



SOLAS

Approved Training Organisation

**CSCS and QSCS Procedures for Managing
Assessment System Malpractice**



Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	4
1.1	Purpose	4
1.2	Scope.....	4
2.0	What Constitutes Assessment System Malpractice?.....	5
2.1	Definition of an Assessment System Irregularity.....	5
2.2	Definition of an Assessment System Malpractice.....	5
2.3	Candidate Malpractice	5
2.4	Personnel Malpractice	6
3.0	Notification and Reporting of Alleged Assessment System Malpractices	7
3.1	Initial Notification	7
3.2	Approved Training Organisation	7
4.0	Conducting an Investigation	7
4.1	Communication with Party/Parties to be investigated.....	7
4.2	Appointment of Investigator(s).....	8
4.3	Conflict of Interest	8
4.4	Natural Justice.....	8
4.5	Establishing the Facts within the Investigation.....	9
4.6	Confidentiality.....	9
4.7	The Investigation Report.....	10
4.8	Report Findings Adjudication.....	10
5.0	Communicating the Findings	10
5.1	Unsubstantiated Assessment System Malpractice	11
5.2	Substantiated Assessment System Malpractice	11
5.3	Communicating the Findings to other persons.....	11
6.0	Appealing an Assessment System Malpractice Finding.....	11
6.1	Basis of an Appeal of an Assessment System Malpractice Finding	11
6.2	Appealing the Findings.....	12
6.3	Appeal Application Approval	12
6.4	Appeal of Findings Process	12
6.5	Adjudicating on an Appeal of the Findings Decision Outcome.....	12

6.6	Communicating the Findings Appeal Decision Outcome.....	12
7.0	Sanctions for Assessment System Malpractice.....	13
7.1	Communicating the Sanctions (Candidate Only)	13
7.2	Implementation of Sanctions (Candidate Only).....	13
8.0	Appeal of a Sanction Imposed for an Assessment System Malpractice	13
8.1	Basis for an Appeal of the Sanction (Candidate Only)	14
8.2	Making an Appeal of the Sanction (Candidate Only).....	14
8.3	Appeal Application Approval (Candidate Only)	14
8.4	Appeal of Sanction Process (Candidate Only).....	14
8.5	Adjudicating on the Appeal Decision Outcome (Candidate Only).....	14
8.6	Communicating the Sanction Appeal Decision Outcome (Candidate Only).....	15
9.0	Assessment Results and Certification Issues	15
10.0	Corrective/Preventative Action and Follow-Up.....	15
10.1	Corrective Actions: Candidate Redress.....	15
10.2	Corrective / Preventative Actions for Improving Assessment Processes or Conduct	16
10.3	Communication of Corrective Actions	16
10.4	Updating the CSQAS Topic Log	16
	Appendix 1: Glossary of Terms	17

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

A SOLAS approved training organisation, the Approved Training Organisation, is committed to ensuring CSCS and QSCS assessment integrity is maintained throughout the assessment process. The SOLAS CSCS and QSCS Assessment Governance and Processes document set out the arrangements for protecting the integrity of its assessment process and the subsequent validity and currency of the candidates' results. Where the contents of this document differ from the regulations of the Awarding Body, regulations of the Awarding Body take precedence.

SOLAS recognises however, that on occasion, the integrity of the assessment process may be breached and consequently place high importance on how such occasions are addressed and managed. In particular, it is the view of the organisation that there must be a strong emphasis on the development and application of procedures that ensure that any assessment malpractices are addressed promptly and appropriately.

It is important that these are applied consistently to maximize opportunity for resolution. Lastly, it is also important to ensure communication of these instances to stakeholders so that lessons can be learned and the process of continuous improvement and quality enhancement can be facilitated.

To this end, SOLAS Construction Services has developed and produced these procedures, which will apply to all assessment arising from training organised or procured by SOLAS.

1.2 Scope

This document provides information on:

- a) The definition of assessment system malpractices
- b) Roles and responsibilities
- c) Notification and reporting of assessment system malpractice
- d) Conducting an investigation
- e) Reporting requirements
- f) Outcomes of an investigation
- g) Sanctions
- h) Appeals

This document is intended for use by all Approved Training Organisation personnel involved in the management, coordination or invigilation of assessment of CSCS and QSCS programmes.

