Please note that these examples are not exhaustive and are only intended as guidance on our definition of malpractice:

- Failure to keep assessment materials, examination question papers and assessment scripts secure, before during or after an assessment;

- Failure to keep abreast of dates, deadlines and qualification rules issued to centres on an annual basis in the staff qualification handbooks
- Failure to implement procedures to verify students' identity
- Failure to adequately supervise students who have been affected by a timetable variation;
- Failure to use current learning materials for assessments
- Failure to issue to students the appropriate notices and warnings

Process for making an allegation of malpractice or maladministration

Anybody who identifies or is made aware of suspected or actual cases of malpractice or maladministration at any time must immediately notify the appropriate personnel at LONDON PROACTIVE and Active IQ. In doing so they should put their notification in writing / email and enclose appropriate supporting evidence. If the area of malpractice or maladministration involves LONDON PROACTIVE then the informant should bypass us as a centre and report the issue directly to Active IQ.

All allegations must include (where possible):

- centre's name, address and number
- learner's name and Active IQ registration number (If known)
- centre/Active IQ personnel's details (name, job role) if they are involved in the case
- details of the Active IQ course/qualification affected or nature of the service affected
- nature of the suspected or actual malpractice or maladministration and associated dates
- details and outcome of any initial investigation carried out by the centre or anybody else involved in the case, including any mitigating circumstances

If LONDON PROACTIVE has conducted an initial investigation prior to formally notifying Active IQ, LONDON PROACTIVE should ensure that staff involved in the initial investigation are competent and have no personal interest in the outcome of the investigation. However, it is important to note that in **all** instances LONDON PROACTIVE must immediately notify Active IQ if they suspect malpractice or maladministration has occurred as Active IQ have a responsibility to the regulatory authorities to ensure that all investigations are carried out rigorously and effectively.

In all cases of suspected malpractice and maladministration reported to Active IQ they will protect the identity of the 'informant' in accordance with their duty of confidentiality and/or any other legal duty.

Confidentiality and whistle blowing

Sometimes the 'informant' will wish to remain anonymous. However, it is always preferable to reveal your identity and contact details to LONDON PROACTIVE or Active IQ, and if you are concerned about possible adverse consequences please inform LONDON PROACTIVE or Active IQ that you do not wish to divulge your identity. If it helps to reassure you on this point, LONDON PROACTIVE or Active IQ can confirm that we are not obliged (as recommended by the regulators) to disclose information if to do so would be a breach of confidentiality and/or any other legal duty.

Whilst LONDON PROACTIVE or Active IQ are prepared to investigate issues which are reported anonymously LONDON PROACTIVE or Active IQ shall always try to confirm an allegation by means of a separate investigation before taking up the matter with those that the complaint/allegation relates to. At all times we will investigate such complaints from whistleblowers in accordance with relevant whistle blowing legislation.

LONDON PROACTIVE's responsibility for preventing malpractice or maladministration

To eradicate cases of malpractice/maladministration LONDON PROACTIVE will ensure:

- all staff are aware of policies and procedures and receive appropriate training/briefings on these
- staff have clear roles and responsibilities
- there is a documented internal quality assurance procedure/methodology that is clearly in place and is subject to regular internal reviews
- there are documented internal standardisation arrangements in place and evidence that these take place at least once a year
- learners are informed of their roles and responsibilities in terms of not doing anything that may be deemed as malpractice and jeopardise their potential achievements
- all assessment and internal verification activities are accurately recorded and carried out in accordance with LONDON PROACTIVE's internal quality assurance arrangements and in line with LONDON PROACTIVE's expectations as outlined in its qualification guides.
- all registration and certification records are subject to appropriate internal review before submission
- all registration, assessment and certification records will be kept securely either as electronic records or as hard copies in a locked filing cabinet, in a locked cupboard for up to 3 years after the student has completed their course. Only authorised and appropriate members of staff will have access to them.

LONDON PROACTIVE's procedure to conduct a malpractice / maladministration investigation

To embed effective arrangements to investigate instances of malpractice/maladministration the following process will ensue. It is intended that the stages involve generic key activities; however, not all of these would be implemented in every case.

Stage 1: Briefing and record-keeping

Anyone involved in the conduct of an investigation should have a clear brief and understanding of their role.

All investigators must maintain an auditable record of every action during an investigation to demonstrate that they have acted appropriately.

The officer assigning the investigating officer(s) will stipulate and/or provide secure storage arrangements for all material associated with an investigation in case of subsequent legal challenge. There may be occasions when a joint investigation occurs with Active IQ, with the roles of the two teams being clarified by Active IQ. It is LONDON PROACTIVE responsibility to ensure their investigators are fully aware of the agreed roles and processes to follow during the investigation.

Stage 2: Establishing the facts

Investigators should review the evidence and associated documentation, including relevant Active IQ guidance on the delivery of the qualifications and related quality assurance arrangements.

Issues to be determined are:

- what occurred (nature of malpractice/substance of the allegations)
- why the incident occurred
- who was involved in the incident
- when it occurred
- where it occurred – there may be more than one location
- what action, if any, LONDON PROACTIVE has taken

Stage 3: Interviews

Interviews should be thoroughly prepared, conducted appropriately and underpinned by clear records of the interviews. For example:

- Interviews should include prepared questions and responses to questions which should be recorded
- Interviewers may find it helpful to use the 'PEACE' technique:
 - Plan and prepare.
 - Engage and explain.
 - Account.
 - Closure.
 - Evaluation.

Face to face interviews should normally be conducted by two people with one person primarily acting as the interviewer and the other as note-taker.

Those being interviewed should be informed that they may have another individual of their choosing present and that they do not have to answer questions. These arrangements aim to protect the rights of all individuals. Both parties should sign the account as a true record/reflection of what was covered/stated/agreed.

Stage 4: Other contacts

In some cases, learners or employers may need to be contacted for facts and information. This may be done via face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews, by post or email. Whichever method is used, the investigator will have a set of prepared questions. The responses will be recorded in writing as part of confirmation of the evidence. Investigators should log the number of attempts made to contact an individual. Again accounts should be signed for agreement with written records to be formatted as non-editable PDF.

Stage 5: Documentary evidence

Wherever possible documentary evidence should be authenticated by reference to the author; this may include asking learners and others to confirm handwriting, dates and signatures.

Receipts should be given for any documentation removed from LONDON PROACTIVE. Independent expert opinion may be obtained from subject specialists about a learner's evidence and/or from a specialist organisation such as a forensic examiner, who may comment on the validity of documents.

Stage 6: Conclusions

Once the investigators have gathered and reviewed all relevant evidence, a decision is made on the outcome.

Stage 7: Reporting

A draft report is prepared and factual accuracy agreement obtained. The final report is submitted to the relevant staff member within LONDON PROACTIVE for review and sign-off and shared with Active IQ and relevant parties within your organisation.

Stage 8: Actions

Any resultant action plan is implemented and monitored appropriately and Active IQ notified. If you would like to refer to Active IQ's policy for Malpractice and Maladministration, please visit <https://www.activeiq.co.uk/for-centres/policies-and-procedures>

Thank you for your contribution and commitment to making our policy work.