

Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Version Control

Version	Description	Approved By	Date
1.0	Initial version	Richard Clegg	04/01/2024
1.1	Annual review of document	Richard Clegg	02/01/2025
1.2	Revision to include sample Investigation Report	Richard Clegg	29/04/2025

Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Malpractice, which includes maladministration, is defined as a deliberate act, default, or practice to deceive, or falsify records in order to obtain a qualification, result or certificate. Committing malpractice breaches regulations set by awarding organisations thus compromising the integrity of the assessment and damaging the authority, reputation and credibility of awarding organisations and the training provider.

Maladministration is defined as an ‘act of inefficient or dishonest administration in situation where the individual or group in charge is unjust, dishonest, or ineffective in their leadership’.

Inovra Group is committed to investigate and report all suspected cases of malpractice to the awarding organisation in all cases that fail to abide by regulations that may constitute malpractice and take appropriate action in order to maintain the integrity and validity of awards and our reputation and image as a trustworthy and reliable training provider.

Inovra Group will not tolerate actions (or attempted actions) of malpractice or maladministration. The malpractice and plagiarism policy exists to enable Inovra Group to work with awarding organisations to reduce instances of malpractice through effective detection of irregularities, and by imposing appropriate penalties and sanctions.

Examples of learner malpractice (the list is not exhaustive):

1. Plagiarism by copying and passing off, as the learner’s own, the whole or part(s) of another person’s work, whether published or not, with or without the originator’s permission and without appropriately acknowledging the source. This includes the use of Artificial Intelligence.
2. Making a false declaration of authenticity in work submitted for internal or external assessment.
3. Collusion by working with others to produce work that is submitted as individual work. Learners should not be discouraged from teamwork, as this is an essential key skill for many sectors and subject areas, but individual roles must be clearly identified.
4. Impersonation in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one’s place in an assessment/examination/test.
5. Failing to abide by the instructions or advice of a trainer/assessor or an invigilator or the awarding organisation’s rules and regulations.
6. Cheating to gain an unfair advantage, the alteration of any results document, including certificates.

Examples of staff malpractice (the list is not exhaustive):

1. Failing to keep an awarding organisation mark schemes secure, alteration of any mark schemes or grading; producing falsified witness statements, for example, for evidence a learner has not generated.
2. Assisting learners in the production of work for an assessment, where the support

has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves the assessor or trainer producing work for the learner.

3. Allowing evidence that is known not to be the learner's own, to be included for internal or external assessment.
4. Falsifying records/certificates.
5. Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
6. Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements/access arrangements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as a scribe, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment.
7. Fraudulent certificate claims.
8. Failing to keep assessments/examination/test papers secure prior to the assessment/examination/test.
9. Entering fictitious candidates for examinations or assessments, or otherwise subverting the assessment or certification process with the intention of financial gain (fraud).
1. 10. Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed components where there is no actual evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks awarded.
2. 11. Fabricating assessment and/or internal quality assurance records or authentication statements.

Staff and learners will be informed of the Malpractice and Plagiarism Policy regarding via induction processes and website.

Inovra Group will take positive steps to prevent and reduce instances of malpractice by:

1. Showing learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources including websites.
2. Introducing procedures for assessing work in a way that reduces or identifies malpractice.
 - Checks for plagiarism to be carried out by tutors/assessors in learner work as standard
 - Effective internal quality assurance which includes plagiarism checks as standard
 - Identifying periods of supervised study where assessment evidence is produced by learners, as required
 - Altering assessment assignments/tasks/tools on a regular basis
 - Using oral questions with learners to ascertain their understanding and verify their evidence.

All cases of suspected or confirmed malpractice must be reported to the awarding organisation. Failure to do so constitutes malpractice in itself. The Directors of Inovra Group are responsible for investigating and reporting all cases of suspected or actual malpractice to the awarding organisation and conducting a full and thorough investigation.

The Directors will report suspicions or actual incidences to the appropriate awarding organisation immediately.

Individuals involved in the alleged or actual malpractice will be informed in writing making them fully aware of the nature of alleged malpractice and its possible consequences at the earliest opportunity.

The individual(s) involved in the alleged malpractice will be given the opportunity to respond in writing to the allegations made. They will also be informed of the appeal process and possible penalties or sanctions if an allegation is upheld.

Upon conclusion of a full investigation the Directors will inform the awarding organisation of the result.

If malpractice is proven Inovra Group may apply its own sanctions in addition to any imposed by the awarding organisation. Sanctions could include being removed from the programme with no reimbursement of fees.

Individual(s) will be informed of the decision and sanction(s) imposed as a result of an allegation, to which they have a right to appeal using the Appeals Policy.

Member of staff responsible for Malpractice and Plagiarism Investigations

Richard Clegg – Managing Director
info@inovra.co.uk

Inovra Group
142 Thornes Lane
Wakefield
WF2 7RE

Sample Investigation Report

Date:	June 1, 2025
Student Name:	Jane Doe
Student RUID:	123456789
Investigator:	John Smith, Director
Course Name & Number:	Expository Writing (355:101)
Semester:	Spring 2020
Charges:	Violations of the Inovra Group Malpractice and Maladministration Policy
Witnesses:	Henry Brown, Tutor
Supporting Information:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Doe paper (submitted by Henry Brown) 2. Alternate version of Doe paper (submitted by Jane Doe)

Tutor Henry Brown reported that Jane Doe submitted a final paper in his Expository Writing course that was largely plagiarised. The paper was worth 35% of the course grade. I reviewed the paper provided by Mr Brown and found multiple paragraphs taken word for word, without quotation marks or citations, from the book *God and the Oval Office: The Religious Faith of Our 43 Presidents*, by James McCollister. In cases where Ms. Doe did provide citations, she attributed material clearly taken from the McCollister book to sources such as *Under God: Religion and American Politics* and *Religion and The American Presidency: George Washington to George W. Bush*.

I met with Ms. Doe to discuss the matter. I explained the allegations, the company Malpractice and Maladministration Policy, and her rights as a respondent. Ms. Doe agreed to share her version of events.

Ms. Doe maintained that she inadvertently turned in her rough draft, rather than the final paper with appropriate citations. She provided me with a copy of this final paper, and showed me library copies of the books she cited on the “Works Cited” page. I asked Ms. Doe to describe her writing process. She told me that she reviewed her sources and identified material that would be useful for her paper, then cut and pasted this material into a single document for ease of use. She would then begin writing her rough draft, using the material from her source document. I asked whether the paper she submitted to Mr. Brown was the source document, or the rough draft. She said that it was a hybrid of both.

When I asked why she had attributed text from the McCollister book to other sources,

Ms. Doe could offer no explanation. She said that she had no idea how this had happened.

After reviewing the available information, I conclude that there is sufficient cause to find Ms. Doe responsible for a violation of the Malpractice and Maladministration Policy (under the “preponderance of information” standard of proof). It is not in dispute that she submitted a paper rife with plagiarism. I find that the numerous incorrect attributions and the polished format of the paper (running header, page numbers, title block, formatted “Works Cited” page) cast doubt on the claim that this is merely a rough draft.

I am recommending the following sanctions:

- Failing mark in the course
- Future refusal to register Ms. Doe for any future courses with Inovra

Ms. Doe denies responsibility and does not accept the recommended sanctions, so I am referring the case to a the Awarding Body for advice.