2.0 What Constitutes Assessment System Malpractice?

2.1 Definition of an Assessment System Irregularity

Assessment system irregularities are typically accidental omissions or mistakes which are detected by mechanisms within the assessment system, are corrected, and which do not impact on the validity of the assessment. These could include test administration errors, missing assessment data, transcription errors, etc., which are detected and rectified. All instances of irregularities should be documented and addressed in line with the Construction Services Quality Assurance System (CSQAS).

It is important to distinguish between irregularities and malpractices. The decision on whether an issue is deemed to be an assessment system irregularity or alleged malpractice will relate to the intent, scale or fraudulent nature of the incident by the offender. An issue that may initially be adjudged to be an assessment system irregularity could after preliminary investigation be determined to be an alleged malpractice issue. Where such an issue is deemed to be an alleged malpractice, the procedures outlined in this document must be utilised.

2.2 Definition of an Assessment System Malpractice

An assessment system malpractice is any act or practice which brings into question the validity or integrity of the assessment process and normally arises due to one or more non-accidental factors. There are two categories of malpractice:

- a) Candidate Malpractice: malpractice committed by a candidate during the course of the assessment process.
- b) Personnel¹ Malpractice: malpractice committed by personnel involved in the assessment process.

2.3 Candidate Malpractice

In instances where candidates are responsible for assessment system malpractices, Approved Training Organisation assessment personnel should refer to the SOLAS CSCS and QSCS Assessment Governance and Processes document for more information. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates²:

- a) Plagiarism by copying or passing off work as one's own
- b) Unauthorised removal of assessment material from the assessment location
- c) Use of electronic communication devices (where prohibited) or other unauthorised materials during the assessment
- d) Assisting other candidates during the assessment
- e) Collusion by working collaboratively with other candidates, beyond what is allowed
- f) Copying from another candidate
- g) Fabrication of results and/or evidence
- h) Behaving in such a way as to undermine the integrity of the assessment event

¹ Personnel in this context includes: Second Provider (Grantee) Personnel

² The examples provided do not constitute an exhaustive list.

- i) Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment
- j) Engaging in unsafe and or unhealthy practices

In the majority of cases, instances of suspected malpractice that arise during an assessment event will be dealt with promptly by the Trainer/Assessor and in accordance with the SOLAS CSCS and QSCS Assessment Governance and Processes. These instances must be recorded by the Approved Training Organisation in the Assessment Report³ in accordance with the CSQAS.

The Approved Training Organisation will review the information available on conclusion of the assessment event and decide if the instance of suspected malpractice warrants further investigation. Where the instance warrants further investigation, the procedures outlined in this document must be followed. In addition, due regard must also be given to candidates by ensuring that the communication and appeals sections of this document are adhered to. All instances of irregularities must be recorded.

2.4 Personnel Malpractice

Malpractice can be committed by personnel relating to the assessment process. The following are examples⁴ of malpractice by personnel:

Serious negligence which results in failure to apply defined assessment processes, for example:

- a) negligence by any persons involved in the assessment process which causes (or is capable of causing) unacceptable loss, damage or injury
- b) failure to follow proper/required procedure and/or

The conduct of assessment with disregard for prescribed requirements, for example:

- a) non-adherence to health and safety requirements, defined assessment procedures or rules, or not using defined equipment or tools
- b) use of unapproved personnel to conduct or assess an assessment
- c) loss of required candidate assessment evidence, and/or

A deliberate action that compromises the validity of the assessment process, for example:

- a) proven fraudulent activity in relation to the assessment process and/or the issuing of certificates
- b) manipulation of assessment data
- c) deliberate falsification of documentation including assessment results or requests for certificates
- d) providing candidates/other unauthorised personnel with access to a controlled assessment instrument or other information relating to the content in advance of an assessment event
- e) amendment to assessment papers outside the agreed protocol

³ TCC-6a-F04 - Assessment Supervisor & Assessor Report

⁴ The examples provided do not constitute an exhaustive list

3.0 Notification and Reporting of Alleged Assessment System Malpractices

3.1 Initial Notification

Any person involved in the assessment process has a responsibility for ensuring the integrity and validity of the SOLAS CSCS and QSCS assessment system. Alleged malpractices may be identified by a variety of sources⁵. Where an alleged malpractice is identified, it must be notified to the relevant personnel within the Approved Training Organisation. Notification may be either verbal and/or in writing.

