

Awarding Organisation Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

June 2026



AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



Introduction

As a recognised awarding organisation (AO), the Institution of Occupational Safety and Health (IOSH) are subject to external regulation and must meet the requirements set by education regulation. The AO is committed to providing a quality service. As part of our commitment, the AO will listen and respond to the views of our customers.

Malpractice and/or maladministration can cause reputational damage and can threaten the integrity of IOSH, its qualifications, and the quality of the learner experience. The focus of this policy is to prevent malpractice or maladministration wherever possible. Where it is not possible, it is essential to ensure that all cases, whether suspected or actual, are dealt with quickly, thoroughly, and effectively.

Purpose

This policy defines the issues of malpractice and maladministration and clarifies the roles and responsibilities for the AO, the Awarding Organisation Committee (AOC), contractors, IOSH approved Study Centres and learners.

It also sets out to outline the procedures for dealing with suspected, or actual, incidents of malpractice or maladministration.

Under the General Conditions of Recognition, B3, the AO is also required to notify Ofqual if certain types of events occur. This condition requires the AO to notify regulators where: 'the awarding organisation believes that there has been an incident of malpractice or maladministration, which could either invalidate the award of a qualification which it makes available or could affect another awarding organisation.'

Scope

This policy is for anyone involved in the management, assessment, certifications processes, and quality assurance of qualifications and learners undertaking AO qualifications need to be familiar with this policy and its procedures.

Please refer to section 'Terms, definitions, acronyms, and abbreviations' for a list of malpractice and maladministration examples. Please note that this list is by no means exhaustive.

Roles and Responsibilities

Employees of the AO, members of the AOC and Assessment Panel and Heads of Study Centres are expected to build and maintain an ethical culture to avoid malpractice by learners, staff, and contractors. Leading a culture of honesty and openness is more likely to encourage the reporting of matters of concern.

All Study Centres teaching and assessing IOSH qualifications are required to meet AO quality standards. Details of the responsibilities for the prevention and management of malpractice and maladministration for the separate roles involved are set out below.

Version 2.1	AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy	IOSH AO	Page 2 of 16
Printed copies of this document may not be the latest version. Please refer to the intranet for the latest updates.			

AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



Responsibilities of the AO

This policy sets out responsibilities to prevent malpractice or maladministration wherever possible. In doing so the AO will undertake the following actions: -

- prevent, wherever possible, malpractice or maladministration
- provide procedures for the investigation of suspected or alleged malpractice or maladministration.
- keep centre arrangements for preventing, investigating, and reporting malpractice and maladministration under review.
- communicate any changes to systems and procedures to Study Centres in a clear and timely manner.
- provide guidance to centres (upon request) as to how best prevent, malpractice or maladministration.
- identify and share good practice amongst centres to encourage and support high quality delivery and assessment.
- assess the risk posed by each centre relating to the potential for malpractice/ maladministration and take appropriate steps in response to that perceived level of risk.

If any malpractice or maladministration is suspected or found to have taken place, the AO will take all reasonable steps to:

- ensure that investigations into incidents of malpractice or maladministration are conducted rigorously and effectively.
- promptly take all reasonable steps to prevent or mitigate any Adverse Effects arising from the malpractice/maladministration.
- take appropriate and proportionate action, with the cooperation of third parties against those who are responsible for the malpractice/ maladministration.
- apply appropriate sanctions consistent with the AO's published policy.
- report the matter to the relevant regulatory authorities, if the AO decides that the circumstances of the incident are sufficiently serious to warrant such reports being made.
- suspend any claims for learner certification submitted by the Study Centre, at any point during an investigation into an incident of malpractice or maladministration, if this is deemed necessary.
- inform appropriate regulatory authorities whenever the Responsible Officer and AO Committee cannot resolve an incidence of malpractice or maladministration and agree the appropriate course of remedial action with them.
- where necessary, share information with other Awarding Organisations that may be affected by incidents of malpractice/maladministration, whether suspected or proven.
- take all reasonable steps to prevent that malpractice or maladministration from recurring.
- In exceptional incidents, the regulatory authorities may lead an investigation.

