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1 Overview

As an approved awarding organisation ASDAN must maintain rigorous quality

assurance and control arrangements as outlined in the Conditions of Recognition\*

.

ASDAN expects to work co-operatively with centres to ensure that the statutory

regulation of external qualifications is upheld and, through this, award appropriately

the candidates who have demonstrated that they have successfully achieved the

required standards.

As a regulated awarding organisation, we aim to prevent malpractice and

maladministration occurring. If such incidents happen, we will fully investigate and

work with centres to find a satisfactory conclusion and to minimise the effects on

all parties, and we will aim to identify improvements in practice that will prevent

any reoccurrence.

As part of this regulatory responsibility, we require centres to ensure that they have

robust measures in place to prevent, investigate, report and deal with cases of

maladministration, and any suspected, alleged and actual cases of malpractice, and

to work with us in cases where there is found to be cause for concern.

This policy covers all ASDAN qualifications and all related procedures and activities.

Centres must ensure that all centre staff having a role in the delivery, assessment,

moderation/verification and administration of ASDAN qualifications, and all

candidates undertaking ASDAN qualifications have access to this policy and

understand their responsibilities in relation to it.

2- **Definition of malpractice and maladministration**

Malpractice is any illegal or unethical activity or practice that deliberately breaches

regulations, or might compromise quality assurance or control, or undermine the

integrity and validity of assessment, the certification of qualifications and/or damage

the authority of those responsible for conducting the assessment and certification,

or could otherwise compromise the reputation of ASDAN, the centre, or the wider

qualifications community.

Malpractice may involve any or all of the following: candidates, centre staff,

awarding organisation staff, for example:

• Candidate malpractice could be plagiarism of any kind; collusion or copying

of another candidate’s work; assuming the identity of another person for the

purposes of assessment; providing false information in relation to exemption

from assessment. The increasing use of AI by learners is an example of where

plagiarism could occur. See section 2.1 for more details.

• Centre staff malpractice could be contravention of, or continued failure to

meet centre approval, or any of ASDAN’s administration or quality assurance

requirements; providing improper assistance to candidates in the production of

work for assessment; allowing evidence which is known by the staff member not

to be the candidate’s own to be included; or making claims for certification prior

to the candidate completing all the requirements of the assessment.

• Awarding organisation malpractice could be the failure of an ASDAN auditor,

EQA or External Moderator to fully undertake their role in line with quality

assurance requirements. In suspected cases involving an ASDAN External

Moderator or other member of staff, ASDAN will conduct an investigation

appropriate to the nature of the allegation.

Maladministration is any unintentional activity or practice that leads to noncompliance with ASDAN requirements. In most cases, maladministration will relate

to administrative or quality assurance procedures, and may involve any or all of the

following: candidates, centre staff, awarding organisation staff. Maladministration,

if serious enough, may be treated as malpractice.

In suspected cases involving an ASDAN External Quality Assurer or other member

of staff, ASDAN will conduct an investigation appropriate to the nature of the

allegation.

2.1 Artificial intelligence (AI)

The increasing use of AI generative tools (eg ChatGPT) by candidates is an example

of where plagiarism and malpractice could occur.

ASDAN recognises that there are huge opportunities for teachers and candidates

with this new technology, as it enables candidates to manipulate information

quickly in a way that is easily accessible. However AI generative tools do not credit

sources and there is a risk that candidates using AI generative tools could produce

inaccurate or even harmful content.

ASDAN would consider the use of unacknowledged AI-generated evidence to be

plagiarism; it is the responsibility of the centre (assessor) to establish that the

candidate’s work is authentically their own. Candidates must be made aware of

the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and

candidates must make sure that work submitted for assessment is demonstrably

their own. If any sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI-generated

responses, those elements must be identified by the candidate and not included as

evidence of meeting a learning outcome or assessment criteria.