3.2 Approved Training Organisation

If notified of an alleged malpractice, Approved Training Organisation staff shall:

- a) Inform the appropriate authorised officer⁶, of the alleged malpractice and to suspend the issuing of results associated with the alleged malpractice.
- b) Initiate the Alleged Assessment System Malpractice Report – please reference the *SOLAS Reporting Forms for an Alleged Malpractice of the Assessment System Booklet*
- c) Record locally the alleged malpractice incident
- d) Inform SOLAS Construction Services of the alleged malpractice investigation
- e) Facilitate and/manage the investigation into the alleged malpractice in a timely manner
- f) Informs the SOLAS approved Quality Assurance Provider of the outcome of locally managed malpractice investigations

4.0 Conducting an Investigation

All notified alleged assessment system malpractices must be investigated by the Approved Training Organisation. **Note:** Investigations of alleged malpractice by Approved Training Organisation staff will be undertaken in accordance with the appropriate Approved Training Organisation's HR Policies. However, the Approved Training Organisation will conduct an investigation and will notify the SOLAS Construction Services Manager of the outcome of the investigation and any sanctions imposed. The Approved Training Organisation will also advise the SOLAS approved Quality Assurance Provider on the outcome of the investigation.

4.1 Communication with Party/Parties to be investigated

The Approved Training Organisation shall be responsible for communicating in writing to the party to be investigated, in relation to the alleged assessment system malpractice(s)⁷. The initial communication shall:

- a) Provide notification of receipt of alleged assessment system malpractice
- b) Advise the individual that the SOLAS CSCS and CSCS procedures for managing assessment system malpractices outlines the conduct of the investigation

⁵ Typically these might be: Trainers, Internal Verifiers, Assessors, Invigilators, Candidates, other Approved Training Organisation personnel, other stakeholders

⁶ Detailed descriptions of this and other roles in the assessment system can be found in Introduction Section of the SOLAS CSCS and QSCS Assessment Governance and Processes.

⁷ Communicate to Approved Training Organisation staff that the alleged assessment system malpractice will be conducted in accordance with HR Policies.

- c) Emphasise that the investigation will be carried out in a discreet and confidential manner
- d) Avoid implying or suggesting that conclusions have already been determined or that decisions have been made in respect of the application of corrective actions

4.2 Appointment of Investigator(s)

The Approved Training Organisation will decide who will undertake the investigation⁸.

4.3 Conflict of Interest

Conflict of interest is a situation that has the potential to undermine the impartiality of a person because of the possibility of a clash between the person's self-interest and professional interest which may appear to influence the outcome of an investigation. Possible conflict of interest situations may arise where personnel:

- a) Were engaged in any aspect of the assessment process (including quality assurance functions⁹)
- b) Have a personal relationship or family relationship with the party being investigated
- c) Have a professional relationship with the party being investigated, that may be perceived to unfairly influence the investigation process

Any person who has a possible conflict of interest shall not be involved in any investigation or subsequent making of judgments. The person(s) alleging that a malpractice has occurred is also prohibited from subsequent involvement in handling the alleged malpractice, once the initial facts have been investigated. The relevant Approved Training Organisation personnel shall be responsible for ensuring that a conflict of interest does not arise and that all members of an investigation panel sign a declaration to that effect – *please reference the SOLAS Reporting Forms for an Alleged Malpractice of the Assessment System Booklet*. In cases where real or apparent conflict of interest is identified, alternative arrangements must be put in place.

4.4 Natural Justice

Those responsible for conducting an investigation shall establish the facts and circumstances of any alleged assessment system malpractice. It should not be assumed that an allegation equates to proof of a malpractice. Any investigation into an alleged malpractice shall have due regard to the principles of natural justice. As such, it is necessary that those responsible for managing the conduct of any investigation must ensure adherence to these principles. This includes ensuring that:

- a) All investigations do not disadvantage the person against whom the allegation is made and are concluded within 40 working days from the date of the notification to the Approved Training Organisation of the alleged malpractice¹⁰

⁸ One or more persons may be assigned to complete the investigation.

⁹ Quality Assurance functions can consist of: internal verification on the conduct of assessment process, peer review, internal verification of results, external authentication, results approval, appeal process, certification auditing or monitoring etc.