Responsibilities of IOSH approved Study Centres

To comply with this policy in terms of prevention, Study Centres must:

- ensure that relevant staff, third parties and learners on IOSH policy.
- take all reasonable steps to prevent incidents of malpractice or maladministration from occurring.
- regularly review procedures for preventing and investigating incidents of malpractice or maladministration and make any improvements necessary to ensure the procedures remain relevant and fit for purpose.
- update policies and procedures to reflect any changes/updates that the AO make to this policy.

Version 2.1	AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy	IOSH AO	Page 3 of 16
Printed copies of this document may not be the latest version. Please refer to the intranet for the latest updates.			

AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



- require learners to authenticate work as their own and evidence this when submitted for assessment.
- have in place robust procedures for preventing and investigating incidents of malpractice or maladministration, ensuring these are up to date and that staff, third parties and IOSH registered learners are informed of them.
- deliver assessments in a manner that does not encourage malpractice, being vigilant to such possibilities.

Should any malpractice or maladministration be suspected or identified, Study Centres will:

- take all reasonable steps to investigate any suspected incidents of malpractice or maladministration.
- co-operate fully with any investigation into suspected, or actual, incidents of malpractice or maladministration, including providing access to documents, records, data, staff, third parties, subcontractors, learners, satellite sites or any other resource as required by the AO or regulator during the investigation.
- promptly notify the AO using the IOSH AO Incident Report Log on the Qualification Management System (QMS) of any incidents of malpractice or maladministration.
- deliver in full, the actions required to manage and rectify any identified incidents of malpractice or maladministration to minimise any Adverse Effect
- take appropriate and proportionate action against those responsible for the malpractice or maladministration to ensure it does not recur in the future.

Failure by a Centre to deal with an identified issue may constitute malpractice and may result in a Study Centre's accreditation being temporarily, or permanently, removed or learners being withdrawn from the qualification.

The Policy and Procedures for dealing with malpractice or maladministration.

The reporting of suspected incidents

Anyone who identifies or is made aware of suspected, or actual, incidents malpractice or maladministration must inform the AO at the earliest opportunity.

Incidents may be reported by any person present at the time the alleged malpractice took place or was identified.

Anonymous reports of malpractice will be acted upon only if there is supporting evidence, or if the nature of the report warrants it.

The AO Incident Report Form should be used to make the report and is available on the IOSH website www.iosh.com. The form should be submitted to admin@ioshao.com or alternatively approved Study Centres can complete the form on the QMS.

If a Study Centre is found to have not reported an incident, the AO may apply sanctions in accordance with the AO Sanctions Policy, and it may ultimately lead to permanent or temporary removal of a Study Centre's accreditation or the removal of learners from the qualification.

AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



The AO will take appropriate steps to prevent, where possible, any Adverse Effect to which the suspected malpractice or maladministration may give rise and, where any such Adverse Effect occurs, mitigate it as far as possible and correct it.

Investigating incidents

Irrespective of the underlying cause or the people involved, the AO will investigate all allegations of malpractice or maladministration. In most cases the AO expects the Study Centre to conduct an initial investigation into the incident, however in more serious cases the AO may conduct its own investigation directly or conduct a follow up investigation after the Study Centre has conducted its own and supplied its report.

If the AO intends to conduct a direct investigation, or a follow up investigation, the Study Centre will be informed of this.

When dealing with alleged malpractice or maladministration, the AO will deal primarily with the Head of the Study Centre or their nominee. In certain circumstances, for example, when a learner's account of events differs with that of the Study Centre's, the AO may deal directly with the learner or the learner's representative.

The AO will seek witnesses, as appropriate, to establish the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice or maladministration, or to validate evidence presented, where required.

Conducting an Investigation

During an investigation there are certain principles that should be adhered to:

Confidentiality of investigation details – by their very nature investigations usually necessitates access to information that is confidential to a centre or individuals. All material collected as part of an investigation must be kept secure and not normally disclosed to any third parties (other than the regulators or the police, where appropriate).

Rights of individuals - such as data protection – where an individual is suspected of malpractice they should be informed of the allegation(s) made against them (preferably in writing) and include the evidence that supports the allegation(s). They should be provided with the opportunity to consider their response to the allegation(s) and submit a written statement or seek advice, if they wish to. They should also be informed of what the possible consequences could be if the malpractice/maladministration is proven, and of course the possibility that other parties may be informed (E.g. Regulators). The centres appeals process should also be communicated to them, in conjunction with AO Review and Appeals policy.

