



Malpractice Policy

September 2024

Version 1.1

Approved by the Board of Governors

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. DEFINITIONS	3
3. RESPONSIBILITIES	5
4. IDENTIFICATION AND REPORTING OF MALPRACTICE	7
5. APPEALS.....	9
6. REVIEW OF THE POLICY	9
7. APPENDIX A	10
8. APPENDIX B	11
9. APPENDIX C	

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 - UK Business College (UKBC) is committed to providing a full and efficient education to all students, and embraces the concept of equal opportunities for all.
- 1.2 - UKBC will endeavour to provide an environment where all students feel valued and welcomed.
- 1.3 - UKBC is committed to providing high quality learning opportunities for its students and therefore require that standards of assessment are consistent, transparent and inline with the requirements of the awarding body.
- 1.4 - This policy will contain within it, the procedures that the College will use to manage malpractice and suspected malpractice by students.
- 1.5 - The purpose of the malpractice policy is to identify the risk of malpractice by students, ensure consistency and appropriateness in the handling of malpractice and suspected malpractice, and outline response procedures and the recording of any investigations.
- 1.6 - This policy applies to all students and staff studying on a taught programme of study at UK Business College.
- 1.7 To reflect the current taught programmes offered at UK Business College, this document has been primarily informed by the following awarding policy documents and guidance:
 - Joint Council for Qualifications: Plagiarism in Assessments
 - Joint Council for Qualifications: Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures
 - Centre Guidance: Dealing with malpractice and maladministration
 - Understanding and Managing Plagiarism - Vocational Quality Assurance
 - BTEC Centre Guide to Plagiarism

2. DEFINITION

- 2.1 - 'Malpractice' is defined as the failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This policy and procedure use the word 'malpractice' to cover both 'malpractice' and 'maladministration' and is defined as any act, default or practice which is:
 - a breach of the Regulations; and/ora breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered; and/or
 - a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification;which:

- gives rise to prejudice to candidates; and/or
- compromises public confidence in qualifications; and/or
- compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate;

and/or

damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre

2.2– Malpractice comprises of a variety of different actions and practices, including plagiarism, collusion, and subcontracting. For clarity and consistency of understanding, table 1 outlines what typically constitutes plagiarism:

Direct Quotes and Verbatim	Direct quotes that are not referenced accordingly or passages of text copied verbatim with no acknowledgement to the original author
Cutting and Pasting from the Internet/AI Sources/Copying directly from Books	Directly copying material from an online/Physical source without referencing or citing appropriately.
Inaccurate citation	Not following the rules that are set regarding referencing and citation, both within text and part of a reference list/bibliography
Paraphrasing	Where the context stays the same, but a few words are changed, or the order is swapped around to make it look like their own work. Failure to give credit to the original work
Submitting the same piece of work for two different purposes	Trying to submit the same piece of work across two different courses or purposes is considered academic misconduct

2.3 **Misuse of Artificial Intelligence (AI)** also constitutes a form of malpractice and will be subject to the same reporting procedures as outlined in this document. For the purposes of staff and students at UK Business College, AI misuse is defined as ‘inappropriately using an AI tool such that the work submitted for assessment is not the student’s own and/or the student fails to appropriately reference and explain their use of AI’.

2.4 **Collusion**, comprising of the unauthorised sharing of work between a cohort, and/or working collaboratively with other candidates when the assessment is an individual submission, and **subcontracting** to someone to complete the work for you or using a ghost-writing service, also constitute forms of malpractice for UKBC programmes.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES

- 3.1- The College must ensure that information for students, including non-examination assessments, coursework, on-screen tests, written examinations, social media, and plagiarism is distributed to candidates prior to assessments/examinations taking place. This also includes information pertaining to the use and misuse of AI and associated AI tools, where applicable.
- 3.2- Ensure students are informed verbally and in writing about the required conditions under which the assessments are conducted, including warnings about the introduction of prohibited materials and devices into the assessments, and access to restricted resources.
- 3.3- Ensure that students are aware of what actions and practices constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice.
- 3.4- Ensure that students are aware of the sanctions of passing on or receiving (even if the information was not requested) confidential assessment materials. If a student receives confidential information, they must report it to a member of centre staff immediately.
- 3.5- Ensure that students completing coursework or non-examination assessments are aware of the need for the work to be their own, and fully understand the risks of malpractice and AI misuse, including the negative impact on their own learning. This information should be included within the student induction at the start of the programme, and reinforced throughout the academic year.
- 3.6– Ensure that students have opportunities to develop their AI literacy and fully understand the ethical use of AI, which includes knowing when it is appropriate to be used, and receive guidance and support on how to use correct referencing conventions when acknowledging its use.
- 3.7 Ensure students have regular and comprehensive opportunities to develop a range of assessment literacies, including time management strategies, to minimize the likelihood of unintended plagiarism.
- 3.8– The College must establish and maintain, and at all times comply with, up-to-date written procedures for the investigation of suspected or alleged malpractice.
- 3.9– The College must ensure that staff receive appropriate and regular training to remain up to date with advancements in AI and associated tools, and other possible forms of malpractice.