¹⁰ In exceptional circumstances where there are a number of persons involved or other circumstances, the

- b) The parties in question are made aware of the allegation and are given the opportunity to respond
- c) Care is taken to avoid conflict of interest (see Section 4.3)

The party/parties against whom an allegation is made should therefore:

- a) Know what evidence exists to support that allegation
- b) Know the possible consequences should an assessment system malpractice be proven
- c) Have the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations, if required
- d) Have an opportunity to submit a written statement
- e) Have an opportunity to seek advice, as necessary, and to provide a supplementary statement, if required
- f) Be informed of the appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him or her.
- g) Be informed of the possibility that information relating to a particular malpractice may be shared with other relevant parties

4.5 Establishing the Facts within the Investigation

The Approved Training Organisation's investigating party should endeavour to obtain all the relevant facts about the alleged assessment system malpractice. This may be done through some or all of the steps outlined below:

- a) Review of allegation details
- b) Interview with the party being investigated
- c) Interview with personnel and/or management connected to the course, project or alleged malpractice
- d) Interview with candidates connected to the course, project or alleged malpractice
- e) Interview with the other relevant parties
- f) Written statement(s) from the party being investigated
- g) Written statement(s) from the candidate connected to the alleged malpractice
- h) Written statement(s) from personnel connected to the alleged malpractice
- i) Written statement(s) from other relevant parties
- j) Review of related assessment reports, for example, Assessment Report, Assessor's Report, Internal Verification Report, External Authentication Report and Monitoring reports
- k) Other related records

4.6 Confidentiality

Confidentiality is key element when conducting an investigation into an alleged malpractice, due to the risk of reputational damage to parties involved. In order to ensure confidentiality is maintained before, during and after an investigation, the following conditions should apply:

investigation may take longer. In such situations the parties must be advised in writing of expected date for conclusion of the process.

- a) Material relating to any allegations, findings or conclusions must not be made known to any parties, either internally or external to the Approved Training Organisation, beyond those key to the investigation
- b) It is not necessary to inform all parties being interviewed of the details of meetings with other parties unless there is a specific relevant matter to be raised
- c) The name or other details of the party making the malpractice allegation are not to be divulged to the party/parties to be investigated without consent
- d) All material relating to the investigation must be held and stored in a secure manner. Material relating to a given investigation should be stored together on a single file. Each file should have a unique code to identify the investigation. Copies of electronic material should also be held with this file

4.7 The Investigation Report

Typically, the report that results from the investigation of an assessment system malpractice shall contain the following:

- a) Number of candidates affected and/or implicated
- b) Approved Training Organisation personnel involved
- c) Clarify how the alleged malpractice was identified
- d) Explain the notification process used to inform the Approved Training Organisation
- e) The nature of the malpractice and the specific assessment procedure(s) or assessment governance requirement(s) that were allegedly been breached
- f) The details of the scope of the alleged malpractice investigation carried out
- g) The findings of the malpractice investigation:
- h) details of the assessment procedure or requirement that were alleged to have been breached
- i) A statement of facts, as described, by all parties
- j) Details of any mitigating factors
- k) Conclusion (whether the malpractice allegation is substantiated or unsubstantiated)

The investigating party should not adjudicate on the report findings. The report will be signed and dated by the investigating party. Any written statements, notes of interviews or other relevant documentation reviewed or obtained as part of the investigation must be filed separately and securely as part of the investigation process. The related Report Form templates are to be used.

4.8 Report Findings Adjudication

The investigation report is submitted to the Approved Training Organisation and will adjudicate on the report findings and notifies the person(s) involved in writing of the outcome of the investigation. Where the allegation is substantiated the notification will include details of the appeal process.

5.0 Communicating the Findings

The Approved Training Organisation is responsible for ensuring that the notification of the alleged assessment system malpractice investigation finding is communicated to the relevant parties within 10 days from the date of receipt of the investigator's report. The finding of an

investigation into an alleged assessment system malpractice may be:

- a) Unsubstantiated Assessment System Malpractice
- b) Substantiated Assessment System Malpractice

5.1 Unsubstantiated Assessment System Malpractice

If the assessment system malpractice is found to be unsubstantiated, the Approved Training Organisation will convey the findings of the investigation, in writing within the timeline specified, to the person(s) involved. The Approved Training Organisation will inform the Construction Services Unit Manager.

5.2 Substantiated Assessment System Malpractice

Where the allegation is substantiated, the Approved Training Organisation will convey the findings of the investigation, in writing within the timeline specified, to the person(s) involved. In addition, the notification to the person must also outline the Assessment System Malpractice Appeal process and the timeline for submitting an appeal application (Section 6.0).

