



## Malpractice and Maladministration Policy & Procedure

Document Specification:	
Purpose:	To ensure that Gatehouse Awards adopts robust procedures for preventing, investigating and dealing with malpractice and maladministration relating to the development, delivery and award of its qualifications, in compliance with Ofqual conditions of recognition.
Accountability:	Gatehouse Awards Governing Body
Responsibility:	Responsible Officer
Version:	8.3
Effective from:	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2017
Indicative Review date:	March 2019
Links to Ofqual GCR	A6, A7, A8 and B3
Other relevant documents:	Gatehouse Awards Terms and Conditions of Business Regulations for Conducting Controlled Examinations Appeals Policy and Procedure Centre Handbook Whistleblowing Policy

### Gatehouse Awards Limited

3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Oaktree House  
408 Oakwood Lane  
Leeds  
LS8 3LG  
UNITED KINGDOM

Tel: 0113 249 1000

[www.gatehouseawards.org](http://www.gatehouseawards.org)



## 1. Introduction

Should malpractice or maladministration occur or be suspected to have occurred, this document sets out the procedures to be used to report directly to Gatehouse Awards.

All Gatehouse Awards and Approved Centres' staff are required to report to Gatehouse Awards any instances of suspected maladministration or malpractice that may occur during the examination, assessment and awarding process.

## 2. Scope & Purpose

This policy applies to all Gatehouse Awards staff, the staff of Centres approved to deliver Gatehouse Awards qualifications and all Candidates registered to take such.

The purpose of this policy is to:

- Define malpractice and maladministration
- Identify the rights and responsibilities of Gatehouse Awards, its Centres and Candidates in relation to such matters.
- Describe the procedures to be followed in cases where there is reason to suspect malpractice or maladministration has taken place.

## 3. Definitions of Malpractice, Maladministration and Adverse Effect

Malpractice and maladministration shall be deemed as the improper actions or omissions of Candidate, Centre staff, and anyone involved with delivering qualifications, that would have an adverse effect on any and all stakeholders, the integrity of the qualification or the certification thereof.

### 3.1 Malpractice

Malpractice is deemed as a deliberate act by a staff member, Candidate or Centre which has, or may have, an adverse effect on the assessment process, the award of the qualification or the integrity or security of any examination or qualification made available by Gatehouse Awards. This could include where a Centre fails to inform Gatehouse Awards of any suspicions of malpractice or maladministration or attempts to deny, alter or conceal any evidence pertaining to such suspicions when these are presented to them – including 'coaching' of Candidates or staff in respect of responses to give during any investigative interviews conducted by Gatehouse Awards.

### 3.2 Maladministration

Maladministration is a sub-category of malpractice which relates directly to the administration of Gatehouse Awards qualifications, but which has not been a deliberate act to attempt to subvert the integrity or security of the assessment process or the qualification as a whole. An instance of potential Maladministration may be escalated to Malpractice if:

- the investigation into maladministration is obstructed
- an Action Plan be laid down by Gatehouse Awards is not adhered to
- repeatedly logged instances of Maladministration events indicate that it is an endemic issue

### 3.3 Adverse Effect

An Adverse Effect is defined by the Regulator as an act, omission, event, incident or circumstance that:

- (a) gives rise to prejudice to Learners or potential Learners, or
- (b) adversely affects –
  - (i) the ability of the awarding organisation to undertake the development, delivery or award of qualifications in accordance with its Conditions of Recognition,
  - (ii) the standards of qualifications which the awarding organisation makes available or proposes to make available, or
  - (iii) public confidence in qualifications.

Examples of what an adverse effect may be in terms of the qualifications offered by Gatehouse Awards include, but are not limited to:

- A Centre allowing copies of assessment materials provided by Gatehouse Awards into the public domain, either accidentally or purposely (including providing details of the content of live items to Candidates during preparation for the assessment)
- A Centre or Gatehouse Awards staff member (as appropriate) failing to invigilate an examination leading to collusion or other attempts to defraud the examination process
- A Centre failing to make arrangements for a Reasonable Adjustment for a Candidate who has a verifiable need for one
- A Centre or Gatehouse Awards staff member failing to comply with the requirements of security, impartiality, integrity and openness with the Awarding Organisation or the Regulator
- A Centre attempting to tamper with the examination materials provided by Gatehouse Awards either prior to or following an examination and/or an Gatehouse Awards appointed member of staff (if present) failing to prevent an examination going ahead when evidence of said tampering had been noticed or otherwise allowing the tampering to occur.
- Gatehouse Awards failing to ensure that qualifications are only awarded to Candidates who have met the required standard, based on work that can be verified as having been produced by that Candidate
- Gatehouse Awards failing to ensure that the examination papers provided to Centres accurately, fairly and reliably allow Candidates to demonstrate the required standard

