

ATHE Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Revision History		
Version Number	Revision Date	Review Date
Version 3.1	15/05/2016	15/05/2017
Version 3.2	22/12/2017	22/12/2018

Contents

Part A - Policy

1. Scope of the Policy	3
2. Definitions of Malpractice	3
3. Examples of Actions that may constitute Malpractice	3
3.1 Examples of Centre Malpractice	3
3.2 Examples of Learner Malpractice	4
4. Definition of Maladministration	5
5. Examples of Maladministration	5
6. Dealing with Malpractice or Maladministration	5
7. Copies of the Policy	5
8. Responsibility of Centres	6
9. Monitoring and Review	6

Part B - Process

1. Allegations of Malpractice or Maladministration	7
1.1 Suspected Malpractice or Maladministration	7
1.2 Terminology	7
1.3 Process	7
1.4 Anonymous Allegations	8
2. Procedures to be followed in Cases of Alleged or Suspected Malpractice or Maladministration	8
2.1 Alleged or Suspected Malpractice by Learners	8
Initial Response	8
Centre Investigation	8
Procedures	9
Penalties: Learner Malpractice	9
Case Records: Learner Malpractice	10
Appeals	10
2.2 Alleged or Suspected Malpractice or Maladministration by Centre Employees	10
Initial Response	10
Centre Investigation	11
2.3 Alleged or Suspected Malpractice or Maladministration by Centres	11
Initial Response	11
ATHE Investigation	11
Responsibility	12
Notification	12
Investigation Timescales and Procedures	12
Investigation Report	13
Investigation Outcomes	13
2.4 Alleged or Suspected Malpractice or Maladministration by ATHE Employees or Associates	14
ATHE Investigation	14
Investigation Outcomes	15
Appeals Against Sanctions	15

Part A - Policy

1. Scope of the Policy

This policy is aimed at all our key stakeholders namely centres, their staff and learners and ATHE associates and staff, within and outside the UK, who are using any ATHE products and services and who are involved in suspected or actual malpractice or maladministration.

The policy sets out how centres, learners or other personnel should work with us to deal with such cases and the steps which must be followed when reporting suspected or actual cases of malpractice and maladministration. It also identifies ATHE's responsibilities in dealing with such cases and the steps that will be followed when reviewing such cases. The policy should be used alongside the ATHE Guidance on the Centre Malpractice Policy.

2. Definitions of Malpractice

For the purposes of this policy 'Malpractice' is defined as:

'non-compliance with the regulations pertaining to the assessment process, which may adversely affect the integrity of a qualification, its assessment and the validity of learner certificates'.

For the purposes of this policy it also includes some forms of misconduct and forms of unnecessary discrimination or bias towards certain groups or groups of learners.

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

3. Examples of Actions that may constitute Malpractice

Examples of centre and learner malpractice are provided below. Please note that these examples are not exhaustive.

3.1 Examples of Centre Malpractice

- Failure to meet ATHE centre recognition and qualification approval requirements as stated in the centre contract and ATHE policies. Examples of this would include:
 - failure to continually meet ATHE centre recognition and qualification approval requirements e.g. failure to advise ATHE of centre changes related to the delivery of ATHE qualifications; external verifier action plans repeatedly not implemented within agreed timescales
 - repeated short-notice cancellation of external verifier visits by a centre
 - continued failure to meet ATHE requirements for assessment, internal verification
 - failure to keep learners' portfolios of evidence secure
 - providing deliberate erroneous advice to learners
 - using threatening or abusive behaviour towards ATHE staff or associates, either in person or via email or telephone

- Failure by the centre to implement the agreed internal Malpractice policy relating to staff and learners. Examples of this would include:
 - improper assistance to learners over and beyond normal levels of supervision such as to put in doubt learner ownership of work
 - inventing or changing judgements for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) without following agreed internal policies and processes
 - repeated incidences of insufficient evidence of the learners' achievements to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made (fraudulent claims for certificates)
 - inappropriate retention of certificates
- Failure to deal appropriately with learner malpractice such as:
 - plagiarism of any nature
 - collusion with others
 - copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying)
 - deliberate destruction of another's work
 - false declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework
 - impersonation
- Failure to meet the requirements of the regulations for the conduct of timed assessments or other forms of assessment under controlled conditions including:
 - non-adherence to any arrangements agreed with ATHE for such assessments
 - amendments to assessment materials without permission
 - failure to provide access arrangements for assessment in accordance with ATHE requirements