The aim of the investigation will be to:

- Establish the facts – circumstances?
- Identify the scale of the alleged malpractice
- Identify the cause(s)
- Identify and, where necessary, take action to minimise the risk to current learners

AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



Evaluate any action already taken

- Determine whether any corrective action is required to reduce the risk to learners and to preserve the integrity of the qualification(s) and assessment
- Identify any changes to policies/procedures that are required to mitigate re-occurrence

Stage 1: Briefing and record-keeping.

Anyone involved in the conduct of an investigation should have a clear brief and understanding of their role. All investigators must maintain a record of their actions during an investigation.

Stage 2: Establishing the facts.

Investigators should review the evidence and associated documentation, including AO guidance on the delivery of the qualifications and internal quality assurance arrangements. Facts to be determined:

- What occurred (nature of malpractice/substance of the allegations)?
- Why the event occurred?
- Who was involved in the event?
- When & where it occurred? – there may be more than one location
- What action, if any, has been taken?

Stage 3: Interviews

The interview questions and format for the interview should be prepared and agreed by the interviewers prior to undertaking any interview(s); the interviewers must remain impartial and open-minded throughout the process. One person primarily should function as the interviewer and the other as note-taker. Interviewers may find it helpful to use the 'PEACE' technique:

- Plan and prepare
- Engage and explain
- Account
- Closure
- Evaluation

Interviewees may have another individual of their choosing present at the interview; this may include a trade union representative, colleague, solicitor etc. It is important to consider the age of the interviewees and where appropriate, adults or other representatives are present during any interview. Safeguarding parameters must be considered at all stages before any interviews take place.

When undertaking interviews, notes should be taken in the most appropriate form and then typed up, dated, and forwarded to the individual for a signature and returned to the centre and logged as evidence. Recording equipment can also be used to aid the interviewing process, although permission should be sought from the interviewee beforehand. Any recordings must state the names and roles of the persons present, the start time, end time and include any breaks in the interview.

Stage 4: Other contacts

In some cases, you may need to contact third parties for facts and information; this may be done via face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews, by post or by email. Prepare a set of questions and record the responses as confirmation of their evidence. When conducting phone interviews with any learner(s) and/or staff, the investigators should pre-arrange these phone calls. Investigators should log the number of attempts made to contact an individual, if no response is initially made.

AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



Stage 5: Documentary evidence

The interview team may present evidence to the alleged person(s) for review and ask for comment; again, all responses must be recorded. Wherever possible, documentary evidence should be authenticated by reference to the author. This may include asking learner(s), staff, and others to confirm handwriting, dates, and signatures.

Stage 6: Reporting

The centre should submit a final report of the investigation findings and outcomes to the AO Operations and Quality Manager by the Head of Centre or Centre Coordinator upon completion.

The report should include:

- A statement of the facts - a detailed account of the circumstances and alleged event, together with details of the investigations conducted
- Written statements from all parties, who have been interviewed as part of the investigation
- Any assessment records of the learner(s) and relevant internal quality assurance documentation
- Whether the malpractice allegation(s) have been substantiated, not substantiated, or partly substantiated
- Any corrective action(s) being taken to ensure the integrity of the qualification, where relating to learner malpractice
- Any mitigating factors that should be considered

Stage 7: Conclusions

Once the report has been reviewed by AO, a decision will be made on the investigation outcome, in some cases, AO may decide to investigate further or request additional evidence/information from the centre.

Retention and storage of evidence and records

All relevant documents and evidence should be retained in line with AO/Centre policies and procedures.

Co-operation

The AO expects all parties, who are either directly or indirectly involved in the investigation to co-operate fully, including, but not limited to, providing access to documents, records, data, staff, third parties, subcontractors, Learners, satellite sites or any other resource as required by the Awarding Organisation during an investigation.

In instances where a Study Centre or learner refuse to co-operate, there may be no alternative but to remove accreditation and remove learners from the programme permanently or temporarily. The AO may also inform the relevant regulatory authorities.

Timescales

All reported incidents of suspected, or actual, malpractice or maladministration will be acknowledged in writing within 3 working days.