## 4. Examples of Malpractice and Maladministration

Below are some examples of events which could lead to a report of suspected malpractice or maladministration. Please note, this list is not exhaustive:

### 4.1 Malpractice:

- Assessment delivery staff prompting or providing inappropriate assistance to Candidates
- Ineffective prevention of plagiarism
- Attempts by a Centre to influence the outcome of the external assessment and/or moderation processes, including offering of any inducements to Gatehouse Awards appointed members of staff
- Falsifying evidence pertaining to a qualification
- Failure of Centre or Gatehouse Awards staff to verify the identity of a Candidate
- Failure to provide relevant information required and requested by Gatehouse Awards or the Regulator
- Overruling or ignoring the stipulations of guidance or policies provided by Gatehouse Awards

- Claiming invalid qualification results or certificates
- Making claims for certification before the required procedure for assessment and quality assurance has been carried out
- Breach of examination security, e.g.
  - Centres tampering with, or attempting to tamper with, examination material packs or handling them in any way that is not in accordance with the instructions given by Gatehouse Awards
  - Candidates allowed sight of any live version of examination materials prior to an examination
  - Candidates are coached in answers specific to the questions on any live version of examination materials
  - Candidates are allowed to leave the Centre with examination materials
- Centre has exceeded the acceptable 'risk' score based on maladministration issues logged against them\*

#### 4.2 Maladministration:

- Failure to make available or submit assessment materials correctly and in a timely manner
- Recordings (where applicable) have not been produced or stored correctly, leading to digital files becoming corrupt or irretrievable
- Failure to request a Reasonable Adjustment for a Candidate with a clear and verifiable need for one [prior](#) to an examination being delivered
- Failure to inform Gatehouse Awards of a change in relevant staff
- Failure to have relevant equipment available for the purpose of assessment
- Use of unapproved members of staff (where applicable), or delivery staff not meeting the requirements for assessment and quality assurance staff as outlined in the relevant Qualification Specification
- Use of unapproved examination venue
- Use of unapproved Satellite Centre sites

\*Each maladministration issue raised is logged and the overall number of instances per centre monitored on monthly basis. If a significant number of maladministration cases are reported in any given period this might be escalated to potential malpractice.

## 5. Reporting Cases of Malpractice and Maladministration

Centres must report any cases of suspected malpractice or maladministration to Gatehouse Awards immediately using the *Centre Malpractice/ Maladministration Report Form*, (Appendix 2). Receipt of this form will be acknowledged, in writing, within 2 working days by the Quality Assurance Manager. The failure of any Centre to cooperate could lead to awards not being made and / or future entries/registrations not being accepted. In such cases all efforts will be made by Gatehouse Awards to reduce or eliminate any adverse effects suffered by Candidates, however, the integrity of the qualification is of paramount importance and must be considered first and foremost in all cases.

All alleged cases will be investigated rigorously by an appropriate person(s) who has no personal interest in the outcome. Gatehouse Awards will inform the Regulator of all cases of suspected malpractice and maladministration which may have an adverse effect on Candidates. Where appropriate, Gatehouse Awards will also inform all other relevant Awarding Organisations offering similar qualifications, other Approved Centres, affected Candidates, and other relevant third parties, such as Government departments.

During examinations, Candidates are required to conduct themselves in accordance with the examination rules, which are contained in the Instructions to Candidates provided by Gatehouse Awards. The Invigilator may ask a Candidate to leave the examination room at any time if malpractice is suspected and will take any necessary action to prevent further malpractice, without disadvantaging other Candidates that are taking the examination. Any such action, and the reason for it, must be recorded in the *Examination Report Form*, which is returned to Gatehouse Awards with the examination materials.

All Gatehouse Awards staff involved in the assessment delivery and marking / moderation are required to identify any evidence of potential malpractice and to report these to the Quality Assurance Manager.

As part of its risk management strategy, Gatehouse Awards keeps under review all activities relating to the development, delivery and award of qualifications in order to identify where the potential for malpractice and maladministration is most likely to occur and will take appropriate action to prevent issues arising.