3.2 Examples of Learner Malpractice

- Cheating - This includes communicating with or copying the work of another learner during an examination; introducing written or printed material into an examination room; possession of any materials not permitted in the room, regardless of whether they are relevant to the assessment such as electronic devices including mobile phones, personal organisers, books, dictionaries / calculators (when prohibited).
- Collusion - This is when a learner submits work as their own, when in reality it is done in collaboration with another person. This also includes actions where a learner knowingly permits another learner to copy all or part of their work and submit it as an original piece of work.
- Falsifying Data - This could take place in for example research projects when learners gather and use primary data to support an argument.
- Fraudulent Claims for special consideration, while studying or for assessment. This might include forged or falsified documentation.
- Ghosting - This occurs when a learner submits work as their own when it has been produced in whole or part by another person on their behalf. This would include the buying of assignments from the internet.
- Plagiarism - This is defined as the presentation of work by learners as their own, without appropriate acknowledgment that the source belongs to others. This would include the summarising of someone else's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation; the inclusion of another person's work without the

use of quotation marks and acknowledgement of the sources; the use of the ideas of another person without acknowledgement of the source; copying the work of another learner.

4. Definition of Maladministration

For the purposes of this policy this is defined as:

‘any activity, neglect, default or other practice that results in the centre not complying with the specified requirements for delivery and assessment of the qualifications as set out in the relevant regulatory and ATHE requirements’.

For the purposes of this policy it also includes persistent mistakes or poor administration within a centre.

5. Examples of Maladministration

Examples of actions that may constitute maladministration are listed below. These are exemplars and ATHE reserves the right to consider as maladministration other actions not listed but falling under the general definition of maladministration.

- delay in issuing certificates
- unreasonable delay in responding to requests for information or other communications from ATHE
- erroneous claims for certificates
- incorrect action or failure to take any action when requested to by ATHE
- failure to provide information when reasonably requested to do so
- inadequate record-keeping for example in relation to assessment of learners
- failure to investigate malpractice or maladministration appropriately
- intentionally making misleading or inaccurate statements

6. Dealing with Malpractice or Maladministration

In accordance with the requirements of the regulatory authorities, all allegations of malpractice or maladministration must be investigated. The nature of the investigation, and of the actions taken if malpractice or maladministration is proven, will be commensurate with the nature and the gravity of the malpractice or maladministration. ATHE regards all allegations and suspicions of malpractice or maladministration as potentially serious issues, and as such all must be investigated and recorded formally, no matter how trivial they may at first appear.

7. Copies of the Policy

Copies of the policy can be downloaded from our website: www.athe.co.uk or centres may request copies from our Centre Support Team on 01603760030 or by emailing info@athe.co.uk. We have also signposted the policy in our qualification specifications and in our handbook for centres “*Delivering ATHE Qualifications*”.

8. Responsibility of Centres

It is important that all personnel involved in the management, assessment and quality assurance of ATHE qualifications are fully aware of the contents of this policy. Staff in ATHE centres and learners studying for ATHE qualifications must be clear that ATHE will need to be informed of cases of alleged malpractice and will take action as appropriate. When a centre is seeking recognition it will need to confirm that they have read and understood the ATHE Malpractice and Maladministration Policy. In addition, the centre must have robust internal policies in place to combat malpractice and maladministration and this will be checked by ATHE. Centres must ensure these policies are fully implemented and that staff and learners strictly adhere to the procedures stated in this documentation. Centres should keep malpractice policies under review to ensure they remain fit for purpose. The ATHE Guidance on Centre Malpractice Policy will assist with this task.