3.10 – The College must ensure that investigations are carried out rigorously and effectively.

4. IDENTIFICATION AND REPORTING OF MALPRACTICE

- 4.1 - UKBC has an established process to prevent and identify malpractice by students, including the misuse of AI.
- 4.2 - Once suspected malpractice is identified, the marker will complete the form for malpractice (Appendix - A) and submit it to the Programme Manager for review. The Programme Manager will review the case and the student will be contacted by the Registry Department via email requesting a written statement from the student within 10 working days.
- 4.3 - Malpractice by a student discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the student signing the declaration of authentication need not be reported to the awarding body but must be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures.
- 4.4 - The marker and the Programme Manager will investigate the case to determine whether it is a malpractice by the student.
- 4.5 - If it is considered to be malpractice, the College will schedule the Malpractice Committee and the outcome will be communicated to the student.
- 4.6 - If it is a minor offence, then it will be considered as Poor Academic Practice and the student will be invited to attend a one-to-one meeting with their Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) for an informal warning. If applicable, a development plan to support the enhancement of assessment literacy will also be developed with the PAT.
- 4.7 - If a student has signed the declaration of authentication, the Head of Centre **must** notify the awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected, or actual incidents of malpractice by completing the JCQ/M1 Form (Appendix - B).
- 4.8 In the event of suspected learner malpractice in *external assessments*, the awarding body must be made aware immediately through completion of JCQ/M1 Form (Appendix - B)
- 4.9 If **staff** malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the Head of Centre **must** inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate(s), and before any investigation is undertaken.
- 4.10 In the event of suspected malpractice by **centre staff**, the Head of Centre is also required to complete a JCQ Form M2 (Appendix – C)

4.11 4.10 It is also the responsibility of the Head of Centre for UKBC to inform learners and centre staff of suspected malpractice of their responsibilities and rights.

4.12 Upon receipt of malpractice concerns, the awarding body will review them and determine the appropriate next steps, as detailed below.

- Awarding body will review and assess strategy of investigation and if an investigation is necessary
- Background desktop research conducted by awarding body (factual review of the allegation or notification, historical malpractice cases, student volumes)
- Information gathering
- Evidence review (review of all the information gathered to determine if the allegations are supported by the evidence and if there are other concerns arising during the investigation)
- Findings of the investigation

- Case/investigation review (identification from the evidence of any potential regulation/ specification breaches)
- Malpractice Committee (the outcome of the investigation is determined by the Malpractice Committee)
- Final outcome

4.13 Once a decision has been made, it will be communicated in writing to the Head of Centre as soon as possible. It is the responsibility of the Head of Centre to communicate the decision to the individuals concerned and to pass on details of any sanctions and action in cases where this is indicated. The Head of Centre must also inform the individuals if they have the right to appeal.

5. APPEALS

5.1 - UKBC has established procedures for considering appeals against sanctions arising from malpractice decisions.

5.2 - Appeals must normally be made within 14 days of receiving the outcome of the Malpractice Committee's decision.

5.3 - Further information about the appeals process can be found in the *UKBC Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure*.

6. REVIEW OF THE POLICY

6.1 - This policy will be reviewed annually or as required by changes in external regulations. Changes to it will be reviewed by the College's Executive Committee and ratified by the Board of Governors.

7. APPENDIX A

MALPRACTICE FORM

Student Number:	Student Name:
Module Code:	Module Name:
Assessment Item Number (e.g. 001):	Assessment Item Name (e.g. 'Report'):
What type of malpractice is the student accused of?	
Plagiarism Self-plagiarism Collusion Falsification subcontracting Misuse of AI Other (please specify)	
Details of Accusation: Examples of information to include here – please be as detailed as possible: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the accusation based on a high Turnitin similarity score?• Have you checked whether this score can be accounted for by inclusion of cover sheet/ethics policy etc.?• Can Turnitin matches be accounted for by legitimate references and quotes?• Is there evidence of synonym word changes within copied text (i.e. indicative of more intentional plagiarism)?• Have you viewed past work or emails with the student to compare the language styles/ ability?• Have you already spoken to the student about the accusation? Please include a summary of their response.	
Please note: it is the role of the tutor to investigate the incident of malpractice and provide evidence; the Malpractice Committee decide the extent of the malpractice and appropriate penalty.	

Tutor's Name (please print):
Tutor's Signature:
Date:

The completed form, accompanied by a Turnitin Report (in colour), should be returned to the Registry Department via email: registry@ukbc.org

8. APPENDIX B



JCQ/M1

Suspected candidate malpractice

Confidential

This form is to be used by centres to report instances of suspected candidate malpractice.

