The Bosco Centre	
Policy:	**Malpractice Policy and Procedure**
Applies to:	**College**
Reviewed:	**September 2025**
Next review:	**September 2026**

The Bosco Centre treats all cases of suspected malpractice* very seriously and will investigate all suspected and reported incidents of possible malpractice. The purpose of this Policy *and Procedure* is to set out how allegations of malpractice in relation to all qualifications are dealt with. The scope of the policy is to provide:

- a definition of malpractice
- examples of student and centre malpractice and maladministration;
- possible sanctions that may be imposed in cases of malpractice.

*The term 'malpractice' in this policy is used for both malpractice and maladministration.

1. Introduction

1.1. For the purpose of this document 'malpractice' is defined as:

> Any act, or failure to act, that threatens or compromises the integrity of the assessment process or the validity of qualifications and their certification. This includes: maladministration and the failure to maintain appropriate records or systems; the deliberate falsification of records or documents for any reason connected to the award of qualifications; acts of plagiarism or other academic misconduct; and/or actions that compromise the reputation or authority of The Bosco Centre, or of any awarding bodies, their centres, officers and employees.

1.2. The Bosco Centre will report all relevant cases of suspected malpractice to the awarding body, accepting that in certain circumstances awarding body may take action of its own, including imposing sanctions.

2. Malpractice by students

2.1 Some examples of student malpractice are described below. These examples are not exhaustive and all incidents of suspected malpractice, whether or not described below, will be fully investigated, where there are sufficient grounds to do so.

2.1.1 Obtaining examination or assessment material without authorization.

2.1.2 Arranging for an individual other than the student to sit an assessment or to submit an assignment not undertaken by the student.

2.1.3 Impersonating another student to sit an assessment or to submit an assignment on their behalf.

2.1.4 Collaborating with another student or individual, by any means, to complete a coursework assignment or assessment, unless it has been clearly stated that such collaboration is permitted.

2.1.5 Damaging another student's work.

2.1.6 Inclusion of inappropriate or offensive material in coursework

assignments or assessment scripts.

2.1.7 Failure to comply with published awarding body examination regulations.

2.1.8 Disruptive behaviour or unacceptable conduct, including the use of offensive language, at centre or assessment venue (including aggressive or offensive language or behaviour).

2.1.9 Producing, using or allowing the use of forged or falsified documentation, including but not limited to:

a) personal identification;
b) supporting evidence provided for reasonable adjustment or special consideration applications; and
c) awarding body results documentation, including certificates.

2.1.10 Falsely obtaining, by any means, an awarding body certificate.

2.1.11 Misrepresentation or plagiarism

2.1.12 Fraudulent claims for special consideration while studying.

(If the study centre is also an examination centre):

2.1.13 Possession of any materials not permitted in the assessment room, regardless of whether or not they are relevant to the assessment, or whether or not the student refers to them during the assessment process, for example notes, blank paper, electronic devices including mobile phones, personal organizers, books, dictionaries / calculators (when prohibited).

2.1.14 Communicating in any form, for example verbally or electronically, with other students in the assessment room when it is prohibited.

2.1.15 Copying the work of another student or knowingly allowing another student to copy from their own work.

2.1.16 Failure to comply with instructions given by the assessment invigilator, i.e., working beyond the allocated time; refusing to hand in assessment script / paper when requested; not adhering to warnings relating to conduct during the assessment.

3. Malpractice by centre employees and stakeholders

3.1. Examples of malpractice by, teachers, tutors and other officers, (*including, where the centre is also an examination centre, invigilators and examination administrators*) are listed below. These examples are not exhaustive and all incidents of suspected malpractice, whether or not described below, will be fully investigated, where there are sufficient grounds to do so.

3.1.1. Failure to adhere to the relevant awarding body regulations and procedures, including those relating to centre approval, security undertaking and monitoring requirements as set out by the awarding body. Knowingly allowing an individual to impersonate a student.