A failure by a centre to report suspected or actual cases of malpractice or maladministration, or a failure to have in place effective arrangements to prevent such cases, may lead to sanctions being imposed on the centre.

Examples of cases where centres should inform ATHE are as follows:

- a member of staff is suspected of malpractice
- the issue of malpractice potentially involves learners and/or staff in 2 or more centres
- malpractice is systemic across a group of learners
- the malpractice or maladministration calls into question the validity of a previous result
- forged/fake certificates have been identified

This list is not exhaustive and centres should seek advice if they are not sure when cases should be reported. A centre that requires guidance or advice on how to prevent, investigate and deal with malpractice and maladministration should contact ATHE which will provide such advice and/or guidance.

A centre's compliance with this policy and how it takes reasonable steps to prevent and/or investigate instances of malpractice and maladministration in the institution will be reviewed by ATHE periodically through the centre monitoring arrangements on their centre visits, External Verifiers will check not only that centres have read this policy but have also prepared internal malpractice policies which are being implemented and that all relevant colleagues and learners are aware of the contents and purposes of both documents.

9. Monitoring and Review

A report on cases of malpractice or maladministration including those found not proven will be made annually to the ATHE Quality and Compliance Committee or more frequently if the need arises.

ATHE will review this policy bi-annually or as required, ATHE will take into account the operation of the policy in the previous time period, feedback from stakeholders, or changes brought about by external agencies and regulatory authorities. The review will ensure that procedures continue to be consistent with the regulators Conditions of Recognition and are applied properly and fairly in arriving at judgements.

Part B - Process

1. Allegations of Malpractice or Maladministration

1.1 Suspected Malpractice or Maladministration

Suspicion of malpractice or maladministration may arise from a variety of sources of information for example during the assessment of learner work, analysing plagiarism reports or assessment records. Information may also have been brought to the attention of staff by colleagues or learners or people external to the centre. Allegations may also be made indirectly via a third party (for example, the police or a regulatory authority). ATHE expects centres to act on the information which has been provided.

1.2 Terminology

In all cases, in order to avoid prejudicial language, until an investigation has been completed and the allegation or suspicion proved, centres and ATHE will use the terms '*alleged malpractice or maladministration*' or '*suspected malpractice or maladministration*', as appropriate to the circumstances, in relation to the case in question.

1.3 Process

Allegations should normally be made in writing. Where an allegation is made orally, the receiver of the allegation should attempt to obtain written confirmation from the person making the allegation, but if this is not possible he/she should make a written record. In such cases, care will need to be taken in noting accurately the details of the allegation.

Cases of alleged malpractice in centres will initially be dealt with by applying the centre malpractice policy. There will however be cases where suspected cases of alleged malpractice or maladministration are notified directly to ATHE (see section 8 Responsibility of Centres). In such cases allegations should normally be put in writing (which may include email) and enclose appropriate supporting evidence. Such allegations should normally be reported to ATHE within 5 working days of the discovery of the alleged malpractice.

All allegations should include (where possible):

- centre's name, address and number
- learner's name(s) and ATHE learner ID number(s) (where relevant)
- staff names and roles in the centre (where relevant)
- centre or ATHE person's details (name, job role) if they are involved in the case
- details of the ATHE qualification/s affected or nature of the service affected
- nature of the suspected or actual malpractice and associated dates
- details and outcome of any initial investigation carried out by the centre or anybody else involved in the case, including any mitigating circumstances

In all cases of suspected malpractice and maladministration reported to ATHE it will protect the identity of the '*informant*' in accordance with its duty of confidentiality and/or any other legal duty.

1.4 Anonymous Allegations

An anonymous allegation should normally only be acted upon if there is sufficient supporting evidence, but may require investigation without such evidence depending on the nature of the allegation. While ATHE is prepared to investigate issues which are reported anonymously and/or by whistle-blowers it will always try to confirm an allegation by means of a separate investigation before taking up the matter with those persons about whom the complaint or allegation relates.

