

College Policy



Policy name:	Academic Malpractice and Maladministration Policy
Current version Approval date:	18 th December 2024

1.	Purpose:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice or maladministration by staff or learners. 2. To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice or maladministration promptly and objectively. 3. To standardise and record any investigation of malpractice or maladministration to ensure openness and fairness. 4. To impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on learners or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice or maladministration are proven. 5. To protect the integrity of Highlands College and all awarding organisation qualifications offered by the centre including but not limited to BTEC, City & Guilds, VTCT and UAL qualifications.
2.	Scope:	Academic malpractice and/or maladministration by any member of staff or any full- or part-time student.
3.	Definitions:	
3.1	Definition of malpractice:	<p>Any activity or practice which deliberately (or through neglect) contravenes regulations and compromises the integrity of the internal or external assessment process and/or the validity of certificates. It may include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plagiarism of any nature (academic misconduct). 2. Misuse of content generated by artificial intelligence (AI) (see section 3.1.2). 3. Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information. 4. Collusion by working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work. 5. Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying). 6. Deliberate destruction of another's work. 7. Fabrication of results or evidence. 8. False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework. 9. Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test. 10. Facilitating and allowing impersonation. 11. Presenting another's work as your own. 12. Failure to carry out assessment or quality assurance in accordance with awarding organisation requirements. 13. Improper assistance to candidates by centre staff, for example assisting learners in the production of work for

		<p>assessment where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, or where the assistance involves centre staff producing work for the learner.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. 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. 15. 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. 16. Deliberate submission of false information to gain a qualification. 17. Deliberate failure to maintain appropriate records of assessment and certification. 18. A loss, theft of, or a breach of confidentiality in any assessment materials. 19. Unauthorised amendments, copying or distribution of exam/assessment papers/materials. 20. Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud. 21. Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment. 22. Failure to declare any conflicts of interest in relation to students. 23. Persistent instances of maladministration in a centre. <p>This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by Highlands College.</p>
<p>3.2.0</p>	<p>Definition of AI and when it may be used</p>	<p>Refer to the respective awarding organisations' guidance documents on use of AI in assessments. Some awarding organisations allow the use of AI in preparing coursework but the rules depend on the qualification.</p> <p>AI use refers to the use of AI tools and chatbots such as ChatGPT to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications.</p> <p>Students must be clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment. If an AI tool has been used it must be acknowledged in the student work by using the name of the AI source and the date the content was generated. If an AI tool 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.</p> <p>When marking student work in which AI use is permitted and has been acknowledged, and there are no concerns of AI misuse, the assessor must still ensure that the student has independently met the marking criteria for marks/grades to be awarded. Students cannot be awarded marks for content solely produced by AI, their marks come from showing their own understanding and producing their own work.</p>

		Clear records should be kept of the consideration of AI use in assessments, particularly where this has had an impact on the final marks/grades awarded. This provides feedback to the student and provides clarity in the event of an internal appeal or the work being selected for moderation/standards verification.
3.2.1	Risk of using AI	<p>AI tools produce responses based on the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response, so the responses cannot be relied upon and can pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assignments.</p> <p>AI chatbots often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information.</p> <p>Some AI chatbots have produced fake references or refer to real people incorrectly, and can also provide dangerous or harmful answers.</p>
3.2.2	Misuse of content generated by artificial intelligence	<p>Students must be able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking. Tutors must adhere to the AI guidance of the respective awarding organisations.</p> <p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own 2. Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content 3. Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations 4. Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information 5. Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools 6. Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies. 7. Teaching staff must not use artificial intelligence (AI) as the sole means of marking candidates' work. A human assessor must review all student work in its entirety and determine the mark they feel it warrants, regardless of the outcomes of an AI tool. The assessor remains responsible for the mark/grade awarded.
3.3	Definition of maladministration:	<p>Any activity or practice which results in non-compliance with administrative regulations and requirements and includes persistent mistakes or poor administration within a centre.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failure to adhere to awarding organisation approval requirements. 2. Failure to maintain appropriate records of enrolments, registrations, claims, appeals, conflicts of interest, etc. 3. Late candidate registrations.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Inaccurate claims for certificates. 5. Failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure. 6. Inappropriate retention of records or certificates. <p>This list is not exhaustive and other instances of maladministration may be considered by Highlands College.</p>
4.	Policy:	<p>Highlands College will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Seek to avoid potential malpractice (academic misconduct) by using the induction period and the learner handbook to inform learners of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice. 2. Show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources. 3. Ask learners to declare that their work is their own. 4. Ask learners to provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used. 5. Conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the Senior Leadership Team and all personnel linked to the allegation. It will proceed through the following stages: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Make the individual fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven. b. Give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made. c. Inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgment made. 6. The college will document all stages of any investigation.
5.0	Operational arrangements:	
5.1	Responsibilities	
5.1.1	Responsibilities - Lecturers and Coordinators	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will ensure students are made aware of the college policy on malpractice through the student course handbook and through the course induction process. 2. Will, with module tutors, show learners how to reference and cite texts and other sources of information correctly. 3. Ensure that there is a declaration that the student's work is their own in accordance with awarding organisation requirements. 4. Ensure learners provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised information and acknowledged their sources. 5. Where potential academic malpractice is identified by unit tutors the Course Coordinator should raise this with the Head of Department.