## 6. Investigation Procedure

Gatehouse Awards operates a two-stage procedure when investigating and processing cases of suspected or reported malpractice and/or maladministration.

If the allegations against a Gatehouse Awards Centre are affirmed, a relevant sanction might be applied in line with Gatehouse Awards Sanctions Policy.

In cases where the security of examination papers has been compromised or breached, the following issues will be investigated as part of the decision into the severity of the breach:

- Was the breach at a Centre level only? – i.e. Centre staff or Invigilators/Interlocutors failed to ensure that the papers were not disclosed to one or more cohorts of Candidates prior to the examination being undertaken.
- Was the breach at a regional level? – i.e. the papers have been mislaid in the local area but recovered prior to these being distributed more widely and there is evidence to support that this is the case.
- Was the breach at a national or international level? – i.e. the papers have been mislaid and not recovered or it cannot be confirmed prior to them being recovered that they have not been distributed more widely. There may also be evidence to show they have been reproduced on the internet or other national or international publications.

In cases involving breaches of the security of examination papers, in addition to the sanctions against the Centre detailed in Section 7, Gatehouse Awards will also instigate one or more of the following measures to protect the integrity of the examination:

- Withdrawal of that set of questions from the question bank for that qualification on a temporary (minimum of 24 months) basis, either for a specific region or nationally/internationally
- Withdrawal of the affected set of questions from the question bank for that qualification on a permanent basis for a specific region or nationally/internationally
- Arranging for Candidates who may have been affected by the breach to re-sit the examination with an alternative question set

If suspicions about malpractice carried out by a Candidate are affirmed, the following actions could be taken at the discretion of Gatehouse Awards:

- i. The qualification will not be awarded or, if already issued, will be cancelled.
- ii. The Candidate will not be permitted to register for any future qualifications or units.

In addition, where a Candidate has been found guilty of malpractice, the Centre may also face sanctions due to being complicit in the malpractice or in being negligent in their safeguarding practices to prevent such malpractice from taking place, other than where a Centre has raised an issue, reported in a timely manner and has taken appropriate steps to mitigate any Adverse Effect.

The following sections outline the specific procedure to be followed by Gatehouse Awards when investigating any and all assertions of malpractice, either by a Candidate, Centre or one of its own members of staff or associates.

## **6.1. Stage One**

### **6.1.1. Suspected Candidate Malpractice**

When a report asserting malpractice on the part of a Candidate undertaking a Gatehouse Awards qualification has been received, the Quality Assurance Manager will:

- Acknowledge receipt of the *Malpractice/ Maladministration Report Form* within 2 working days
- Suspend certification for the Candidate concerned pending the outcome of the investigation.
- Make a record of the nature and details of the assertion in the '*Malpractice/Maladministration Database*'
- Where appropriate, investigate the allegation jointly with the Head of Centre
- Report the findings and outcome of the investigation back to the Centre within 20 working days of either the initial report being filed or, where appropriate, details have been received from the Centre necessary to conduct the investigation (such as Candidate contact details), whichever is the later.

### **6.1.2. Suspected Centre Malpractice**

Upon receipt of a report asserting malpractice on the part of a Gatehouse Awards Approved Centre, the Quality Assurance Manager will:

- Acknowledge receipt of the suspected malpractice notification within 2 working days
- Make a record of the nature and details of the assertion in the '*Malpractice/Maladministration Database*'
- Instigate a full investigation into any assertions made
- Inform the Head of Centre in writing, within 10 working days, that an investigation has been launched into conduct at their institution
- Ensure that the integrity of the qualification is maintained during the investigation. This may include a suspension of certification for the Centre concerned for the duration of the investigation
- If there is evidence that results or certificates may be invalid, all certification for that Centre will be suspended immediately
- If necessary, Gatehouse Awards may seek the co-operation of appropriate third parties in taking action
- Issue a full report of Gatehouse Awards' findings to the Head of Centre within 20 working days of either the initial report being filed or, where appropriate, details have been received from the Centre necessary to conduct the investigation (such as Candidate contact details), whichever is the later. If the assertions concerning malpractice are found to be warranted, this report may include an appropriate level of sanction detailed in Section 7 and an Action Plan to be followed in order to

prevent further sanctions. If further investigations are required, then Gatehouse Awards will endeavour to ensure that the Centre is informed of the delay and the reason for that prior to the end of the 20 working days period.