Sometimes a person making an allegation of malpractice or maladministration may wish to remain anonymous. Although it is always preferable for 'informants' to reveal their identity and contact details to ATHE, the person may be concerned about possible adverse consequences and request ATHE not to divulge their identity to third parties. If it helps to reassure the 'informant' on this point, ATHE should confirm that it is not obliged to disclose information if to do so would be a breach of confidentiality and/or any other legal duty.

2. Procedures to be followed in Cases of Alleged or Suspected Malpractice or Maladministration

These procedures are designed to cover a wide range of circumstances in relation to: the subject of the allegation or suspicion; the person making the allegation or developing the suspicion; the person or organisation receiving the allegation; the nature and gravity of the alleged malpractice or maladministration. Examples of malpractice or maladministration may arise where these procedures are not wholly appropriate and they may therefore need to be adapted in some cases to suit the actual circumstances. In cases where there is an allegation or suspicion of centre malpractice, ATHE may inform the regulatory authorities irrespective of whether the investigation has been completed.

2.1 Alleged or Suspected Malpractice by Learners

Initial Response

Centres will be expected to have robust policies in place and reference the actions they will take should malpractice in learner work be identified for example a refusal to accept learner work for assessment purposes. Isolated incidents of learner malpractice should however be recorded for example on the learner tracker. See also information on page 11.

ATHE external verifiers who discover or suspect malpractice in assessments when visiting centres, or when sampling learner evidence record their findings, including supporting evidence in full in their report. The centre is given initial oral feedback on the findings and the contents of the report. The centre is also informed that the report will be sent to a Regional Standards Manager at ATHE for checking and approval. In some cases, ATHE will formally write to the Head of Centre and request information so that an investigation into the malpractice and appropriate action can be undertaken.

Centre Investigation

ATHE reserves the right to issue advice to the centre on the conduct of any preliminary investigation, or to require the involvement of ATHE staff in the investigation, or to conduct the investigation itself should the circumstances appear to it to warrant such a course of

action, for example, where the alleged malpractice has been brought to its attention by an external verifier, where the suspected or alleged offence is serious, or has potentially wider consequences (for example, implicates a group or groups of learners).

Procedures

In accordance with the centre's policy there should be an investigation of incidents of malpractice and maladministration prior to formally notifying ATHE. The centre should ensure that staff involved in the initial investigation are competent and have no personal interest in the outcome of the investigation ATHE has a responsibility to the regulatory authorities to ensure that all investigations are carried out rigorously and effectively. Where an investigation is taking place ATHE should be informed

In conducting any preliminary investigation the centre must follow the procedures stated in their internal policy. This will normally include the following actions:

- inform the learner in writing at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged or suspected malpractice, of the procedures that will be followed, and the possible penalties if malpractice is proved
- undertake an investigation of the allegation or suspicion
- provide the learner with an opportunity to contest or refute the allegation or suspicion, either in writing, or at a hearing, or both
- allow the learner to be accompanied by a friend at any hearing
- make a decision based on the investigation and hearing
- ensure that the person or persons conducting the investigation, any hearing, and making any decision:
 - are not the same as the person making the allegation or raising the suspicion
 - have sufficient professional standing and authority, and, if necessary have appropriate subject knowledge
- inform ATHE if it is unable to meet any of the above requirements (for example, if it has a small number of employees), which will advise the centre on how to meet the requirements, if necessary by the involvement of persons external to the centre
- inform the learner of the outcome in writing
- where malpractice is proved, immediately inform ATHE in writing
- keep a full case record (see below) and make available such a record to ATHE on request
- ensure that the assessed work is included in any sample of work considered by the Internal Verifier
- ensure that the work is included in any sample of work provided to the ATHE authorised person (External Verifier) so that he/she can view the evidence and report the findings to ATHE

Following any investigation into malpractice, the centre must send the outcomes of the investigation, including all the documentation, to ATHE.

