

## MALPRACTICE & PLAGIARISM STATEMENT

### Document Control

|                       |                                               |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| <b>Document Title</b> | <b>Malpractice &amp; plagiarism statement</b> |
| <b>Policy Owners</b>  | Service Manager<br>Skills Development Manager |
| <b>Policy Date</b>    | 15/08/2025                                    |
| <b>Review Date</b>    | 15/08/2026 (Annually)                         |

Learn Harrow policy for assessment and examination malpractice and plagiarism follows the Awarding Bodies and JCQ requirements.

### Definition of malpractice

Malpractice includes maladministration and refers to an act or practice which compromises, or attempts to compromise, or may damage the process of assessment, the integrity of the qualification or the validity of the result/certificate and/or damages the authority, reputation or credibility of Learn Harrow and/or the Awarding Body (reference JCQ policies).

### Definition of Plagiarism

JCQ defines plagiarism as “unacknowledged copying from or reproduction of published sources or incomplete referencing<sup>1</sup>”. Some examples of this could include printed resources or accessed through the internet, AI-generated content, work previously submitted by others, memorisation and reproducing texts.

### Acknowledging sources:

- Learners, when using external sources from the internet or AI for their coursework, must not copy or claim it as their own work. In such cases, learners must use referencing sources to indicate where the particular part/element/phrase came from.
- Learners must give detailed references even where they paraphrase the original material.
- When using AI generated computer content, learners must refer to the name of the AI bit and the date the content was generated. For e.g. ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2024. Learners must also retain a

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Plagiarism-in-Assessments.pdf>

copy of the copy of the computer-generated content so as to verify the reference and authenticate it.

- Learn Harrow accepts a maximum of 25% referencing in work submitted by learners.

### **Preventing plagiarism:**

Learn Harrow managers and tutors will work together to ensure that preventive measures are taken to avoid plagiarism. To achieve this:

Senior leaders and managers will:

1. Ensure that teaching staff are aware of the current policies and procedures set by JCQ and awarding organisations
2. Update their policies as and when required
3. Train staff to familiarise them with prospective changes

Tutors will familiarise learners with referencing and ensure that:

1. Each learner is issued with an individual copy of the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents/>)
2. Each learner understands the contents of the notice, especially the meaning of plagiarism and the implications of plagiarising work
3. Each learner signs a declaration stating that they have understood what plagiarism is and that it is forbidden,
4. Each learner is clear about what is acceptable and what is not
5. Each learner understands the risks of using AI, how they can acknowledge its use and what could constitute as malpractice

### **Examples of learner malpractice & plagiarism is not exhaustive and might include:**

- Impersonating another candidate, or persuading another to impersonate a candidate
- Obtaining unauthorised access to accreditation materials and exams
- Copying other learners or attempting to copy
- Using unauthorised material such as mobile phones, notes, books, internet access
- Not following the instructions of an invigilator or examiner, such as switching off or handing over to safekeeping a mobile phone
- Altering documents outside the assessment time, or results documents such as certificates

- Use or misuse AI
- Using someone else's work and attempting to pass it as your own intentionally
- Using images, words and computer-generated work as your own
- Third party production of work

**Staff malpractice:**

Following are some examples of staff malpractice. This list is not exhaustive.

- Failure to maintain exam materials secure prior to an examination
- Obtaining/providing unauthorized access to examination /assessment materials.
- Revealing exam related secure information in public
- Failure to follow the centre regulations and procedures for the conduct of examinations/assessments
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- Failure in carrying out proper learner identification processes prior to an exam/test
- Changing/altering Awarding Body mark schemes/assessment and grading criteria.
- Helping, coaching or supporting learners during assessments or in producing assessment related evidence
- Falsifying records/certificates.

**Dealing with and reporting suspected malpractice/plagiarism:**

In case of any instances or incidents of suspected malpractice, the Exam Invigilator must first take charge and ask the candidate to cease any activity related to malpractice for e.g., using a phone or talking. If the candidate concurs, they must be allowed to continue with the exam. If not, the Invigilator must contact the Exams Officer and remove the candidate from the exam.

All malpractice incidents must be reported to the Exams Officer who will require a report from the invigilator and advance it to the Skills Development Manager. It is their responsibility to report any malpractice or maladministration incidents (suspected or otherwise) to the awarding body immediately.

**Learner malpractice investigation process**

All cases of suspected malpractice will be reported to the Skills Development Manager and a further investigation will be carried out as per the Awarding Body's guidelines. The Skills Development Manager must inform the Service Head and Quality Assurance Manager who must further notify the Awarding Body within the stipulated deadline and timeframe. Penalties for proved malpractice following a thorough investigation will be determined based on the Centre's policies and the Awarding Body's regulations.

**Staff malpractice investigation process**

In case of suspected staff malpractice, the case must be referred to the appropriate line manager in the first instance. The case investigation will be carried out by the Head of Service following the Council's procedures into suspected cases of misconduct. The Awarding Body will be informed about the investigation process. Penalties resulting from proven cases of misconduct will comply with the Council's policies.

**Appeals procedure**

The entire investigation process is designed to ensure that all decisions are consistent, fair and based on the fullest information available. Learn Harrow usually aims to complete the investigation of malpractice cases within 4 weeks.

There is an appeals procedure for candidates who wish to appeal against a malpractice decision. Information about the appeals procedure can be found on the Learn Harrow website ([www.learnharrow.ac.uk](http://www.learnharrow.ac.uk)) or obtained from the admin office in Kenton Learning Centre.