The use of AI generative tools in teaching and formative assessment could be

beneficial for candidates. However, the concern is when AI-generated content

is used in summative (final) assessment and the evidence produced is not

authentically written/created by the candidate, therefore it does not support the

candidate demonstrating critical or evaluative skills. It’s important that candidates

maintain a critical lens and use a range of sources, especially in research and

project-based qualifications.

This means ensuring that the final product is in the candidate’s own words, that

it isn’t copied or paraphrased from another source (eg an AI generative tool) and

that the content reflects their own independent work. Candidates are expected

to demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding required for the

qualification, as set out in the qualification specification. Any use of AI-generated

content that means candidates have not independently demonstrated their own

attainment is likely to be considered malpractice.

Using AI as a source but not a final product could be suitable. For example, if a

candidate uses an AI generative tool that provides details of the sources it has

used in generating content. The candidate would need to verify the sources and

reference this in their work in the normal way. Where an AI generative tool does

not provide such details, candidates should ensure that they independently verify

the AI-generated content and then reference the sources they have used. This will

allow the assessor to review how AI-generated content has been used and whether

that use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is

particularly relevant for Level 2 and Level 3 qualifications that require research and

evaluation or analysis of the research findings
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Examples of AI use\*

 that would be considered malpractice:

• Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no

longer the candidate’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 candidate’s own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations

• 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

Where teachers/assessors/internal quality assurers have doubts about the

authenticity of candidate work submitted for assessment (eg they suspect that

parts of it have been generated by AI tools), they must investigate and take

appropriate action.

• Should the misuse of AI-generated content be confirmed and the candidate has

not completed the assessment checklist, where they are asked to declared their

evidence to be their own, the centre should manage this internally and does not

need to notify ASDAN of the malpractice.

• If the misuse of AI-generated content is detected or suspected by the centre and

the declaration of authenticity on the assessment checklist has been signed, the

case must be reported to ASDAN.

The Head of Centre has ultimate responsibility for ensuring that all incidences of

malpractice relating to inauthentic learner work are managed appropriately and

effectively

3 Responsibilities in alleged or actual cases of malpractice or maladministration

When alleged or actual malpractice or maladministration has been identified ASDAN

will:

• notify the Head or Principal of the centre. If the allegation implicates the Head or

Principal, ASDAN will notify another suitable person at the centre

• undertake fair and unbiased investigations

• notify the Regulators Ofqual/CCEA/Qualifications Wales (as appropriate) of

all serious incidents of maladministration or malpractice and of steps taken or

intended to be taken to prevent, correct or mitigate any adverse effect that may

occur as a result, in line with ASDAN’s policy for dealing with Adverse Effects

• notify other Awarding Organisations (as appropriate) of all serious incidents of

maladministration or malpractice identified within centres

• ensure that all reasonable steps are taken to prevent or mitigate the effect of the

alleged or actual incident as far as possible

• if requested by the centre, give advice and guidance on how best to work with

ASDAN to investigate, deal with and prevent the effect of the alleged or actual

incident

• provide the centre with a report of the investigation outcome

• take appropriate action against any person found to be responsible for proven

malpractice or maladministration

• revoke any certificate found to have been issued invalidly as a result of

malpractice or maladministration

• apply sanctions in line with ASDAN’s sanctions policy

• work with the centre to ensure that the malpractice or maladministration do not

recur

3.2 Centres’ responsibilities

As a requirement of registration and approval, a centre must:

• have in place, and make available to ASDAN as part of Centre Approval

procedures, an appropriate policy for dealing with malpractice within the centre

• promptly report to ASDAN all suspected (alleged) and actual incidents of

malpractice or maladministration

• inform the person suspected of malpractice that an investigation will take place

and that they have a right to reply or appeal against any sanction imposed on

them

• comply fully with ASDAN’s requests for information in relation to the allegation

• co-operate with ASDAN during the investigation, including carrying out internal

investigations in line with ASDAN’s requests, using people who are not involved in

the alleged maladministration or malpractice

• provide ASDAN with a report of the outcome any such investigation

• implement agreed actions as a result of the investigation, and take

appropriate measures to mitigate the effect and prevent any recurrence of the

maladministration or suspected or actual malpractice

• notify ASDAN if any person involved in the malpractice or maladministration or in

completing any actions as a result of the investigation leaves the centre

• respect the confidentiality of information handled

• retain records and documentation relating to the investigation for a period of time

Failure to report malpractice or maladministration, suspected or actual, once

candidates have been registered, may affect the issue of certificates, and a failure to

co-operate might affect the future registration of candidates.