3.1.2. Allowing a student to copy another student's assignment work, or allowing a student to let their own work be copied.

3.1.3. Allowing students to work collaboratively during an assignment assessment, unless specified in the assignment brief.

3.1.4. Completing an assessed assignment for a student or providing them with assistance beyond that 'normally' expected.

3.1.5. Damaging a student's work.

3.1.6. Disruptive behaviour or unacceptable conduct, including the use of

offensive language (including aggressive or offensive language or behaviour).

3.1.7. Allowing disruptive behaviour or unacceptable conduct at the centre to go unchallenged, for example, aggressive or offensive language or behaviour.

3.1.8. Divulging any information relating to student performance and / or results to anyone other than the student.

3.1.9. Producing, using or allowing the use of forged or falsified documentation, including but not limited to:

a) personal identification;
b) supporting evidence provided for reasonable adjustment or special consideration applications; and
c) awarding body results documentation, including certificates

3.1.10. Falsely obtaining by any means an awarding body certificate.

3.1.11. Failing to report a suspected case of student malpractice, including plagiarism, to awarding body.

(If the study centre is also an examination centre):

3.1.12. Moving the time or date of a fixed examination.

3.1.13. Failure to keep examination question papers, examination scripts or other assessment materials secure, before during or after an examination.

3.1.14. Allowing a student to possess and / or use material or electronic devices that are not permitted in the examination room.

3.1.15. Allowing students to communicate by any means during an examination in breach of regulations.

3.1.16. Allowing a student to work beyond the allotted examination time.

3.1.17. Leaving students unsupervised during an examination.

3.1.18. Assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers.

4. Possible malpractice sanctions

4.1. Following an investigation, if a case of malpractice is upheld, The Bosco Centre may impose sanctions or other penalties on the individual(s) concerned. Where relevant we will report the matter to the awarding body, and the awarding body may impose one or more sanctions upon the individual(s) concerned. Any sanctions imposed will reflect the seriousness of the malpractice that has occurred.

4.2. Listed below are examples of sanctions that may be applied to a student, or to a teacher, tutor, invigilator or other officer who has had a case of malpractice upheld against them. Please note that

i) this list is not exhaustive and other sanctions may be applied on a case-by-case basis.

ii) where the malpractice affects examination performance, the awarding body may impose sanctions of its own.

Possible study centre sanctions that may be applied to students

a) A written warning about future conduct.
b) Notification to an employer, regulator or the police.
c) Removal from the course.

Possible sanctions that may be applied to teachers, tutors invigilators, and other officers

a) A written warning about future conduct.
b) Imposition of special conditions for the future involvement of the individual(s) in the conduct, teaching, supervision or administration of students and/or examinations.
c) Informing any other organisation known to employ the individual in relation to the awarding body courses or examinations of the outcome of the case.
d) *The Bosco Centre* may carry out unannounced monitoring of the working practices of the individual(s) concerned.
e) Dismissal.

5. AI - Use in Assessments

AI (Artificial Intelligence) use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications.

While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice.

Teachers and students should also be aware that AI tools are still being developed and there are often limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

AI chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. Users can ask follow up questions or ask the chatbot to revise the responses already provided. AI chatbots respond to prompts based upon patterns in the data sets (large language model) upon which they have been
trained. T

hey generate responses which are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate.

AI chatbots can complete tasks such as the following:
● Answering questions
● Analysing, improving, and summarising text
● Authoring essays, articles, fiction, and non-fiction
● Writing computer code
● Translating text from one language to another
● Generating new ideas, prompts, or suggestions for a given topic or theme
● Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or format

6. What is AI Misuse

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of 'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism' include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years.

Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

● Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated evaluation, so that the work 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
● Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
● Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliography.

7. Acknowledging AI Use

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 AIgenerated 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/), 25/01/2023.

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. This must be submitted with the work, so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own.

See https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications/ for further information.

8. Informing and advising candidates

Students are made aware of the college approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice. The college also ensures that students are made aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment.