Penalties: Learner Malpractice

The following penalties may be imposed, depending on the nature and gravity of the malpractice:

- a written warning
- not achieving the unit concerned

- not achieving in all units in the qualification concerned
- disqualification from the qualification concerned
- learner is barred from registering for qualifications for a set period of time
- a combination of two or more of the above
- other actions

Where the malpractice appears to involve a criminal offence, it may, after advice from ATHE, be appropriate to report the case to the police

Case Records: Learner Malpractice

Case records for learner malpractice whether investigated by the centre or ATHE should include:

- a statement of facts
- a detailed account of the circumstances
- names of all persons involved and their roles in the case
- copies of any written statements by learners and staff
- details of the investigation carried out by the centre □ a record of any hearing
- copies of any learner's work that is the subject of the allegation or suspicion of malpractice
- a record of the decision
- copies of the centre's procedures for informing learners of assessment regulations including those relating to malpractice
- a record of the proposed penalty imposed if the allegation or suspicion is upheld (and a record of the confirmed penalty once this is agreed)

Appeals

Where a learner wishes to appeal against a centre decision he/she should in the first instance use the centre's internal appeals process. Where the learner does not believe that the appropriate processes or action has taken place the learner may contact ATHE directly. Where ATHE has taken a decision and the centre or learner wishes to appeal against this decision, the procedures described at the end of this document should be followed.

2.2 Alleged or Suspected Malpractice or Maladministration by Centre Employees

Initial Response

Where a centre employee is suspected of malpractice, or maladministration or is alleged (whether by another employee of the centre, a learner or a member of the public) to have committed malpractice or maladministration, the centre must immediately inform ATHE in writing. Where a member of staff of a centre is suspected by ATHE of malpractice or maladministration, or ATHE receives an allegation of malpractice or maladministration by an employee of a centre, where appropriate the Head of Information Systems will inform the centre (normally the Principal or some other senior member of staff nominated by the centre) in writing.

Centre Investigation

Upon receipt of an allegation or suspicion, it is the responsibility of the centre as the employer of the employee concerned:

- to conduct an investigation
- to determine the outcome
- to determine the appropriate penalty
- to comply with the centre's own employment and disciplinary procedures
- to comply with appropriate employment legislation

In conducting the investigation, the centre should seek the advice of ATHE, and should consider any evidence that ATHE may provide. Subject to agreement between the centre and ATHE it may be considered appropriate for an ATHE member of staff to give evidence at any hearing called as part of the investigation.

Where the malpractice or maladministration appears to involve a criminal offence, the centre and ATHE should consult about whether it is appropriate for the centre to report the case to the police.

Notwithstanding the outcome of the investigation by the centre into the actions of its employee, ATHE reserves the right to undertake an investigation of the centre, as the employer of the person concerned, in order fully to discharge its responsibilities to the regulatory authorities. This investigation will be undertaken following the procedures in section 2.3 below.

2.3 Alleged or Suspected Malpractice or Maladministration by Centres

Initial Response

Where a centre is suspected by ATHE of malpractice or maladministration, or ATHE receives an allegation from a learner, an employee or a member of the public of malpractice or maladministration by a centre, or where the investigation by the centre into alleged malpractice or maladministration by one of its employees is not considered sufficient, ATHE will initiate an investigation. All notifications of suspected cases of malpractice and maladministration received by ATHE will be managed operationally by the Head of Information Systems who will acknowledge receipt, as appropriate, to external parties within three working days.

ATHE Investigation

The regulatory authorities explicitly require ATHE as the awarding organisation to take such action, with respect to the learners and centres concerned, as is necessary to maintain the integrity of the qualification. In accordance with these regulatory requirements all suspected cases of maladministration and malpractice by a centre will be examined promptly by ATHE to establish if malpractice or maladministration has occurred and it will take all reasonable steps to prevent any adverse effect from occurring.

Responsibility

The Head of Information Systems has ultimate responsibility for ensuring the investigation is carried out in a prompt and effective manner and in accordance with the procedures in this policy.

The Head of Information Systems will allocate a relevant member of staff to lead the investigation and establish whether or not the malpractice or maladministration has occurred, and review any supporting evidence received or gathered by ATHE, this will normally be a Regional Standards Manager.

At all times ATHE will ensure that personnel assigned to the investigation have the appropriate level of training and competence and they have had no previous involvement or personal interest in the matter.