## 6.2. Stage Two

Non-compliance with the report and subsequent directions given at the end of Stage One will result in Stage Two being initiated by the Quality Assurance Manager. The process to be carried out during Stage Two is as follows:

- After the time period for compliance with directives of the Stage One Report & Action Plan has expired, the Quality Assurance Manager will inform the Head of Centre, in writing, of their continued non-compliance and any further sanctions to be imposed as a result.
- Further assessments delivered at the Centre, if not suspended as part of a sanction, will be more frequently scrutinised in order to further ensure that the quality of the assessments is not compromised as a result of the actions of the Centre concerned.
- An External Quality Assurer may be despatched to conduct a Centre Visit, if applicable, it will coincide with examinations being delivered by the Centre concerned. A *'Malpractice Investigation Report Form'* will be completed and accompany all documentation generated at Stage One and Stage Two as part of a body of evidence.
- Temporary suspension of specific members of staff, Interlocutors or Invigilators who have contact with or deliver Gatehouse Awards examinations may occur for the duration of the on-going investigation.

## 7. Types of Sanction

The type of action taken will depend on the impact and risks associated with the problem. For example, Gatehouse Awards will consider:

- The impact on Candidates and on public confidence in regulated qualifications
- Whether the breach applies to just one qualification or if it affects a range of qualifications
- Whether the Centre itself has identified the problem and has taken steps to address it
- Whether there is a history of non-compliance
- The level of adverse effect the incident may have on the Candidate, the integrity of the qualification, public confidence in Gatehouse Awards qualifications or the industry as a whole, the reputation of Gatehouse Awards with the public and/or relevant Regulators and stakeholders.

Example issues and the resulting sanctions for non-compliance are listed in the attached Appendix 1. Please note this list is not exhaustive. Other cases of malpractice or maladministration may have a potential impact on other organisations or individuals, including other Awarding Organisations or other Candidates. In these circumstances, Gatehouse Awards will take all necessary steps to inform these organisations and individuals about the incident, any potential impact it could have on them and the corrective action that is to be taken.

## 8. Reporting Outcomes

A copy of the completed report, or a summary of its content (as appropriate), will be sent to all parties concerned. All Level 4 and 5 sanctions will be reported to the Regulator, other relevant Awarding Organisations and appropriate third parties by the Quality Assurance Manager. In addition, where an event has taken place which suggests deliberate malpractice leading to an adverse effect by a person or persons involved in the delivery of an examination, leading to a Level 3 sanction, it may be deemed appropriate to make a similar notification. Such notifications are required by the Conditions of Recognition under which Gatehouse Awards is recognised as an Awarding Organisation and therefore are not optional.

In all reportable cases an initial report will be sent to the Regulator, relevant Awarding Organisations and other appropriate third parties outlining the suspicion that has been raised. At the end of any investigation a follow up report will be issued detailing the final outcome, whether the initial suspicion was upheld or not and what final sanction (if any) has been applied. **Please note that if Gatehouse Awards are requested by any of the parties to disclose further details of the case Gatehouse Awards must do so under the Conditions of Recognition.**

Where appropriate, Gatehouse Awards may issue a report to other Approved Centres regarding the incident. In most cases this report would not name the Centre under sanction but the details of the findings used as information or training provided to Centres. Centres or individuals will only be named where either this information is already in the public domain (i.e. has been reported via other avenues such as the press or media) or to protect other Approved Centres from an individual or individuals who might seek to claim to be approved by Gatehouse Awards.

## 9. Appeals Process

Anyone wishing to lodge an appeal against a Gatehouse Awards decision should follow the procedures in the *Appeals Policy and Procedures*

Organisations and individuals may appeal against any decision taken by Gatehouse Awards as a result of a malpractice or maladministration investigation. Appeals may be on the grounds of bias, disregard of published policy and procedures, failure to consider relevant additional information provided, or administrative irregularity.

An appeal must be made in writing to the Quality Assurance Manager no later than 10 working days after the outcome of the investigation is communicated by Gatehouse Awards. The appeal should include:

- The name, address and contact details of the individual or organisation submitting the appeal; and
- The reasons for the appeal.

Gatehouse Awards will process all appeals in line with its *Appeals Policy and Procedures*.

