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1. Introduction

UAL Awarding Body (we, us, our etc) has a responsibility to identify and manage risks and incidents, and to investigate all suspected cases of malpractice and maladministration. We are also required to establish, maintain, and at all times comply with an up to date Malpractice and Maladministration Policy.

As an awarding body recognised by the UK qualifications regulators, we are required to comply with all Conditions of Recognition to ensure the qualifications we offer and award are fit for purpose, valid, accurate and reliable.

We require UAL Approved Centres to have in place, and at all times comply with their own internal policies and procedures relating to the identification and management of any potential or actual malpractice and maladministration.

UAL Approved Centres must alert us of any potential or actual incident (including malpractice and maladministration) as soon as the centre becomes aware. This is outlined in more detail in section 3.

To help UAL Approved Centres in defining, identifying and notifying UAL Awarding Body of potential malpractice or maladministration, we have produced this guidance document. Here you will find a list of indicative examples of potential centre level incidents, as well as guidance about how you may look to prevent and manage particular circumstances, whether intentional or otherwise.

This guidance document must be read alongside our Malpractice and Maladministration Policy as well as our Investigations Procedure. The Policy covers our responsibilities as an awarding body, our responsibilities to our qualifications regulators, and our requirements of UAL Approved Centres.
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2. What does potential or actual malpractice or maladministration look like at centre level?

The UAL Awarding Body Malpractice and Maladministration Policy details the following definitions of malpractice and maladministration:

**Malpractice**
Malpractice is defined as any deliberate activity, neglect, default or other practice that compromises the integrity of the assessment process, undermines public confidence in UAL Awarding Body qualifications, and/or impacts the validity of assessment outcomes.

**Centre Staff malpractice** – malpractice committed by a member of staff or contractor at a UAL Approved Centre, or an individual appointed as an assistant to a learner.

**Candidate malpractice** – malpractice committed by a learner during the course of any examination or assessment. This includes the preparation, presentation and authentication of any work, plagiarism, and the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence.

**Maladministration**
Maladministration is defined as any activity, neglect, default or other practice that results in UAL Awarding Body, the UAL Approved Centre or learner not complying with the specified requirements for the delivery of UAL Awarding Body qualifications. Maladministration is typically unintentional and therefore is less likely to feature any deliberate activity intended to cause harm or compromise the integrity of the assessment process.

UAL Awarding Body looks to actively support its centres in being able to detect and mitigate against any potential or actual malpractice or maladministration. What we set out in this following section are several centre specific examples (taken from our Malpractice and Maladministration Policy) of scenarios that would constitute malpractice or maladministration:

**Examples of malpractice**
- Contravention of our UAL Approved Centre and qualification approval conditions;
- Failure to satisfactorily meet approval criteria;
- Denial of access to resources (premises, records, information, learners and staff) for any authorised UAL Awarding Body representative and/or the qualifications regulators;
- Actions required by our External Moderators or External Verifiers not being met within agreed timescales;
- Failure to carry out delivery, internal assessment, or internal verification in accordance with our requirements;
- Failure to handle assessment related documentation securely;
- Failure to adhere to our learner registration and certification procedures;
- Failure to continually adhere to our qualification/centre approval criteria;
- Failure to maintain auditable records, e.g. certification claims;
Fraudulent claim for certificates, including any falsification of assessment outcomes;
Intentional withholding of information from us which is critical to maintaining robust quality assurance mechanisms;
Deliberate misuse of the UAL Awarding Body logo or that of the qualifications regulator(s);
Forgery or falsification of evidence;
Learners breaching the rules of an assessment, collaborating with other learners inappropriately or tampering with the work of others; or
Plagiarism of any nature by learners, including inappropriate use of any Artificial Intelligence (AI) programmes.

Examples of maladministration
- Failure to maintain accurate records of learner registrations;
- Failure to comply with reasonable adjustments and/or special consideration request forms;
- Failure to appropriately administer assessments, such as failing to deliver assessment under controlled conditions where required;
- Failure to accurately complete and provide mark sheets;
- Failure to check results prior to release;
- Administrative errors resulting from inattention or incompetence;
- Poor communication, resulting in procedural delays;
- Unintentional withholding of information from us which is critical to maintaining robust quality assurance mechanisms; or
- Any actions that lead to learners having and unfair advantage or disadvantage

These are indicative examples only and we require UAL Approved Centres to notify us immediately of any circumstance that may be considered as potential or actual malpractice or maladministration.
3. Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in assessments

The use of AI has become more prevalent due to continual advances in technology and has become an increasing concern within the awarding sector in terms of safeguarding against malpractice and plagiarism. Given the expansion of AI, mitigations must be put in place and learners must be educated on how to use AI appropriately to assist with their learning.

