Malpractice Procedures

Suspected candidate or staff malpractice must be investigated and acted on, in line with awarding body requirements.

Document Control Information	
Reviewed by the Academic Board:	February 2025
Date of Next Review:	February 2028

The Academic Board (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.

Glasgow Kelvin College procedure on investigating
Candidate and Centre Malpractice in Internally Assessed Qualifications

↓

Definition of candidate/centre malpractice

↓

Potential actions/sanctions by the Awarding Body if malpractice is proven

↓

Reporting suspected malpractice

↓

Investigating suspected malpractice

↓

Communicating outcome of investigation

↓

Actions and sanctions by the College if malpractice is proven

↓

Appeals against malpractice decisions to the College,

Awarding Body or Regulator

Reporting suspected malpractice

Staff can report suspected malpractice by:
- Candidates to the: Internal Verifier, Curriculum Manager, Senior Curriculum Manager, Director of Faculty or Quality Enhancement Manager.
- Other members of staff to the: Director of Faculty, Quality Enhancement Manager, Vice Principal Curriculum and Quality or College Principal.

Candidates can report suspected malpractice by:
- other candidates to the: Class Tutor, Curriculum Manager, Senior Curriculum Manager, or the Quality Enhancement Manager.
- members of staff to the: Curriculum Manager, Senior Curriculum Manager, Director of Faculty, Quality Enhancement Manager, Vice Principal Curriculum and Quality or the College Principal.

Investigating suspected malpractice

Glasgow Kelvin College will investigate all cases of suspected malpractice. Depending on the severity of the malpractice allegation the Internal Verifier, Curriculum Manager, Senior Curriculum Manager, Director of Faculty, Quality Enhancement Manager, Vice Principal Curriculum and Quality or the College Principal will be involved in the investigation. Investigations will be conducted by: reviewing assessment evidence and records; seeking a second opinion from an internal verifier; interviewing other candidates or members of staff.

Communicating outcomes of investigations

Investigations into suspected malpractice will be communicated by letter and email to:
- the candidate or member of staff under investigation within 5 working days
- other interested parties (e.g. assessor, tutor, Director of Faculty, data management staff dealing with results, line manager of member of staff) within 5 working days

Actions and sanctions by the College if malpractice is proven

- Written feedback on the outcome of the investigation will state the actions to be taken as a result of malpractice being proven through investigation.
- Candidate or staff disciplinary procedures will be implemented at this stage. Potential sanctions, which may vary in the level of severity depending on the circumstances and seriousness of the malpractice could range from re-sitting one or all assessments to dismissal from a course/employment.

- Candidates involved in an investigation of malpractice (whether candidate or centre malpractice) will not be resulted for the assessments in question until the investigation is completed, the outcome decided and any appeal concluded.

Appeals to the College against malpractice decisions

Candidates and staff have the right to appeal any malpractice decision against them. Appeals should be submitted within 2 weeks of the malpractice decision to the Quality Enhancement Manager Quality@glasgowkelvin.ac.uk The Appeals Panel, consisting of the appropriate senior staff members, will review the original evidence supporting the appeal within 10 working days. A letter will be sent to the candidate /staff member stating the outcome and reason for the Appeals Panel decision.

Reporting malpractice to the Awarding Body

- Any suspected cases of centre malpractice will be reported to the Awarding Body within 5 working days if the internal college investigation is upheld.
- Any suspected case of candidate malpractice subject to statutory regulation by the Awarding Body Accreditation or Ofqual, will be reported to the Awarding Body Accreditation within 5 working days if the internal college investigation is upheld.
- Malpractice involving a criminal act will be reported to the police within 5 working days if the internal college investigation is upheld.

Appeals to the Awarding Body against malpractice decisions

Glasgow Kelvin College has the right to appeal a decision where a case of reported malpractice by the College has been confirmed through investigation by the Awarding Body. The College also has the right to appeal a decision in the case of suspected malpractice by a candidate reported by the College to the Awarding Body.

Candidates have the right to appeal to the Awarding Body where:

- The College has conducted an investigation, the candidate disagrees with the outcome and has exhausted the College appeals process.
- The Awarding Body has conducted an investigation and the candidate disagrees with the decision.

For regulated qualifications only:

Candidates and the College have the right to request a review by the appropriate regulator (e.g. SQA Accreditation or Ofqual) of the Awarding Body's process in reaching a decision in an appeal of a malpractice decision for qualifications subject to regulation.

Record retention

In conducting an investigation, the College will retain the following records and documentation for three years (the Awarding Body may ask to see these records):

- a report containing a statement of the facts, a detailed account of the circumstances of alleged malpractice, and details of any investigations carried out by the College into the suspected case of centre malpractice;
- written statements from staff and candidates involved, signed by the interviewee(s) and dated;
- any work of the candidate(s) and internal assessment or verification records relevant to the investigation; and
- details of any remedial action the College identified as necessary to ensure the integrity of certification now and in the future.

In an investigation involving a potential criminal prosecution or civil claim, records and documentation will be retained for six years after the case and any appeal has been heard. If the College is any doubt about whether criminal or civil proceedings will take place, it will keep records for the full six-year period. In the case of an appeal to the Awarding Body against the outcome of a malpractice investigation, assessment records will also be retained for six years.

