Your Questions during the Webinar:

1. Re a learner submitting a plagiarised piece of work, is it OK to 're-educate' that learner rather than go straight to reporting them for malpractice?

   Answer:

   All instances of suspected plagiarism must be reported to Gateway Qualifications. While we do encourage re-educating the learner as part of the process, any affected evidence cannot be counted towards their portfolio. It will need to be fully reworked, reassessed, and internally quality assured to ensure it meets the required standards.

   Once you notify us of the occurrence, we'll work closely with you to understand the circumstances, review your internal procedures, and discuss any corrective actions and preventative measures needed to help minimise the risk of recurrence.

2. Can you confirm at what point we would have to report both to yourself and JCQ regarding suspected malpractice? Do we have to report to JCQ or just work with yourselves initially?

   Answer:

   Any suspected or confirmed instance of maladministration or malpractice should be reported to Gateway Qualifications as soon as reasonably possible. If, after further investigation, there is no evidence to substantiate the concern, the case will be concluded as "unfounded"

   We understand that these situations can be complex, and we're here to support you throughout the process. If you're ever unsure, it's always best to reach out.

3. If a 'genuine' error is made in the administration of an assessment which is only discovered after the students have left the course (through the EV process), what impact could there be on the students themselves?

   Answer:

   This would depend on the nature of the administrative error and its impact on the award's outcome. Gateway Qualifications cannot permit invalid awards to remain in place, and action must be taken to correct any error or invalid award. If the nature of the error has not impacted the validity of the award issued, there would be no impact on the learner, and our focus would be to identify the cause of the error and support you with mitigations to prevent a recurrence.

4. On the website, there is information to suggest that changing the units students are entered for is possible up until the end of the qualification; however, I understood in the past that changing units was considered maladministration. Is this something that has changed recently?

Answer:

Units can be amended at any point during the learners journey and this would not constitute maladministration if the plan for the learner has changed. They must however, be correct by the time you come to claim their results. If units are claimed incorrectly, this would constitute a maladministration enquiry.

Examples of Malpractice and Maladministration (M&M) and Centre Conflict of Interest (COI) Events

Below, you will find some of the queries covered during our webinar explained in more detail, along with additional examples for your information:

M&M: Retention of Records

Centres must maintain all Learner records and details of achievement in an accurate, timely and secure manner. Centres need to have their own processes in place. However, you are always welcome to query us about your current processes for advice and guidance if you are in doubt.

You must keep complete and accurate records for the duration of your recognised status with us and for 24 months from its termination, or for three years from the award of a Qualification to a Learner, whichever is longer. These records include, but are not limited to:

- Attendance
- Performance
- Assessment and feedback records
- Learner feedback records.

M&M: Late Registrations

Our registration timeframes are outlined on our website and depend on the course length:

- **Short courses (15 weeks or fewer):** Registrations must be submitted within 35 calendar days (25 working days) from the course start date.

- **Longer courses:** Registrations must be submitted within 84 calendar days (60 working days).

The course start date refers to when tutor delivery begins, not the date of induction or enrolment.

These timeframes allow you time to determine whether, after initial enrolment and diagnostic assessment, the learners are likely to go on to achieve the qualification. These timeframes must be adhered to in order to ensure that sufficient quality assurance activities are planned and to prevent any delay in supporting learners should your centre experience any unforeseen circumstances affecting the learner's ability to complete the course/qualification.

An additional fee will apply to all registrations received after the deadlines, and full details can be found in the Fees and Charges section of our website.

M&M: Delivery prior to approval

This refers to teaching, delivering, or assessing a qualification when your centre has not yet received formal approval to offer. Please note that submitting an application does not equate to approval. Delivery must not begin until Gateway Qualifications has fully processed and confirmed the approval.

How to Avoid This:

- Review and strengthen your internal procedures for applying for qualification approval.
- Introduce checkpoints in your process to monitor the progress of applications and confirm approval before any delivery begins.
- Assign specific staff members to oversee these checks and ensure their responsibilities are clearly documented.
- If you have a fixed start date for delivery, proactively contact Gateway Qualifications to check on the status of your application.
- While we aim to keep Centres informed, delays can occur. Ultimately, it is the Centre's responsibility to ensure approval is granted before delivery starts.