5.3 Communicating the Findings to other persons

In addition, the Approved Training Organisation will convey, as appropriate, the outcome of the assessment system malpractice investigation in writing to the:

- a) SOLAS Manager Construction Services
- b) The appropriate SOLAS approved Quality Assurance Provider

6.0 Appealing an Assessment System Malpractice Finding

If the person(s), against whom the substantiated assessment system malpractice finding is made, disagrees with the finding they may initiate an appeal.

- a) Appeals by candidates in relation the Assessment System Malpractice findings will be dealt with in accordance with Section 6.1 below
- b) Appeals by Approved Training Organisation staff in relation to the findings must be undertaken in line with the Approved Training Organisation HR Policies

6.1 Basis of an Appeal of an Assessment System Malpractice Finding

Where an assessment system malpractice allegation is substantiated, the appellant may initiate an appeal of those findings. An appeal must be made, in writing, within 10 working days from the date of the notification of the findings. The grounds on which the appeal process can be activated are as follows:

- a) The alleged malpractice was not dealt with in accordance with procedures
- b) The regulations did not adequately cover the circumstances relating to the malpractice
- c) New information has become available that was not available to the investigation

6.2 Appealing the Findings

To make an appeal, the appellant must:

- a) Complete the relevant application form¹¹ setting out clearly the grounds for the appeal, including any further relevant evidence supporting the appeal
- b) Submit the completed form, within 10 working days from the date of the notification of the findings, to the Approved Training Organisation

6.3 Appeal Application Approval

The Approved Training Organisation will determine if the application meets one of the criteria listed above for activating an appeal and will inform the appellant, in writing, of the decision to proceed or not within 10 working days of receiving the written application. The reason for not granting the appeal must also be provided to the appellant.

6.4 Appeal of Findings Process

The appeals process must be concluded within 20 working days i.e. from the date the relevant Approved Training Organisation approves an appeal to proceed to the date the appellant is notified of the appeal outcome.

The Approved Training Organisation will appoint an Appeal of Findings Reviewer¹² to conduct the appeal. The Appeal of Findings Reviewer will examine the appeal application and consider any supporting evidence. The reviewer will conduct the appeal on the basis of the appeal grounds (Section 6.1). Depending on the nature of the appeal, the reviewer may consult with additional persons on a case by case basis.

The Approved Training Organisation will ensure that all relevant information, documentation, staff, project personnel and candidates are made available to the Appeal of Findings Reviewer, including, if required, arranging meetings between all relevant parties.

6.5 Adjudicating on an Appeal of the Findings Decision Outcome

The Approved Training Organisation will activate the following:

- a) Advise the Appeals of Findings Reviewer of the need to complete a report on their findings and is to issue the report to the Approved Training Organisation within 10 working days
- b) The Approved Training Organisation will adjudicate on the findings of the report.

6.6 Communicating the Findings Appeal Decision Outcome

The Approved Training Organisation will instigate the following communications:

- a) The Approved Training Organisation will inform the appellant of the appeal outcome, in writing, within 10 working days of receiving the report from the

¹¹ Appendix 4a/b: Template for Application Form for Appeal of Assessment System Malpractice Finding

¹² The Appeal of Findings Reviewer will be suitably qualified and independent of the process

Appeals of Findings Reviewer

- b) The Approved Training Organisation will inform the SOLAS Manager Construction Services and the relevant SOLAS approved Quality Assurance Provider of the appeal outcome decision

Where an appeal is upheld, the Approved Training Organisation will arrange for the Construction Services Unit Manager to be updated in line with Section 10.4 of this document.

7.0 Sanctions for Assessment System Malpractice

Depending on the findings of an investigation further steps, such as sanctions or disciplinary action, may be required. Where sanctions and/or, disciplinary action are being considered:

- a) The Approved Training Organisation will decide on the sanctions to be imposed
- b) The application and notification of sanctions against Approved Training Organisation staff will be in line with the Approved Training Organisation's HR Policies

7.1 Communicating the Sanctions (Candidate Only)

The Approved Training Organisation will instigate the following communications:

- a) If no appeal has been lodged, after 10 working days from the date of issue of notification of the Assessment System Malpractice finding, the Approved Training Organisation can proceed to notify the party, in writing, of any sanctions being imposed
- b) The notification will include, details of the Assessment System Malpractice Sanction Appeal process including the timeline for an appeal of a sanction (see Section 8.0)

7.2 Implementation of Sanctions (Candidate Only)

If no appeal has been lodged, after 10 working days from the date of issue of the notification of sanctions being imposed for an Assessment System Malpractice, the Approved Training Organisation can proceed to implement the sanctions.