For guidance on how to complete this form please **see page 6** of this form.

Awarding body

--

Date of incident

Time (AM/PM session)

--	--

Centre number

--	--	--	--	--	--

Centre name and address

Head of centre's email address

Head of centre's telephone number

--	--

Candidate number(s) Candidate name(s)

Examination/assessment details

Qualification or specification code	Qualification or specification title
Component/unit code/batch number	Component/unit title

Name(s) of invigilator(s)/assessment personnel or other witness/witnesses

Name	Role

Complete Sections A, B, C and D as indicated.

Section A (All qualifications)

Describe the nature of the suspected candidate malpractice including details as to how it was discovered, by whom and when.

Section B (Vocational qualifications only)

Describe how the candidates were made aware of the examination or assessment regulations.

Section C (All general qualifications and other qualifications if applicable)

Examinations

Was the *Warning to Candidates* displayed outside the examination room? (either by means of a projector or in hard copy paper format)

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

Had the candidate(s) been issued with a copy of the *Information for candidates?* (either electronically or a paper version)

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

Were candidates reminded of examination regulations at the beginning of this particular examination?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

Coursework/non-examination assessment

Had the candidate(s) been issued with a declaration of authentication?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

Had the candidate(s) signed the declaration of authentication stating that all work completed was the candidate's own?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

Was the *Information for candidates* issued to the candidate(s) prior to signing the declaration of authentication?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section D (All qualifications)

If the incident involves disruptive behaviour, did the candidate's behaviour cause disturbance to other candidates?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

If the answer to the above question is yes and you wish to request special consideration for other candidates, please submit an application for special consideration in the normal way.

If the incident involves the introduction of unauthorised material, is the unauthorised material enclosed?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

If the answer to the above question is no, please give details below of the nature of the unauthorised material.

--

If the case involves plagiarism, please provide full details (i.e. title, author, edition, website, etc.) of the material plagiarised and include copies if possible.

--

If there are any other details you feel are relevant to this allegation, including mitigating circumstances, please give further information below.

--

Supporting evidence

Please indicate below the supporting evidence submitted with this report. All relevant information and materials **must** be submitted at this time. Evidence submitted subsequently may not be considered.

If submitting this form by email, please ensure that all supporting documents are scanned and attached (preferably as PDF documents) to the same email.

Evidence submitted with this form	
Statement(s) from invigilator(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statement from teacher/tutor/head of subject/assessor/internal verifier	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statement from examinations officer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statement(s) from candidate(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statement from employer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seating plan of examination room	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unauthorised material removed from the candidate(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Copies of sources of plagiarised material	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment and Internal Verification or Moderation records	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please give details)	<input type="checkbox"/>

If statement(s) from the candidate(s) is/are not enclosed, please put a cross in this box to indicate that the candidate(s) has/have been given the opportunity to make a statement, but ☐ has/have chosen not to do so.

To be completed by the head of centre

Name (please print)		Tel no.	
Signature*		Date	

* Submission by email from the centre's registered email address will be accepted in place of a signature.

9. Appendix C

JCQ/M2

Notification of suspected malpractice/maladministration involving centre staff

Confidential

This form is to be used by a head of centre **before** an investigation commences to notify an awarding body of an instance of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice or maladministration. **It must be completed and submitted to the appropriate awarding body immediately a suspicion is raised or an allegation received.**

Awarding body

<input type="text"/>

Centre Number

<input type="text"/>

Centre Name and address

<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>

Head of centre's email address

Head of centre's telephone number

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
----------------------	----------------------

Name of head of centre

<input type="text"/>

Name(s) of centre staff involved



Position

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Date incident was reported to centre management


<input type="text"/>

Details of examinations/assessments involved


Qualification, unit or specification code	Qualification, unit or specification title
	

Date and time of incident

Describe the nature of the suspected malpractice/maladministration, including details as to how it was discovered by whom and when.



Could the candidates have been unfairly advantaged or disadvantaged by the suspected malpractice/maladministration? If so, please give details.



Describe the steps the centre management propose to take to gather information relating to this matter.



Individual proposed to gather information

Name:	<input type="text"/>
Role within centre/organisation:	<input type="text"/>
Reason why suitable to gather information (e.g. experienced senior leader):	<input type="text"/>

Have you and the individual proposed to gather information read the JCQ guidance on conflicts of interest and personal interest at sections 4.1.3 and 5.7-5.8 and Appendix 3 within the JCQ <i>Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures</i> ?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Does the individual proposed to gather information have any known conflicts of interest or personal interest in the outcome of the investigation?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

Name and position (please print):

Signed:

Date:

Document Information	
Document Title:	Malpractice Policy
Version:	1.1
Date:	September 2024
Previous Version/Date:	N/A
Next Review:	September 2025
Approved By:	Board of Governors
Owners:	Registry and Exams Department