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

- Copying or paraphrasing sections or whole responses of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the learner’s own work
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the learner’s own work, analysis, or evaluation
- Using AI to create images and submitting them as the learner’s own work
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.
4. Mitigating learner malpractice and plagiarism

UAL approved centres must take action to avoid learner malpractice and plagiarism, including the misuse of AI within assessment and the following mitigations must be implemented:

- Ensure learner guidance stipulates the following:
  - the importance of submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and stress the risks of malpractice and plagiarism;
  - guidance on how learners should acknowledge and reference sources used, including any use of AI;
- Update centre malpractice and maladministration policies to include the use of AI, and if misused can constitute malpractice;
- Ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools;
- Ensure learners sign a Candidate Authentication form to confirm the work submitted is their own, and reinforce the consequences of a false declaration;
- Ensure that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for external assessment;
- Set reasonable deadlines and reminders for the submission of work;
- Where appropriate, allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each learner’s whole work with confidence;
- Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages;
- Do not accept, without further investigation, work which staff suspect has been taken from someone else, the internet or AI tools without proper acknowledgement or is otherwise plagiarised – doing so encourages the spread of this practice and is likely to constitute staff malpractice which can attract sanctions;
- Issue tasks for centre-devised assignments which are, wherever possible, topical, current and specific, and require the creation of content which is less likely to be accessible to AI models trained using historic data;
- In line with UAL guidance, set clear and specific parameters for the contribution/use (including where use is not permitted) of AI generated work for summative assessment.
We require UAL Approved Centres to notify us of any circumstance (such as those detailed in section 2), whether intentional or unintentional, as soon as they become aware. UAL Approved Centres must enact their Malpractice and Maladministration policy, alert UAL Awarding Body immediately, undertake an investigation (if instructed by UAL Awarding Body) and document their findings in a report.

UAL Awarding Body will begin an immediate investigation, of which any centre investigation forms part, and will submit a request for evidence to the UAL Approved Centres(s) as required. More information, as well as a report template can be found in the UAL Approved Centre investigations procedure.

All notifications must be submitted to centreqa.awarding@arts.ac.uk.
6. How UAL Approved Centres can be proactive in the prevention and identification of malpractice and maladministration

UAL Approved Centres must be proactive in preventing and detecting malpractice and maladministration. UAL Approved Centres must put procedures in place to monitor delivery, assessment and quality assurance of UAL Awarding Body qualifications, and must consider where programme delivery and assessment at a centre level may present risks in relation to malpractice and maladministration.

Detailed below is a list of indicative examples of steps UAL Approved Centres must look to take to mitigate against, and aid the identification of, potential or actual malpractice or maladministration:

- Establish a centre level risk register linked to delivery, assessment and quality assurance that is subject to regular monitoring and review;
- Deliver regular in house training relating to malpractice and maladministration and the processes that must be followed when enacting internal and awarding body policies and procedures;
- Regularly review centre level practice relating to the secure and confidential handling of assessment materials, ensuring adherence with UAL Awarding Body requirements;
- Undertake regular reviews of any previous incidents or challenges in respect of qualification delivery, assessment and quality assurance to identify any trends of concern that may warrant further investigation or monitoring;
- Ensure appropriate centre staff regularly attend UAL Awarding Body training events relating to all aspects of qualification delivery and assessment, including the submission of grades and the collation of work for moderation purposes;
- Ensure centre staff engage with all UAL Awarding Body centre guidance, policies and procedures;
- Ensure learners are made aware of centre level and awarding body level policies relating to malpractice and maladministration, perhaps providing an overview during induction periods;
- Ensure appropriate permissions are in place for learners who produce and save work digitally on centre hosted storage; and
- Ensure procedures for authentication of learner work are robust and fit for purpose.
7. Your point of contact regarding malpractice and maladministration

UAL Awarding Body encourages our approved centres to contact us directly in regard to any queries relating to potential or actual malpractice and maladministration.

Please contact centreaqqa.awarding@arts.ac.uk
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