

Glasgow Kelvin College

Academic Board - 06 February 2026

Academic Malpractice Policy

Report by Head of Enhancement & Assurance

1. Introduction

The College Malpractice Policy is due for approval and renewal by February 2026.

The policy has been through a process of consultation with the Vice Principal for Curriculum, and the Senior Curriculum Managers' Quality Forum. Whereas the bulk of the document was considered as still fit for purpose, two changes were agreed:

- The addition of illegitimate use of A.I.-generated material in assessment submissions as a specific example of candidate malpractice.
- The title of the policy and the header of the Centre Malpractice section to 'Malpractice & Maladministration'.

The revised policy document is presented in full in Appendix A, with amendments identified in red text.

2. Rationale, Process & Recommendations

Recommendations from Senior Curriculum Managers' Quality Forum

During review of the policy by the Senior Curriculum Managers' Quality Forum, there was discussion around whether non-exhaustive exemplification remains the best way to define malpractice. It was agreed that this is the best approach, and leaves space for other examples of malpractice not yet anticipated to be subject to the policy.

Further discussion occurred around whether malpractice and maladministration should be more clearly separated, perhaps in separate policies, to ensure the visibility of information around maladministration, in particular centre malpractice. However, it was agreed that they should remain in the same policy, with minor changes to the policy document to add clarity and visibility. These amendments being changing the title of the policy to '**Malpractice & Maladministration Policy**', and the heading of the Centre Malpractice section to '**Centre Malpractice & Maladministration**'. It was felt that the information around both malpractice and maladministration was adequately clear, subject to these changes.

It is felt that candidate misuse of Generative A.I. should be more explicitly addressed in the policy, to reflect the sharp increase in A.I.-related candidate misconduct during the intervening period. The illegitimate use of Generative A.I. was therefore added to the list of examples of candidate malpractice in the policy document.

During that period, the College has created guidelines for staff and learners around the use of A.I, and this amendment to policy should further clarify how related misconduct should be addressed. The policy is compliant with current A.I guidance provided by Qualifications Scotland (formerly SQA) and the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) and should be used in conjunction with that guidance. Information on these guidelines follows.

Qualifications Scotland Guidance on the Use of AI in Assessments

Current Qualifications Scotland guidance on A.I use is outlined on their [website](#), and in Appendix B: Qualifications Scotland Position Statement on AI. The position can be summarised as follows:

Learners may use GenAI tools in the following situations:

- When this does not undermine learners' ability to demonstrate that they have the required knowledge, understanding and skills to meet the assessment standards of the qualification
- When the course or unit specifications explicitly allow such use

The Qualifications Scotland website also includes a rationale for their position, as well as guidance for centre staff when authenticating students' work.

JCQ Guidance on the Use of AI in Assessments

JCQ has updated its previous guidance on rules for AI use with the document [Your Role in Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications](#), including specific reference to AI use. This document is also available in Appendix C: JCQ Guidance on AI. Key examples of misuse are identified as:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies

3. Resource Implications

There is no significant impact on resources arising from this report.

4. Impact on Students

The guidance from the awarding bodies will provide clarification to staff and students regarding the use of AI in assessments. This guidance will be communicated to students in advance of, and across the academic year.

5. Risk and Assurance

Amending our malpractice policy to further reference Artificial Intelligence reduces risks of plagiarism occurring in the assessment process.

6. Equality

There are no equality matters arising from this report.

7. Data Protection

There are no data protection matters arising from this report.

8. Environmental and Sustainability

There are no environmental and sustainability issues arising from this report

9. Recommendations

Members are recommended to note the contents of this report and its appendices.

10. Further Information

- Appendix A: Revised College Malpractice & Maladministration Policy (Feb 2026)
- Appendix B: Qualifications Scotland Position Statement on AI
- Appendix C: JCQ Guidance on AI Use