## 10. Monitoring, Evaluating and Reporting

Records will be kept of all cases of malpractice and maladministration identified by Gatehouse Awards. Information regarding the number and nature of cases, together with their outcomes, will be included in the review as part of preparing the Annual Statement of Compliance for submission to the Regulator.

This policy is monitored as follows:

- A record of all reported incidents of malpractice and maladministration, whether proven or not, is kept by Gatehouse Awards



- Stored data is regularly reviewed to identify emerging themes, assess risk and determine actions for mitigation
- Operation of the policy is reported to the Quality Committee
- Reports are made to the Governing Body as part of the Self-Assessment procedure, and
- Guidance from the regulators is reviewed and the policy is updated to comply with best practice

## 11. Fees for Malpractice/Maladministration Investigations\*

Centres may be charged for the cost of any malpractice or maladministration investigations undertaken by Gatehouse Awards. The following list gives the standard fees which may be applied, however, this is not exhaustive and other charges may also be applied depending on the complexity and severity of the case. These fees can also be applied to Centres who have had their approval revoked entirely due to malpractice and will be subject to the same invoicing policy, including debt recovery actions.

Item	Fee
Initial desk-based investigation	£nil
Initial visit to Centre for investigative purpose	£350 (not applied if allegation is not upheld)
Retesting by Gatehouse Awards	£25 per hour, per staff member, plus expenses (e.g. travel, hotel, etc.). <b>Minimum charge £50</b>
Further visits required by Action Plan and/or implementation of Sanctions	£350 per visit

\*Please note, the fees listed above relate to UK-based Centres. Fees for International Centres are available upon request.

Non-compliance issue	Sanction	Rationale	Sanction lifted when:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. a) Centre’s policies, procedures and assessment practices, and responsibilities of personnel are not clear or well understood by centre’s assessment, quality assurance and compliance team b) use of staff who do not meet the minimum requirements as stipulated by Gatehouse Awards (where applicable)</li> <li>2. Changes to key personnel, including Directors not communicated to GA</li> </ol>	<p><b>Level 1-</b> Entry in action plan</p>	<p>Non-compliance with Centre Approval but no threat to the integrity of assessment decisions.</p>	<p>Gatehouse Awards is satisfied that the Centre has taken all the necessary steps to resolve the issues and prevent recurrence</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Centre fails to keep accurate or complete records to allow a full audit to be carried out by Gatehouse Awards External Quality Assurance</li> <li>2. Previously agreed corrective measures relating to Level 1 have not been implemented</li> <li>3. Centre persistently fails to respond to communications from Gatehouse Awards or its representatives in a timely manner</li> <li>4. Allegation of malpractice in which the Centre’s complicity may or may not be confirmed</li> <li>5. Allegation of malpractice resulting from the Centre’s negligence</li> <li>6. The Centre fails to pay invoices as they fall due</li> </ol>	<p><b>Level 2 –</b> Entry in action plan, and, if appropriate, more frequent moderation of qualification submissions and withholding of certification until issue resolved <b>Centre is not allowed to expand (i.e. open Satellites, etc.) while Sanction is in place</b></p>	<p>a) Close scrutiny of the Centre’s processes and procedures, plus their understanding of their responsibilities is required</p>	<p>Gatehouse Awards is satisfied that the Centre has taken all the necessary steps to resolve the issues and prevent recurrence</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Discrepancies in the records or recordings submitted for marking indicating Candidates have been advantaged or disadvantaged in some way</li> <li>2. Centre fails to provide access to requested records, information, Candidates and staff in a timely manner</li> <li>3. Allegation of malpractice in which the Centre’s complicity has been, or is likely to be confirmed</li> <li>4. Qualification submissions show serious anomalies</li> <li>5. Previously agreed corrective measures relating to Level 2 non-compliance are not implemented</li> <li>6. Security of examination papers has been compromised or breached but restricted to Centre level</li> <li>7. Failure to effectively quality assure satellite locations</li> </ol>	<p><b>Level 3 –</b> As for Level 2 above, plus suspension of staff and/or suspension of the Centre’s ability to deliver assessments until Gatehouse Awards are satisfied that standards are at approved levels (if visits are required they might be done at additional costs to the Centre). Possible notification of issues to other Awarding Organisations and/or Ofqual (or other relevant third parties)</p>	<p>a) There is a threat to Candidates b) The integrity of the assessment practices is compromised</p>	<p>Gatehouse Awards is satisfied that the Centre has taken all the necessary steps to resolve the issues and prevent recurrence. In addition, any Candidates affected by the actions of the Centre have been contacted and, where necessary, re-assessed at the expense of the Centre.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significant faults in the management and compliance for a qualification</li> <li>2. Serious allegations of malpractice have</li> </ol>	<p><b>Level 4 –</b> As for Level 3 above, plus withdrawal of</p>	<p>Significant breakdown in management</p>	<p>As for Level 3, plus additional assurances have</p>