Notification

In all cases of suspected or actual malpractice, ATHE will notify the centre (normally the Head of the Centre) involved in the allegation that ATHE will be investigating the matter – in doing so it may withhold details of the person making the allegation if to do so would breach a duty of confidentiality or any other legal duty.

Where applicable, ATHE will inform the appropriate regulatory authorities if there is a reason to believe that there has been an incident of malpractice or maladministration which could either invalidate the award of a qualification or if it could affect another awarding organisation, and may be required to act on any advice received.

Where the allegation may affect another awarding organisation and their provision ATHE will also inform them in accordance with the regulatory requirements.

Investigation Timescales and Procedures

ATHE normally aims to complete all stages of the investigation within 10 working days of receipt of the allegation and no more than 20 working days. In some cases, the investigation may take longer, for example, if a centre visit is required. In such instances, ATHE will advise all parties concerned of the likely revised timescale.

The fundamental principle of all investigations is to conduct them in a fair, reasonable and lawful manner, ensuring that all relevant evidence is considered without bias. In doing so investigations will be based around the following broad objectives:

- to establish the facts relating to the allegation, suspicion or complaint in order to determine whether any irregularities have occurred
- to identify the cause of the irregularities and those involved
- to establish the scale of the irregularities
- to evaluate any action already taken by the centre
- to determine whether remedial action is required to reduce the risk to current registered learners and to preserve the integrity of the qualification
- to ascertain whether any action is required in respect of certificates already issued
- to obtain clear evidence to support any sanctions to be applied to the centre, and/or to members of staff

- to identify any adverse patterns or trends

The investigation may involve a request for further information from relevant parties and/or interviews with personnel involved in the investigation. Therefore, ATHE will:

- Ensure all material collected as part of an investigation is kept secure. All records and original documentation concerning a completed investigation that ultimately leads to sanctions against a centre will be retained for a period of not less than five years. If an investigation leads to invalidation of certificates, or criminal or civil prosecution, all records and original documentation relating to the case will be retained until the case and any appeals have been heard and for five years thereafter.
- Expect all parties, who are either directly or indirectly involved in the investigation, to fully co-operate with us.

Either at the time of notification of a suspected or actual case of malpractice or maladministration and/or at any time during the investigation, ATHE reserves the right to impose sanctions on the centre in order to protect the interests of learners and the integrity of the qualifications.

ATHE also reserves the right to withhold a learner's, and/or cohort of learners' results for all the ATHE qualifications and/or units they are studying at the time of the notification or investigation of suspected or actual malpractice or maladministration.

Where ATHE finds that the complexity of a case or a lack of cooperation from a centre means that it is unable to complete an investigation, it may consult the relevant regulatory authority in order to determine how best to progress the matter.

Investigation Report

ATHE will make the final report available to the parties concerned and to the regulatory authorities and other external agencies as required. In cases where the original notification of the suspected or actual case of malpractice came from a person or organisation external to ATHE (or its centres and learners) it will also inform them of the outcome – normally within 10 working days of making the decision - in doing so it may withhold some details if to disclose such information would breach a duty of confidentiality or any other legal duty. In some cases ATHE may ask parties to check the report for factual accuracy prior to its finalisation and any proposed changes will be considered.

Investigation Outcomes

If the investigation confirms that malpractice or maladministration has taken place ATHE will:

- impose appropriate actions in relation to the centre with specified deadlines in order to address the instance of malpractice or maladministration and to prevent it from recurring
- impose appropriate sanctions on the centre – if so these will be communicated to the centre along with the rationale for the sanction(s) selected. Examples of sanctions include:
 - suspending individual learner or group registrations
 - withholding results