8.0 Appeal of a Sanction Imposed for an Assessment System Malpractice

If the person(s) against whom the assessment system malpractice has been substantiated disagrees with the sanctions imposed, they may initiate an appeal:

- a) An appeal by a candidate in relation any sanction imposed for an assessment system malpractice must be addressed through the following procedures
- b) Appeals by Approved Training Organisation staff in relation to any sanction relating to assessment system malpractice must be undertaken in line with the Approved Training Organisation's HR Policies.

8.1 Basis for an Appeal of the Sanction (Candidate Only)

An appeal must be made, in writing, within 10 working days from the date of the notification of the sanction. The grounds on which the appeal process can be activated are that:

- a) The sanction is excessively punitive in relation to the incident
- b) The alleged sanction was not in accordance with policy

8.2 Making an Appeal of the Sanction (Candidate Only)

To make an appeal, the appellant must:

- a) Complete the appeal application form setting out as clearly as possible the grounds for the appeal, including any further relevant evidence supporting the appeal
- b) Submit the completed form, within 10 working days from the date of the notification of the sanction, to the Approved Training Organisation

8.3 Appeal Application Approval (Candidate Only)

The Approved Training Organisation will determine if the application meets one of the criteria for activating appeal listed above and will inform the appellant, in writing, of the decision within 10 working days of receiving the written application. The Approved Training Organisation will notify the appellant in writing of the decision:

- a) To proceed with the appeal application, or
- b) Not to proceed with the appeal application. The reason for not granting the appeal must also be provided in the correspondence to the appellant

8.4 Appeal of Sanction Process (Candidate Only)

The Approved Training Organisation will instigate the following sanction process:

- a) An appeal of the sanction process must be concluded within 20 working days, i.e. from the date the Approved Training Organisation approves an appeal to proceed to the date the appellant is notified of the appeal outcome
- b) The Approved Training Organisation will appoint an Appeal of Sanction Reviewer¹³ to conduct the appeal. The relevant Approved Training Organisation will ensure that all relevant information, documentation, is made available to the reviewer
- c) The Appeals of Sanction Reviewer will examine the appeal application and the supporting evidence in the context of the appeal grounds (see Section 8.1). Depending on the nature of the appeal, the reviewer may consult with additional persons on a case by case basis

8.5 Adjudicating on the Appeal Decision Outcome (Candidate Only)

The Approved Training Organisation will instigate the following sanction process:

¹³ The Appeal of Sanction Reviewer will be suitably qualified and independent of the process.

- a) The Appeals of Sanction Reviewer will complete a report on their findings and will issue the report to the Approved Training Organisation
- b) The Approved Training Organisation will adjudicate on the findings of the report. The Approved Training Organisation will inform the SOLAS Manager Construction Services and the SOLAS approved provider of external authentication, results approval and certification applications of the adjudicated findings of the sanction appeal decision outcome

8.6 Communicating the Sanction Appeal Decision Outcome (Candidate Only)

The Approved Training Organisation will inform the appellant of the outcome within 10 working days of receiving the Appeal Reviewer's Report.

9.0 Assessment Results and Certification Issues

Regardless of the outcome of the assessment system malpractice investigation, it is imperative that the assessment system and certification process is not unnecessarily compromised, and that where applicable, candidates receive certificates with minimal delay, following, and in accordance with, the investigation outcome. Consequently, as soon as the investigation outcome is communicated, one of the following steps should be taken:

- a) In cases where certificates had already been requested or issued by the Awarding Body, the Approved Training Organisation will inform the SOLAS Manager Construction Services of the outcome of the investigation, or
- b) If the processing of results was suspended pending an investigation, the Approved Training Organisation will inform the appropriate SOLAS approved Quality Assurance Provider whether or not to proceed with the processing of assessment results

Note: In the majority of cases of investigations into malpractices with the assessment system, subsequent outcomes are confidential. However, in cases of serious malpractices, where the threat to the integrity of the assessment outweighs a duty of confidentiality, it will normally be necessary for information to be exchanged amongst other relevant parties within the Approved Training Organisation.