The AO will endeavour to complete any investigation within 28 working days of the receipt of the written report. The duration of the investigation may vary to ensure a fair and thorough process dependent on the circumstances. The AO will inform the notifier if the investigation takes longer than anticipated and will keep them informed as much as possible during the investigation.

Version 2.1	AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy	IOSH AO	Page 7 of 16
Printed copies of this document may not be the latest version. Please refer to the intranet for the latest updates.			

Source of the Allegation

Malpractice or Maladministration discovered by a Study Centre

If a Study Centre discovers, or suspects, malpractice, or maladministration, it is the responsibility of the Head of the Study Centre or their nominee to report this to the AO at the earliest opportunity as per the above Reporting procedure.

They must then, acting on behalf of the AO, personally supervise a thorough investigation into the allegation, the purpose of which is to establish the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice or maladministration.

If the allegation is directed at the Head of the Study Centre or their nominee, or they have a personal interest in the outcome of the investigation, the Study Centre should appoint another member of staff to lead the investigation. Study Centres should ensure that all actions taken as part of the investigation are fully documented.

A full written report of the investigation must then be submitted to the AO, this should include the following, where appropriate:

- A statement of the facts, a detailed account of the circumstances and details of any investigations conducted by the Study Centre.
- Written statement(s) from the staff concerned.
- Written statement(s) from the learner(s) concerned.
- Any mitigating factors (e.g., relevant medical reports).
- Information about the Study Centre's procedures for advising learners of the AO's regulations.
- Any work of the learner and any associated material (e.g., source material for coursework) which is relevant to the investigation.
- Any other information that the Study Centre feels would be relevant to the investigation.

Malpractice or Maladministration discovered by the Awarding Organisation

If malpractice or maladministration is discovered by the AO's External Verifier, or another AO representative, or, if it is reported to the AO by a Learner or member of the public, or by any other means, full details of the alleged malpractice or maladministration will be reported to the Study Centre.

The Study Centre must then conduct a thorough investigation into the allegation. The AO will record the details of the incident using the AO Incident Report Log on the QMS.

Third Parties and Confidentiality of Evidence

If suspected or alleged cases of malpractice and/or maladministration are brought to the AO's attention by a third party or 'whistleblower,' the AO will take the below steps to establish the facts of the alleged case.

- This will be done in writing to the third-party seeking permission to use their name, to communicate the details of the allegation with the AO Study Centre, and to find out whether the Study Centre's internal procedures have been exhausted.
- If the 'whistleblower' does not grant permission to use their name, and the allegation still merits investigation, the AO will advise the 'whistleblower' that the scope of the investigation may be impaired and that the AO will strive to preserve their anonymity in bringing the matter to the attention of the Head of the Awarding Organisation.

The AO will store all evidence collated as part of an investigation confidentially and will not normally withhold from the Head of the Study Centre or their nominee any evidence pertinent to incidents of suspected malpractice or maladministration.

In rare incidents, it may be necessary to do so, for example, where it is necessary to protect the identity of an informant. In all such incidents, the AO will provide summaries of evidence and a statement as to why the evidence itself cannot be presented in its original form.

Access to Evidence

It is at the discretion of the Study Centre Co-ordinator as to how evidence is presented to the individuals involved.

The AO requires that individuals subject to an investigation have access to all evidence against them and are provided with all necessary facilities: for example, advice, sufficient time etc. to allow such individuals to prepare full responses.

Investigating Alleged Malpractice by Learners

It is the Study Centre's responsibility to ensure that any learner suspected of malpractice is made fully aware, at the earliest opportunity, in writing of the nature of the alleged malpractice and the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.

Learners accused of malpractice must be given the opportunity to respond in writing, within 5 working days, to allegations made.

Learners accused of malpractice should be made aware of the avenues for appealing should a judgement be made against them. Full details of the procedure for appealing can be found in the AO Review and Appeals Policy.

In those rare incidents where it is necessary for the AO to interview learners directly following a Study Centre's report on the incident, the AO undertakes to do this:

- In the presence of the Study Centre Co-ordinator, or other senior member of staff, if required.
- Only after ensuring that the Learner has been given the opportunity to be accompanied by a supporter of their choice.

AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



Investigating Alleged Malpractice/Maladministration by Study Centre Staff

Investigations into any incident of alleged malpractice or maladministration against a member of Study Centre staff or associates must normally be conducted, in the first instance, by the Head of the Study or their nominee.