Non-compliance issue	Sanction	Rationale	Sanction lifted when:
<p>been raised in which the evidence shows that, on the balance of probability, the Centre has been complicit, affecting the integrity of the assessment and posing a risk to the reputation of Gatehouse Awards, as well as an adverse effect on the candidate</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Previously agreed corrective measures relating to Level 3 non-compliance have not been implemented</li> <li>4. Security of examination papers has been compromised or breached on a regional, national or international level</li> <li>5. An individual at the Centre attempts to influence the actions of the Examination Observers or External Quality Assurers in order to influence the outcome of the result.</li> </ol>	<p>approval to Centre for specific qualification</p>	<p>and compliance of specific qualifications</p>	<p>been received from the management of the Centre as to how they intend to remain compliant in future.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Significant faults in the management and compliance of some or all Gatehouse Awards qualifications</li> <li>2. Previously agreed corrective measures relating to Level 4 non-compliance are not implemented</li> <li>3. Security of examination papers has been breached on a national or international level and evidence shows that the Centre was complicit in this breach</li> <li>4. Centre refuses to cooperate with a Gatehouse Awards investigation, including (but not limited to):                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refusing access to premises to Examination Observers or External Quality Assurers (whether announced or unannounced)</li> <li>• Refusing access to candidate or relevant staff files during an investigation</li> <li>• Refusing to provide candidate contact details</li> <li>• Deliberately putting obstacles in the way of the investigation or divert the focus of the investigation in an effort to conceal evidence of malpractice</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. The Centre attempts to influence the outcome of the result is either endemic and / or supported by senior management.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Level 5 – Permanent withdrawal of Centre Approval for all Gatehouse Awards qualifications including informing other relevant Awarding Organisations, Ofqual and any other affected third parties as required</b></p>	<p>In the opinion of Gatehouse Awards, management and/or compliance at the Centre has broken down irretrievably, or the reputation of the Centre in a wider context has been damaged irretrievably leading to an unacceptable risk for Gatehouse Awards</p>	<p>Not Applicable. If a Centre has reached a Level 5 Sanction, this cannot be lifted.</p>

Please complete this form using **BLOCK CAPITALS**

This form is to be used to record any incidents of actual or potential malpractice or maladministration found by a Centre. The completed form must be forwarded to the Quality Assurance Manager at Gatehouse Awards within 2 working days of the incident or discovery of the incident.

**1. Centre Details**

Centre Name		Centre Number	GA/
Contact Name		Role	
Centre Address			
Telephone No		Postcode	
Email			

**2. Details of Course**

Qualification(s)			
Name of Assessor			
Name of IQA			
Size of Cohort		Was whole cohort affected?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
Start Date		Assessment Date	

**3. Details of Candidate(s) Affected**

Candidate Names & ULN (if applicable)	1.	
	2.	
	3.	
	4.	
	5.	
	6.	
	7.	
	8.	
	9.	
	10.	
	11.	
	12.	
	13.	
	14.	
	15.	

#### 4. Incident and Investigations

Date of incident report:		Reported by:	
How was the issue found? (give details):			
Details of incident found:			
Details of any investigations undertaken by the Centre so far:			
Is there evidence of these investigations?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	
If yes, please give brief details of evidence here or attach to this form:			

#### 5. Candidate Contact Details

If the issue is one of suspected malpractice by a Candidate, please provide details of the candidate(s) below:			
Name:			
Address:			
Telephone:		Mobile Phone:	
Email:			

If more than one Candidate is implicated, please attach a table including all details to this form.

**6. Declaration**

I hereby confirm that the above information is correct and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief. I further confirm that I will make available all documentary and other evidence to Gatehouse Awards on request, whether notice is given or not, and will co-operate with any necessary investigations into this or any other issue. I understand that this may include an inspection visit by an External Quality Assurer appointed by Gatehouse Awards and that this inspection visit may take place with little or no notice and may be chargeable to my Centre.

Signature:			
Print Name:		Date:	
Position:			