		6. Inform their Head of Department immediately if any malpractice or maladministration is found or suspected.
5.1.2	Responsibilities - Head of Department	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will ensure that all members of their teams are aware of the college policy on malpractice and maladministration. 2. Inform Registry immediately if any malpractice or maladministration is found or suspected. 3. Will take guidance from Registry on the process of investigation, commensurate with the nature of the malpractice. 4. Undertake the investigation if appropriate.
5.1.3	Responsibilities - Registry	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will log all allegations of malpractice and maladministration. 2. Will document and record the investigation process related to academic malpractice. 3. Will undertake investigations when requested to by the Head of Department or the Senior Leadership Team. 4. Inform the awarding organisation of any suspected malpractice or maladministration within 48 hours using awarding organisation documentation and processes before any investigation takes place, and ensure that the awarding organisation is fully included in any investigation. Supply the awarding organisation with personal details of staff as required.
5.2.0	Investigation Process	
5.2.1	Investigation Process (Student)	<p>A full description of the investigation process can be found in the Student Academic Misconduct Guidelines document. This process takes place in stages with the student being entitled to support at any meetings and with the right to appeal the college's final decision.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The student will be made aware of the allegation of malpractice at the earliest opportunity and the possible consequences if the allegation is found to be proven. 2. The student will be provided with a copy of the evidence leading to the allegation of malpractice. 3. The student may respond to these allegations. 4. The student can be supported by a friend, relative or student council representative during any meetings relating to the investigation of the allegation. 5. Each stage of the investigation will be documented by Registry.
5.2.2	Investigation process (staff)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the college discovers or suspects anyone of malpractice or maladministration, the Principal or their nominee will make the individual fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the alleged malpractice and possible consequences. 2. An investigation into allegations of malpractice will be carried out using the appropriate CYPES and/or Government of Jersey policies and/or procedures.

		<p>3. The alleged incident will be reported to the appropriate awarding organisation using relevant documentation.</p> <p>4. The Governing Body will be informed of the outcome of the above processes.</p>
6.0	Sanctions	
6.1	Sanctions - Student	<p>(For full process see Student Academic Misconduct Guidelines document.)</p> <p>The sanctions applied are dependent on the outcome of investigations undertaken. These range from advice and guidance on how to avoid academic malpractice to potential removal from the student's programme of study.</p>
6.2	Sanctions - Staff	If allegations are found to be substantiated, sanctions range from an unrecorded verbal warning to removal from post.

Document originally produced by:	Quality and Compliance Manager (Further Education)	
Document originally approved by:	Policy Subcommittee (Assistant Principal Curriculum and Quality)	
Approval dates:	4 th July 2022	Original approval
	12 th December, 2022	<p>Revised by Quality and Compliance Manager to include requirement to notify awarding organisations of any malpractice/maladministration within 48 hours.</p> <p>Approved by Director of Governance and Compliance.</p>
	12 th September, 2023	<p>Reviewed and revised by Quality and Compliance Manager on to include reference to misuse of AI-generated content.</p> <p>Approved by Associate Principal of Governance and Compliance.</p>
	3 rd May 2024	<p>Reviewed and revised by Paul Antonio, Associate Principal Student Records and Development.</p> <p>Updated to include Clause 3.1.2 on the misuse of content generated by artificial intelligence.</p> <p>Approved by Sharon Ward, Approved by Associate Principal of Governance and Compliance.</p>
	13 th November 2024	<p>Section 5.1.3 amended to include any "suspected" malpractice, and also that the awarding body is informed before any investigation takes place, and that it is fully included in any investigation.</p> <p>Approved 13th November 2024 by Sharon Ward, Approved by Associate Principal of Governance and Compliance.</p>
	18 th December 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional Clause 3.2.0 added to cover when the use of AI is permissible, • Additional Clause 3.2.1 added covering the risks of using AI

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clause 3.2.2 re-numbered and additional points covering tutors regulations for marking work which includes use of AI
Supersedes:	Academic Malpractice 20221208 Malpractice and Maladministration Policy 20230912	
Supporting documentation:	Centre guidance for dealing with malpractice and maladministration (pearson.com) http://www.icq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice Page 8 of JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications: AI-Use-in-Assessments_Feb24_v6.pdf (icq.org.uk) JCQ-AI-poster-for-students-2.pdf Student Academic Misconduct Guidelines	
Next Review date due :	1 st December 2025	
To be reviewed by:	Exams Department and Registry	