If the alleged malpractice or maladministration is against the Head of the Study Centre, then the Study Centre must nominate another member of staff to lead the investigation.

Any member of staff accused of malpractice or maladministration must be made fully aware, at the earliest opportunity, in writing of the nature of the alleged malpractice or maladministration and the possible consequences should this be proven.

Any member of staff accused of malpractice or maladministration must have the opportunity to respond in writing, within 5 working days, to allegations made.

A member of staff accused of malpractice or maladministration must be made aware of the avenues for appealing should a judgement be made against them. For further details please see the AO Review and Appeals Policy.

When investigating serious incidents of alleged staff malpractice or maladministration, it may be necessary for a member of the AO staff to be present at an interview with the staff member concerned. A friend or union representative may accompany the member of staff being interviewed, if permitted by the Study Centre's disciplinary procedures.

The AO will review the Study Centre's report of the incident and the supporting evidence and if further information is required this may result in a discussion between the Head of the Study Centre, or their nominee, and the AO Awarding Organisation staff, a request for further information, or a visit to the Study Centre.

If a Study Centre visit is necessary, the AO will liaise with the Study Centre to arrange this and will provide an Agenda for the day; note that a fee will be charged for this visit, as detailed in the AO Statement of Fees.

Outcome of the Investigation

The AO Responsible Officer will then review each incident of malpractice or maladministration individually, and considering the evidence and information available will, in conjunction with the AO Committee or Assessment Panel (as applicable), decide if malpractice or maladministration has occurred.

Where malpractice or maladministration has been found to have occurred the AO will review its processes and guidance to ensure that relevant measures are put into place to avoid future incidents.

Study Centre Malpractice or Maladministration

If the investigation confirms that malpractice or maladministration has taken place, in order to protect the integrity of the AO's qualifications and to prevent future breaches, the Study Centre may have one or more sanctions applied, in accordance with the **AO's Sanctions Policy**, depending on the severity of the incident.

AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



The AO will ensure that any sanction applied is proportionate to the gravity and scope of the incident. The AO reserves the right to apply penalties flexibly, outside of the defined ranges, if mitigating or aggravating circumstances are found to exist.

Learner Malpractice

If the investigation confirms that malpractice has taken place, the learner may have one or more of the following sanctions imposed. In some circumstances other sanctions may also be imposed.

- The learner is issued with a warning.
- The learner's assessment result is voided.
- The results for the entire cohort may be voided.
- The learner is barred from entering for one or more assessments, for a set period of time.
- The IOSH AO may not issue, or may invalidate, the learner's certificate.
- No further registrations will be accepted by the AO for the learner.

Communicating the Decision

Once a decision has been reached The Head of the Study Centre will be informed, in writing, of the outcome of the investigation and any subsequent consequences, including any contingencies that the AO requires to be put in place to avoid further incidents, in proven cases.

It is then the responsibility of the Head of the Study Centre to communicate the decision to the individuals concerned, and to pass on warnings in cases where this is indicated.

In cases where an independent third party made the AO aware of the incident, the AO will also advise the informant of the outcome of the investigation.

Although all investigations and their outcome are confidential to the Study Centre, the AO may, where necessary, share the details of this with the relevant regulatory authorities and/or affected Awarding Organisations (AOs) as required by Ofqual's General Conditions of Recognition. In dealing with cases of malpractice and/or maladministration the AO will pay due regard to this requirement and notify other AOs as appropriate. This will usually be appropriate where:

- The AO Study Centre where the malpractice and/or maladministration has occurred (or is suspected) is also approved with another AO (for similar or different qualifications) and the (suspected) malpractice could potentially impact on the activities undertaken on behalf of that AO. The AO Study Centre where the malpractice and/or maladministration has occurred (or is suspected) is also approved with another AO (for another IOSH accredited qualification) and the (suspected) malpractice could potentially impact on certification of those qualifications which may be/have been used as evidence requirements for IOSH member grades/denominations.
- The AO Study Centre where the malpractice and/or maladministration has occurred (or is suspected) has indicated that they are seeking approval with another Awarding Organisation (for similar or different qualifications) and there is potential for the Study Centre to move their operations to the other AO in an attempt to avoid sanctions and continue sub-standard practices.