Misuse of AI to Generate Candidate Evidence for Assessments

The misuse of **AI in assessments** will be considered as plagiarism and treated as such by the College. Guidance on the use of AI in assessments is provided in appendices 3 and 4, for SQA qualifications and for other awarding bodies, respectively.

Communication with Teaching Staff Regarding AI Misuse in Assessments

All teaching staff and assessors are made aware of AI and their role in managing the risk of AI misuse during their induction to quality processes at the start of each session. Staff are also informed by email throughout the year when the Malpractice Procedures are updated.

Communication with Teaching Staff Regarding AI Misuse in Assessments

Students are made aware of the appropriate use of AI and AI misuse during their induction at the start of their programme. This is information is also contained on the student app, MyKelvin. A reminder email is sent to all students at the start of each session.

Authentication of Student Evidence for Assessments

College staff use a variety of means to ensure that the work that they accept for assessment is authentically the students own work. Examples of these are shown below:

- Being alert to work submitted by learners that is, in part or in full, uncharacteristic of their typical style or standard of work.

- Monitoring learner progress when drafting submissions through progress checklists or spot checks and/or asking the learner about the work they have submitted (e.g. how did they come up with the draft? What sources did they use?)
- Ensuring that subject should discuss the topic of that work with learners individually at an early stage. This helps to ensure that the topic is appropriate for the subject and level, and allows centre staff to immediately become familiar with the likely outputs from that work.
- Reviewing learners' record of activity (including lab books, previous drafts and research notes) and ask questions.
- Using assessor observation.
- Carrying out questioning/short spot-check personal interviews.
- Asking learners questions about what they did and why they did it.
- Using student evidence as a basis for questioning.
- Using AI detection software.
- Declaration by students that the work submitted as assessment evidence is their own and does not contravene the guidance of the relevant awarding body.

Appendix 1: Investigation Report Form

Qualification title:	Unit code(s)/name:
Date of issue:	Level:
Candidate(s) involved (if appropriate):	Staff involved (if appropriate):

Area of concern:

To be completed by the Head of Centre or designated contact.

I confirm that all individuals involved have been notified about the above issue and have been given opportunity to comment.

Where appropriate, a signed statement from each individual is available.

Our findings, based on these investigations, are as follows (attach additional documentation if required).

The individuals involved have been notified of these findings and have been given further opportunity to comment. All parties are aware that this information will inform the decision made by the Awarding Body regarding any application of sanction.

Signature: Date:

Position:

Return this form and supporting documentation/evidence as soon as possible after the date of issue to the Awarding Body Verification Planning Manager.

Appendix 2: Who to contact to appeal against malpractice decisions added the information below for all awarding bodies

A Centre's first contact with the relevant Awarding Body manager will be to agree a time to discuss their disagreement with Awarding Body decision.

Awarding Body Contact Details:

SQA Qualifications:	GCE & GCSE Qualifications:
Cases of malpractice in HN/Vocational Qualifications	Pearson 190 High Holborn London WC1V 7BH
Head of Operations for HN/Vocational Qualifications Operations Directorate Tel: 0345 213 5994	www.qualifications.pearson.com
Cases of malpractice in National Qualifications Head of NQ Delivery: Assessment and Data Services Operations Directorate Tel: 0345 213 6853	**City & Guilds** 1 Giltspur Street London EC1A 9DD www.cityandguilds.com
Regulators (SVQ and Regulated Qualifications) **SQA Accreditation** The Optima Building 58 Robertson Street Glasgow G2 8DQ **Ofqual Complaints** 21 Spring Place Herald Avenue Coventry CV5 6UB public.enquiries@ofqual.gov.uk info@ofqual.gov.uk	**NCFE** Q6 Quorum Business Park Benton Lane Newcastle upon Tyne NE12 8BT service@ncfe.org.uk https://www.ncfe.org.uk/

Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA) Guidance on the use of AI in Assessments

The SQA guidance on the use of AI during session 2024-25 is as follows:

Learners cannot submit AI outputs as their own work

Learners are not permitted to use generative AI tools to create outputs – for example text, prose, formulae, code, images, video, audio – that they then submit as their own work for assessment tasks that contribute towards an SQA qualification. These tasks include: exams, unit assessments, coursework, and portfolios. Doing so would constitute plagiarism and could result in awards being cancelled.

AI cannot be referenced as a source

Learners must not include outputs from generative AI tools that are referenced as a source for assessment tasks that contribute towards an SQA qualification. There are currently some significant issues regarding the reliability and validity of these outputs that mean referencing the tools could be inappropriate or disadvantageous to learners.

Further guidance from the SQA on the use of AI in assessments can be accessed [here](#)

Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) Guidance on Use of AI in Assessments

The JCQ guidance relates to qualifications which are offered by any of the following awarding bodies:

- AQA Education
- City and Guilds
- CEA
- NCFE
- OCR
- Pearsons
- WJEC

The following extract is taken from the JCQ Publication entitled "AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications".

"Students must be able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking. AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- *Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own*
- *Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content*
- *Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations*
- *Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information*
- *Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools*
- *Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies."*

A further extract relates to the use of appropriate referencing when AI sources have been used:

"If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used. In addition to the above, where students use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it.

This allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether that use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources. Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/ blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2024. The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication

purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used."

A full copy of the JCQ Guidance on the use of AI in assessments can be accessed here