10.0 Corrective/Preventative Action and Follow-Up

Where the assessment system malpractice is substantiated, the relevant Approved Training Organisation will forward all r e c o m m e n d e d corrective and or preventative actions in writing to the SOLAS Manager Construction Services for consideration.

10.1 Corrective Actions: Candidate Redress

Where the marking and/or conduct of assessments have been compromised (not by candidates), any candidate impacted shall be given the opportunity to re-sit the assessments, as soon as possible, without any penalties being applied to the candidate. Where appropriate, the necessary supports shall be put in place for the candidate(s).

10.2 Corrective / Preventative Actions for Improving Assessment Processes or Conduct

Proposed corrective actions and/or preventative actions arising from malpractice incidents for improving assessment processes or conduct may include:

- a) Reminding candidates of the requirements governing assessments
- b) Amending the candidate information on assessments
- c) Refresher briefing for Approved Training Organisation assessment personnel
- d) Suggested amendments to the SOLAS Assessment Instrument Specification (AIS) for SOLAS consideration
- e) Suggested amendments to SOLAS assessment governance and procedures and or regulations for SOLAS consideration
- f) Other appropriate measures

10.3 Communication of Corrective Actions

The Approved Training Organisation will convey details of the SOLAS approved corrective actions and follow-up where relevant to the:

- a) Candidate
- b) Approved Training Organisation Personnel
- c) SOLAS approved Quality Assurance Provider

Appendix 1

Glossary of Terms

Adjudication: The formal giving or pronouncing of a judgement.

Appeal of Malpractice Findings: Process whereby an individual can appeal a malpractice finding.

Appeal of Sanctions (Candidate Only): Process whereby a candidate can appeal the sanctions imposed as a result of an assessment system malpractice finding.

Appeals of Malpractice Findings Reviewer: Person appointed to consider the evidence in support of the appeal of an assessment system malpractice finding.

Appeals of Sanctions Reviewer: Person appointed to consider the evidence in support of the appeal of sanctions imposed as a result of a substantiated assessment system malpractice finding.

Assessment: Process whereby candidate performance in a range of areas is established to ensure that the knowledge/skill/competence is demonstrated to meet the requirements of the National Awards Standards for the award.

Assessment Co-ordinator: person who ensures that assessments in ETB provided, organised or procured training are planned, coordinated and administered in accordance with the assessment procedures for the training programme.

Assessment Evidence: Assessment evidence is created during the assessment event or as part of an assigned assessment task. It must be the work of the candidate and includes any article, item or evidence relating to the assessment of learner performance.

Assessment Process: All assessment related activity, including the design and development of assessments, assessment strategies and techniques, the co-ordination of assessment, the conduct of assessment, marking of assessment, internal verification, external authentication, results approval process and certification process.

Assessment Record: Mechanisms for recording that an assessment event has taken place and which document the assessment outcomes for each candidate. Assessment records may be electronic or paper

Assessment System: An assessment system consists of the regulations, procedures, processes, assessment specification, and assessment plan and assessment instruments that used to facilitate the assessment of a candidate's achievement of the standards associated with an award.

Awarding Body: An organisation, which has the authority to issue accredited

qualifications and awards, for example, QQI

Conflict of Interest: Any issue that might unfairly influence, or appear to influence, the outcome of an investigation.

Approved Training Organisation: Is an organisation that is approved by SOLAS to provide CSCS and or QSCS training and or assessments services on behalf of SOLAS.

Investigator: The appointed person who completes the inquiry.

Irregularity: Is typically an accidental omission or mistake, which is detected by the assessment process, is corrected, and which does not impact on the validity of the assessment process.

Candidate: A person who is undertaking an assessment event.

Candidate Malpractice: An assessment system malpractice committed by a candidate.

Malpractice: Any act or practice that brings into question the validity or integrity of the assessment process and that normally arises due to one or more non-accidental factors.

Personnel Malpractice: An assessment system malpractice committed by the Approved Training Organisation personnel.

Programme: Learning experience designed and offered by a SOLAS approved provider, based on predetermined National Awards Standards and leading to an award.

Quality Assurance Provider: SOLAS approved organisation for the validation, results approval and accreditation application

Sanction: Action imposed as a result of an assessment system malpractice.