M&M: Online Assessment Condition Breaches – EDSQ/DFSQ

For EDSQ and DFSQ qualifications, assessments must be conducted on a clean device drive. Failure to meet this condition may result in the evaluation being invalidated and unable to be resulted.

An unclean drive raises concerns about the authenticity of the assessment. It may indicate that the learner had access to unauthorised materials or previous learners' evidence stored on the device, which compromises the integrity of the assessment.

How to avoid this:

- Do not permit learners to use personal or staff logins. Instead, provide dedicated exam logins or use devices specifically configured for assessment purposes.
- Implement procedures to check and confirm that each device has a clean drive before and after every assessment, regardless of the login used.
- Ensure any shared folders or locations are either cleared or securely locked down to prevent access to unauthorised content.

M&M: Plagiarism / Use of AI

AI tools such as ChatGPT offer significant opportunities in education, including the creation of teaching and learning materials, personalised feedback for learners and apprentices, innovative assessment methods, and automated marking. However, alongside these benefits come challenges and risks, particularly around potential misuse.

To maintain the integrity of Gateway Qualifications' provision, all individuals involved in delivery and awarding must ensure that AI use aligns with accepted standards of good practice and does not facilitate unethical or improper behaviour.

Both staff and learners/apprentices must be made aware of the appropriate and responsible use of AI in teaching, learning, and assessment contexts.

Recommended Controls to Mitigate Misuse:

- Restrict access to AI tools where appropriate.
- Supervise assessment activities to ensure they are completed under the guidance of a tutor or assessor.
- Use plagiarism detection tools that include functionality for identifying AI-generated content.
- Keep assessment materials current and secure, reducing the likelihood that AI systems can replicate or generate accurate responses based on prior exposure.

Investigating Potential Misuse:

Detection tools may be used to identify AI-generated content, but they should be part of a broader, holistic approach to verifying the authenticity of learner/apprentice work. These tools should not be relied upon as the sole method of identifying misuse.

COI: Assessment and internal quality assurance carried out by the same person

It is not permitted for the same individual to act as both the assessor and the internal quality assurer (IQA) for the same portfolio or assessment. This separation is essential to maintain the integrity of the assessment process, ensuring decisions are unbiased and subject to independent quality assurance. Combining these roles compromises the reliability of outcomes and increases the risk of errors going undetected.

Recommended Mitigations:

- Assign different qualified staff members to carry out the roles of assessor and IQA.
- Where possible, establish permanent role allocations to support consistency and accountability.

- If necessary in the short term, peripatetic staff may be used to fulfil these roles separately.

- Ensure your Centre has sufficient staffing resources to meet qualification approval and centre recognition requirements.

- Notify Gateway Qualifications promptly of any changes to staffing resources. Failure to do so may be considered malpractice and could impact your Centre's recognition status.

COI: Centre staff investigation Malpractice and Maladministration

During certain investigations, we may ask or permit your Centre to carry out an internal investigation under our guidance.

If this occurs, it's important that you appoint a colleague who can lead the investigation objectively. This individual must not be the person implicated in the matter or someone who could be directly affected by its outcome.

If it's not possible to identify a suitable internal investigator, please let us know. In such cases, Gateway Qualifications will take responsibility for conducting the investigation.

Useful links and locations:

Malpractice and Maladministration Policy:

gatewayqualifications.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Malpractice-and-Maladministration-Policy-and-Procedure-version-8.0-July-2022.pdf

Suspected Maladmin/practice webform:

Suspected Malpractice or Maladministration Form - Gateway Qualifications

Conflict of Interest Policy:

Conflict-of-Interest-Policy-and-Procedure.pdf

Conflict of Interest Declaration Web form:

Centre Declaration of Interest - Gateway Qualifications

AI in assessments Guidance

Artificial-Intelligence-and-use-in-Assessment.pdf