- withdrawing approval for any assessor/internal verifier implicated in malpractice
- de-registering the centre, recognising a duty of care to learners
- in cases where certificates are deemed to be invalid:
 - inform the centre concerned and the regulatory authorities of the reasons why they are invalid and any action to be taken for reassessment and/or for the withdrawal of the certificates
 - ask the centre to inform the affected learners of the action ATHE is taking and that their original certificates are invalid and ask the centre – where possible – to return the invalid certificates to ATHE
- amend its database so that duplicates of the invalid certificates cannot be issued
- expect the centre to amend its records to show that the original awards are invalid
- amend as appropriate aspects of its qualification development, delivery and awarding arrangements and assessment and/or monitoring arrangements and associated guidance to prevent the issue from recurring
- inform relevant third parties of its findings in case they need to take relevant action in relation to the centre
- inform the appropriate regulatory authority(s)

In proven cases of malpractice and/or maladministration by a centre ATHE reserves the right to charge the centre for any reissuing of certificates and/or additional external verifier visits. The fees for these will be the ATHE prices current for such activities at the time of the investigation.

In addition, to the above the Investigating Officer will record any lessons learnt from the investigation and pass these onto relevant colleagues within ATHE to help prevent the same instance of maladministration or malpractice from recurring.

Appeals

Where a centre wishes to appeal against the decision, he/she should use the procedures as described at the end of this document.

2.4 Alleged or Suspected Malpractice or Maladministration by ATHE Employees or Associates

ATHE Investigation

Where an employee of ATHE is suspected of malpractice or maladministration, or is alleged (whether by another employee of ATHE, a learner or a member of the public) to have committed malpractice or maladministration, it is the responsibility of ATHE as the employer of the member of staff concerned:

- to conduct an investigation
- to determine the outcome
- to determine the appropriate penalty
- to comply with ATHE's own employment and disciplinary procedures
- to comply with appropriate employment legislation

In conducting the investigation, ATHE may seek the advice of the Regulatory Authority.

Where the malpractice or maladministration appears to involve a criminal offence, it may be appropriate to report the case to the police.

During the investigation the employee may be suspended or moved to other duties until the investigation is complete.

Investigation Outcomes

If the investigation confirms that malpractice or maladministration has taken place ATHE will take such actions as are necessary and relevant to the case in order

- to safeguard the integrity, validity or reliability of any assessment process and/or the validity of any certificates
- to protect the interests of learners
- to maintain public confidence in ATHE
- to maintain ATHE's status as an awarding organisation These actions may include:
 - in cases where certificates issued are deemed to be invalid:
 - inform the centre(s) concerned and the regulatory authorities of the reasons why they are invalid and any action to be taken for reassessment and/or for the withdrawal of the certificates
 - ask the centre(s) to inform the affected learners of the action ATHE is taking and that their original certificates are invalid and ask the centre – where possible – to return the invalid certificates to ATHE
 - amend its database so that duplicates of the invalid certificates cannot be issued
 - amend as appropriate aspects of its qualification development, delivery and awarding arrangements, assessment and/or monitoring arrangements and associated guidance, internal operational procedures, staff recruitment and training, to prevent the issue from recurring
 - inform relevant third parties of its findings in case they need to take relevant action □
inform the relevant regulatory authority(s)

In addition, to the above the Head of Information Systems will record any lessons learnt from the investigation and pass these onto relevant colleagues within ATHE to help prevent the same instance of maladministration or malpractice from recurring.

Appeals against Sanctions

Where a centre or learner wishes to appeal against the decision and subsequent sanctions taken by ATHE, they can appeal by writing to the ATHE Head of Information Systems. The appeal must be made within 5 working days of the notification of the outcome of the sanctions.

In the communication please include:

- The reason/s why you believe the original decision and sanctions were not justified
- Any further information to support the appeal

You will receive acknowledgement of your appeal within 3 working days of receipt



On receiving your communication ATHE will review the original response you received in light of the additional information presented. If the matter has been fully addressed and there is no further information the appeal will be closed. If the initial response did not deal with all the additional information, the original decision will be reviewed.

You should expect to receive a written response from the Head of Information Systems within 7 working days of the acknowledgment of the appeal. He/she is required to discuss the matter internally with a panel of senior staff, which will review all the information provided, so their decision is final. The panel of staff involved in the discussions will not have been involved in the initial review or taken decisions on the sanctions to be imposed.