Students are made aware of:
a) The importance of submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and it is stressed to them the risks of malpractice.
b) What AI is, the risks of using it, what AI misuse is, how this will be treated as malpractice, when it

may be used and how it should be acknowledged.
c) How they should reference appropriately in their work (including websites) and are given clear guidance on how they should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse.
d) That awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice.
e) The significance of their (electronic) declaration where they confirm the work, they are submitting is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and that they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject.
f) The appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates publications (www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/information-for-candidates-documents)

Procedure

9. Reporting a suspected case of malpractice

9.1. This process applies to, teachers, tutors, invigilators students and other centre staff, and to any reporting of malpractice by a third party or individual who wishes to remain anonymous.

9.2. Any case of suspected malpractice should be reported in the first instance to the Principal.

9.3. A written report should then be sent to the person identified in 5.2, clearly identifying the factual information, including statements from other individuals involved and / or affected, any evidence obtained, and the actions that have been taken in relation to the incident.

9.4. Suspected malpractice must be reported as soon as possible to the person identified in 5.2, and at the latest within two working days from its discovery. Where the suspected malpractice has taken place in an examination, the incident be reported urgently, and the appropriate steps taken as specified by the awarding body.

9.5. Wherever possible, and provided other students are not disrupted by doing so, a student suspected of malpractice should be warned immediately that their actions may constitute malpractice, and that a report will be made to the centre.

9.6. In cases of suspected malpractice by centre teachers, tutors' invigilators and other officers, and any reporting of malpractice by a third party or individual who wishes to remain anonymous, the report made to the person in 5.2 should include as much information as possible, including the following:

a) the date time and place the alleged malpractice took place, if known.
b) the name of the centre teacher/tutor, invigilator or other person(s) involved
c) a description of the suspected malpractice; and
d) any available supporting evidence.

5.7 In cases of suspected malpractice reported by a third party, or an individual who wishes to remain anonymous, The Bosco Centre will take all reasonable steps to authenticate the reported information and to investigate the alleged malpractice.

10. Administering suspected cases of malpractice

10.1. *The Bosco Centre* will investigate each case of suspected or reported malpractice relating to the awarding body qualifications, to ascertain whether malpractice has occurred. The investigation will aim to establish the full facts and circumstances. We will promptly take all reasonable steps to prevent any adverse effect that may arise as a result of the malpractice, or to mitigate any adverse effect, as far as possible, and to correct it to make sure that any action necessary to maintain the integrity of the awarding body's qualifications and reputation is taken.

10.2. The Bosco Centre will acknowledge all reports of suspected malpractice within five working days. All of the parties involved in the case will then be contacted within 10 working days of receipt of the report detailing the suspected malpractice. We may also contact other individuals who may be able to provide evidence relevant

to the case.

10.3. The individual(s) concerned will be informed of the following:

a) that an investigation is going to take place, and the grounds for that investigation;
b) details of all the relevant timescales, and dates, where known;
c) that they have a right to respond by providing a personal written response relating to the suspected malpractice (within 15 working days of the date of that letter);
d) that, if malpractice is considered proven**,** sanctions may be imposed either by The Bosco Centre or by the awarding body , (see section 6, below) reflecting the seriousness of the case;
e) that, if they are found guilty, they have the right to appeal.
f) That The Bosco Centre has a duty to inform the awarding body and other relevant authorities / regulators, but only after time for the appeal has passed or the appeal process has been completed. This may also include informing the police if the law has been broken and to comply with any other appropriate legislation.

10.4. Where more than one individual is contacted regarding a case of suspected malpractice, for example in a case involving suspected collusion, we will contact each individual separately, and will not reveal personal data to any third party unless necessary for the purpose of the investigation.

10.5. The individual has a right to appeal against a malpractice outcome if they believe that the policy or procedure has not been followed properly or has been implemented to their detriment.

Records of all malpractice cases and their outcomes are maintained by The Bosco Centre for a period of at least five years, and are subject to regular monitoring and review