

NEBOSH Candidate Malpractice and Maladministration Policy and Procedure



This policy is intended to meet the relevant requirements of NEBOSH's regulatory principles and ensure that the British Safety Council has safeguards in place to prevent and manage cases of malpractice relating to any NEBOSH courses.

Definitions

Maladministration – Maladministration means 'any action, neglect, default or other practice that compromises the accreditation, or quality assurance process, including the integrity of accredited qualifications, the validity of certificates or the reputation and credibility of NEBOSH e.g. failure to return completed assessment scripts to NEBOSH.

Malpractice – is a deliberate activity, neglect, default or other practice that compromises or could compromise the assessment process, the integrity of the qualification, the validity of a result or certificate, the reputation and credibility of British Safety Council as the course provider, the awarding body NEBOSH, the NEBOSH qualifications, or the wider qualifications community.

Cases of deliberate deception, trickery or cheating intended to gain advantage, including financial advantage may also be reportable as fraud. This can include cases where candidate resources are not as stated.

Candidate malpractice – means malpractice by a candidate in the course of any examination or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any assessments and the writing of any question paper response. Examples of malpractice could include, but are not limited to:

- The alteration or falsification of any results document, including certificates;
- A breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator in relation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations;
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments;
- Copying from another candidate (including the use of ICT to do so);
- Allowing work to be copied e.g. posting on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment;
- The deliberate destruction of another candidate's work;
- Disruptive behaviour in the examination room (including the use of offensive language, shouting and/or aggressive behaviour);
- Exchanging, obtaining, receiving, passing on information (or the attempt to) that could be examination related by means of talking, electronic, written or non-verbal communication;
- Making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of the risk assessment project;
- Collusion – working collaboratively with other candidates beyond what is permitted;
- Inclusion of inappropriate, offensive, discriminatory or obscene material in assessment evidence;
- Impersonation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one's place in an examination or assessment;
- Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from published sources (including the internet) or incomplete referencing;
- Theft of another candidate's work;
- Bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material, for example: notes, study guides, ipads, mobile phones etc.;
- The unauthorised use of a memory stick where a candidate uses a word processor;
- Behaving in a manner which undermines the integrity of the examination.

1. Procedure

1.1 Any allegation of malpractice will be investigated by the Head of Education.

1.2 The Head of Education will collect any relevant evidence and use it to form an opinion.

1.3 Where malpractice is judged to have taken place, the Head of Education will follow the NEBOSH Malpractice Policy Section 5.1 and 5.2 requirements (as per the copy of NEBOSH policy available from the NEBOSH website).

Within the NEBOSH policy the student is advised by that if they are unsatisfied with the provider (British Safety Council) response, they can escalate their complaint to NEBOSH. Should they be unsatisfied by the NEBOSH response, their complaint can be escalated to the SQA Accreditation (NEBOSH' regulator.)

2. Sanctions and penalties

2.1 When malpractice is judged to have taken place by the Head of Education, the student will be failed in both elements of the assessment (multiple choice examination and risk assessment project).

2.2 At the discretion of the Head of Education, the student may be offered a second chance to undertake their assessments.

- This may entail the student re-taking the BSC e-Learning course, in which case the student will be charged at the standard fee for use of this resource.
- The student's line manager must supply a verification e-mail from the line manager verifying that the answers given in the multiple-choice examination and the work undertaken in the risk assessment project are their own.
- Only after the verification email has been received will the student's assessments be marked.

Policy Review Date: August 2018