



Plagiarism, Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Document Ref.	WSP023
Version:	4
Approval Date:	November 2025
Review Date:	November 2026
Document Author:	Zoe Hibberd
Document Owner:	Trustees
Approved by:	Trustees

1. Scope and Purpose

Brunel College, The WASP Centre deems plagiarism and other forms of assessment malpractice and maladministration to be a serious issue, and this policy outlines malpractice/maladministration from both student and staff perspective. It details how examples of this would be dealt with.

This policy applies to all students and staff involved in assessment both internal and external. If an awarding body has its own published procedures, these will take precedence over Brunel College Policy.

This policy should be read in conjunction with the Examinations Policy and the Conflict of Interest Policy. It reiterates definitions of malpractice explained in the Exams Policy and provides greater clarity with regard to plagiarism and maladministration.

1. Purpose and remit of policy

1.1 To recognise and reduce the risk of malpractice/maladministration by staff and students alike and to protect the integrity of Brunel College.

1.2 To respond effectively to any incident of alleged malpractice/maladministration promptly and consistently.

1.3 To ensure the awarding bodies are notified of any malpractice and/or maladministration promptly.

1.4 To ensure that staff and students are sanctioned for malpractice and/or maladministration.

1.5 To ensure staff and students are aware of the terms and the extent of the policy as well as the severity of plagiarism and malpractice.

2. Roles and responsibilities

2.1 Students

Students' should confirm in writing that all work has been done by them.

2.2 Teacher/ Assessor

Teacher:

Responsible for selecting and recommending learners take a particular course, inducting learners with the course expectations as well as informing them of what is recognised as malpractice, maladministration and plagiarism.

Assessor:

Responsible for conducting and reporting on NCFE Functional Skills English Speaking and Listening component, monitoring work on portfolio-based courses.

2.3 Internal Quality Assurer (IV/IQA)

Responsible for ensuring malpractice does not occur.

2.5 Exams Officer

Required to inform Awarding Organisations of any acts of malpractice/maladministration.

2.6 Headteacher

Responsible for any investigation into allegations of malpractice/maladministration

3. Definitions

3.1 Malpractice is understood as a conscious act which puts a candidate at an unfair advantage or disadvantage when taking an exam. This could include activities which result from a failure to keep appropriate records. Further examples as detailed in Brunel College's Exams Policy are:

Definition of Malpractice by Centre Staff

- failure to keep candidate portfolios secure
- withholding of marks from candidates
- improper assistance to candidates in the production of work for assessment
- producing falsified witness statements
- allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the candidates own, to be included in the portfolio
- facilitating and/or allowing impersonation
- misusing the conditions for special candidate requirements
- falsifying and altering records
- fraudulent claims for certificates
- If Brunel College fails to deal with a matter of malpractice effectively, that could constitute Malpractice.

Definition of Malpractice by Learners

- plagiarism of any nature
- collaboration with other candidates to produce work that is submitted as an individual learner work
- copying of any nature (including the use of ICT to aid copying)
- deliberate destruction of another's work
- fabrication of results or evidence
- false declaration of authenticity
- any attempts at impersonation

The lists are not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by Brunel College at its discretion.

Definitions of Plagiarism

Direct Plagiarism

- copying work produced by someone else and passing it off as their own
- using someone else's work without citing the source
- cutting and pasting blocks of text from electronic sources without referencing

Mosaic Plagiarism

- when someone else's work is interwoven with a student's own work

Accidental Plagiarism

- unintentional copying or paraphrasing without reference

Self or auto plagiarism

- reusing the same work for more than one assessment and/or award

3.2 Maladministration refers to any activity, neglect, default or other practice that results in the centre or student not complying with the specified requirements for delivery of the qualifications and as set out in the awarding organisation requirements for approved centres and regulator documents.

Examples of actions that may constitute Maladministration are listed below. These lists are not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice/maladministration may be considered.

- collusion between two or more learners
- deliberate destruction of another learner's work for assessment
- unfair discrimination in assessment (for example, on the grounds of age, sex, ethnicity, etc)
- intentional failure to assess in accordance with the assessment criteria
- failure to provide appropriate facilities for the secure storage of assessment and of assessment records
- failure to keep externally set assessment papers secure prior to or after assessment
- failure to register learners with awarding bodies such that learners are prevented from obtaining the units or qualifications that they are taking.
- repeated failure to follow actions resulting in external quality assurance visits
- failure to keep learner coursework/portfolios of evidence secure.
- adding dates and signatures to coursework/portfolio evidence post assessment
- inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence)
- insufficient management of conflicts of interest
- assisting or prompting learners with the production of answers

4. Identifying malpractice/maladministration

Cases of malpractice/maladministration can be identified in a number of different ways. They may be:

- reported by a member of staff and/or invigilator where the behaviour of a candidate has had a disruptive effect on other candidates
- reported by an examiner or assessor, who may identify shared answers in an examination paper or identical wording in a coursework assignment
- identified by an internal verifier who may identify identical work in coursework assignments
- identified by an external verifier during a EQA visit

5. Dealing with malpractice/maladministration

Brunel College seeks to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and the student handbook/noticeboard to inform learners of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties and actual incidents of malpractice.

5.1 Where Brunel College, The WASP Centre discovers or suspects an individual, or individuals, of malpractice it will conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation.

5.2 Such an investigation will be supported by the Headteacher and all personnel linked to the allegation.

5.3 It will proceed through the following stages:

- The Senior Leadership Team, Subject Teacher and Exams Officer will meet to discuss the allegation of malpractice. If a member of the delivery team is the subject of the allegation then they will be replaced at this meeting by their line manager.
- Parents/carers will be informed that an investigation has been started.
- If there is agreement that malpractice may have taken place, further work may be assessed to establish the scale of the problem.
- the individual will be given the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.

The Headteacher undertakes to:

- 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.
- give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.
- inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgement made.
- document all stages of any investigation.

5.4 Where malpractice is proven, Brunel College, will apply the following penalties/sanctions:

- When allegations of malpractice against a student are proven, they will in the first instance be notified in writing by the Headteacher.
- When allegations against a member of staff are proven, the staff member will be suspended from delivery and/or assessment of the programme. The work of the students will be sampled by the Senior Leadership Team and judgement will be made on the reliability of the assessment decisions.
- When allegations against students are proven, then the student will lose all credit towards the units involved and will have to provide alternative evidence in order to meet the grading criteria of the qualification.

6. To protect the integrity of Brunel College and BTEC/GCSE/IGCSE/NCFE qualifications, Brunel College will:

- seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and the student handbook/noticeboard to inform learners of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice
- show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources
- ask learners to declare that their work is their own
- ask learners to provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used

7. Monitoring Review and Evaluation

Internal monitoring/verification of assessment activity will include malpractice/maladministration checks.