In cases where the AO Study Centre is also an IOSH Training Provider (for IOSH non-regulated training and awareness courses), the AO may, where necessary, share the details of the investigation and outcome with the IOSH Governance team who are responsible for the quality assurance of non-regulated provision.

AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



To decide what action to take as a result of the information received, the AO may:

- request information from the Study Centre, speak to Study Centre staff e.g. external assessors/IQAs who may be aware of this information through their contact with the centre, speak to other AOs to determine their involvement with the centre.
- seek legal advice to find out if it is acceptable to share the fact that an investigation has taken place or is in the process of taking place.

Revocation of Certificates

If, as the result of an investigation into learner malpractice, the decision is taken to invalidate a learner's certificate the AO will ensure that the following actions are taken:

- Follow the principle of seeking to protect the interests of learners, as far as is reasonable and possible in the circumstances.
- Inform the Study Centre of the reasons for their invalidity and any action to be taken for reassessment and/or certification.
- Instruct the Study Centre to inform the learner of this and of such actions to be taken with regards to re-assessment and/or certification, if possible.
- Cancel the original certificates on our database so that duplicates cannot be issued.
- Arrange for the return of the original certificate by the learner.
- Give the regulatory authorities details of the invalid certificates and, if appropriate, make the information available to other awarding organisations.

Appeals

The AO has established procedures for considering appeals against penalties arising from malpractice/maladministration investigations. Appeals against a decision made by the AO will normally only be accepted from the Head of the Study Centre or their nominee (on behalf of learners and/or members of staff) or from individual members of Study Centre staff (in respect of a decision taken against them personally).

Further information may be found in the AO Enquiries and Appeals Policy.

Investigating Alleged Malpractice or Maladministration within the AO

IOSH expects employees, members of its governing boards, and anyone associated with the activities of the functioning of the AO to operate with the highest level of integrity. Should any incidence of potential or actual malpractice or maladministration be reported this will be viewed very seriously. Depending on the situation the AO Committee or IOSH Board of Trustees will nominate an appropriate representative to investigate.

Any investigation into the activity of the AO will follow the procedures for an AO investigation into Malpractice or Maladministration by Study Centre staff.

In such an incidence the AO Committee or nominated representatives will determine any necessary actions, manage any appeals, and determine any sanctions as appropriate to the situation and report this to the education regulator.

Notifications of (Suspected) Malpractice or Maladministration from other Awarding Organisations

Version 2.1	AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy	IOSH AO	Page 12 of 16
Printed copies of this document may not be the latest version. Please refer to the intranet for the latest updates.			

AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



Any notifications received from other Awarding Organisations regarding malpractice or suspected malpractice will be logged onto the “Malpractice and Maladministration Log” held in the QMS by the AO staff member who receives it. Notifications must be passed to the Operations and Quality Manager for information and review. Should the notification affect a Study Centre that is approved by the AO, contact may be made with the issuing AO for more details and if appropriate the incident logged in the QMS against the Study Centre record.

The Operations and Quality Manager will also look for any equivalences with any of the processes, procedures, or controls in place by the AO to see if any lessons can be learned or improvements made to avoid a similar incident. If appropriate the details of the notification will be raised at the next monthly risk review meeting.

All applications for Study Centre approval will be reviewed against the “Malpractice and Maladministration Log” to see if the applicant organisation has previously had any malpractice issues which they have not declared on their application. Where the applicant organisation is also an IOSH Training Provider (for IOSH non-regulated training and awareness courses) a due diligence check is conducted via the IOSH Governance Team to check for any reported incidents of malpractice or maladministration.

Monitoring & Review

The Responsible Officer will regularly review records of all malpractice or maladministration investigations and any other expressions of dissatisfaction. The findings, together with any identifiable trends and recommendations will be formally reported to, and reviewed, by the AO Committee.

As a result of the monitoring and review process, changes to the policy or any of the associated processes and procedures will be agreed by the relevant decision maker and implemented accordingly.

The AO will review this policy on an annual basis as part of our self-assessment and continuous improvement and to address regulatory changes, operational feedback or concerns brought to the attention of IOSH to ensure the policy remains fit for purpose.