**4 Guidance for preventing malpractice and maladministration at ARK**

Provide clear information for staff

Many instances of malpractice relate to a lack of communication. For example,

all staff involved must be aware of the assessment requirements, the relevant

Standards with Guidance, administrative procedures and the terminology and

definitions of malpractice and maladministration. They must be aware of the

procedures to follow should they become aware of either centre staff or candidate

malpractice or maladministration occurring.

Identify the key roles of staff

It must be clear to all staff what their roles and responsibilities are for the various

aspects of the management, delivery and administration of assessments (assessors/

tutors, internal moderator, exams officers and other administrative staff).

Only assist candidates where permitted

Assessors must be clear over how they may “assist candidates” in relation to

assessments/portfolios, and the requirement to provide evidence of candidates’

individual performance. Candidates with access arrangements must not be assisted

beyond what is permitted by the regulations.

Deal with centre staff and candidate malpractice in the correct and

appropriate manner

If centre staff or candidates are suspected of engaging in any of the behaviour/

actions detailed in 2 above then this needs to be dealt with in the appropriate

manner. Senior leaders must ensure that they are clear on what ASDAN expects

when dealing with such instances. They must be aware of the processes related to

dealing with malpractice and how to investigate and report instances accordingly.

Provide clear information for candidates

Although it is almost impossible to monitor every aspect of internal assessments,

candidates should be clear over the consequences of collusion, copying or allowing

their work to be copied. When it is and is not appropriate to use AI generated

material must be discussed with candidates, as well as the potential consequences

for the candidate. It is the responsibility of centres to make candidates aware of

these regulations.

**5 Identifying cases of alleged or actual malpractice or maladministration at ARK**

Suspected cases of malpractice or maladministration could be identified by centre

staff, examiners, moderators and assessors, candidates, external agencies or

individuals, whistle-blowers or anonymous informants.

ASDAN is aware that the reporting of malpractice or maladministration by a

member of staff or candidate can potentially cause a difficult situation in the

workplace or centre, and will therefore protect the identity of the informant as far

as legally possible if this is asked for when a report is made. ASDAN will continue to

carry out an investigation but will tell the informant that its scope may be limited.

Where the person making the allegation gives no contact information whatsoever,

ASDAN will be unable to carry out an investigation but will log the details of the

allegation. If the information is provided by telephone, the informant will usually be

asked to make the allegation in writing.

When ASDAN receives an allegation from someone other than the head of a centre

(including anonymous reports), ASDAN will evaluate the allegation in the light of

any other available information, to see if there is cause to investigate further.

**6 Reporting suspected or actual malpractice or maladministration**

Centres must submit the full details of the case at the earliest opportunity to

ASDAN, using the Notification of malpractice or maladministration form. Copies

can be found on the ASDAN website: asdan.org.uk or obtained by contacting

ASDAN’s Compliance team by email: compliance@asdan.org.uk or phone 0117 954

8316.

Any additional evidence to support the allegation should be included with the form.

Note: Centres must not give credit for any work submitted which is not the

candidate’s own work, but if any assistance has been given, for example use of a

scribe, a note must be made of this on the cover sheet of the coursework or other

appropriate place. Should AI generated evidence be presented by a candidate for

external moderation for any reason, the assessor is to note this on the candidate’s

assessment checklist and provide the rationale behind the decision to include the

evidence.
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