Terms, definitions, acronyms, and abbreviations

Malpractice

The term malpractice covers any deliberate actions, neglect, default, or other practice that compromises, or could compromise:

- the integrity of an IOSH qualification
- the integrity of an assessment process
- the validity of a result or certificate
- the reputation and credibility of the IOSH and its qualifications
- the reputation and credibility of an IOSH approved Study Centre

Malpractice may include a range of issues from academic misconduct, to failure to maintain appropriate records or systems, to the deliberate falsification of records in order to claim certificates.

The following lists identify where different types of malpractice can occur.

Version 2.1	AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy	IOSH AO	Page 13 of 16
Printed copies of this document may not be the latest version. Please refer to the intranet for the latest updates.			

AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



Learner malpractice (academic misconduct)

Learner malpractice (academic misconduct) is an attempt by a learner to gain unfair academic advantage and it can occur in:

- the preparation and authentication of coursework and assessment evidence
- the compilation and authentication of portfolios
- the presentation of practical work
- conduct during internal and external assessment.

Examples of malpractice by a learner include (but are not limited to):

Plagiarism such as

- quoting from published or unpublished work of other persons, including other learners, without crediting the source and referencing in accordance with academic convention
- dishonestly presenting another learner's work as their own, whatever the medium

Collaborating with another student or individual, by any means, to complete a coursework assignment or assessment, unless it has been clearly stated that such collaboration is permitted.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) use in the context of assessment refers to the use of AI tools and technologies to acquire information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which leads towards to IOSH professional qualification. This may involve the application of AI powered algorithms, machine learning models and data driven processes to gather analysis and generate relevant data, insight or assessment content that can enhance the quality and effectiveness of work provided by learners. AO chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompt and questions.

The AO expects of learners to produce original content that is attributed to their authorship in all assessments. This means ensuring that the final submitted assessment is in their own words and is not copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work and submission.

For further guidance on the use of AI and its detection the AO recommend the following resources:

<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/>

Impersonating another learner or allowing self to be impersonated

Inclusion of inappropriate or offensive material in coursework assignments or during assessments, this includes any material of a discriminatory nature.

Falsification including but not limited to:

- personal identification
- supporting evidence provided for reasonable adjustment or special consideration applications.
- IOSH results documentation, including certificates.

AO Malpractice and Maladministration Policy



Centre malpractice

Malpractice at a Study Centre may be committed by a member of staff or a contractor.

Examples include, but are not limited to:

- allowing a learner to copy another learner's assignment work, or allowing a learner to let their own work be copied
- excessive direction from assessors to learners on how to meet assessment standards.
- divulging any information relating to learner performance and / or results to anyone other than the learner
- insecure storage of assessment marking guidance
- misuse of assessments, including inappropriate adjustments to assessment decisions
- failure to advise AO of potential identified issues.
- failure to comply with requirements for accurate and safe retention of learner evidence, assessment and IQA records.
- failure to comply with IOSH procedures for managing and transferring accurate learner data.
- producing, using, or allowing the use of forged or falsified documentation, including but not limited to:
 - personal identification
 - supporting evidence provided for reasonable adjustment or special consideration applications.
 - falsification of records to claim certificates.

Maladministration

The term 'Maladministration' refers to any action, neglect, default, or other practice that results in unintended non-compliance with AO policies and procedures for the delivery of qualifications. Some examples of Maladministration can be found below.

- Persistent failure to adhere to AO learner registration and certification procedures.
- Persistent late learner registrations/assessment entries.
- Inaccurate learner registrations.
- Inaccurate claims for certification.
- Unreasonable delays in responding to requests and/or communications from AO

Awarding organisation malpractice

Awarding organisation malpractice can be malpractice committed by a member of AO, its Governing Body or a contractor acting on behalf of the AO. Examples of such malpractice can include but are not limited to:

- Insecure storage of assessment materials and marking guidance
- Misuse of assessments, including inappropriate adjustments to assessment decisions
- Deliberate falsification of records to support the issuing of certificates
- Knowingly failing to adhere to regulations

This can arise through different situations, including but not limited to: -

- deception, e.g. colluding in the manufacture of evidence of competence, the fabrication of assessment or internal verification records.
- collusion in the provision of improper assistance to learners, e.g., permitting the use of a reasonable adjustment over and above the extent permitted by the AO policy.
- Failure to adhere to regulations/IOSH stated requirements.