

# ORE Part 1 - Suspected Malpractice Policy

**Effective Date:** 01/03/26

**Review Date:** 01/03/27

**Version:** 3.0

## 1. Purpose and Scope

- 1.1 This policy sets out the procedures for managing suspected malpractice in ORE Part 1.
- 1.2 It applies to all candidates and all personnel involved in delivery and oversight of the examination.
- 1.3 The UCL Consortium may investigate all suspected malpractice and take action, including referral to the GDC.

## 2. Principles

- 2.1 ORE Part 1 reflects real-world clinical practice and professional standards.
- 2.2 Candidates must behave in accordance with the standards expected of a registered dental professional.
- 2.3 Any behaviour compromising patient safety, examination integrity, or professional standards will be treated as suspected malpractice.
- 2.4 The UCL Consortium will act proportionately, fairly, and in accordance with due process.

## 3. Definition of Malpractice

- 3.1 Malpractice is any act or omission that threatens examination integrity or confers unfair advantage.
- 3.2 Examples of behaviour that may constitute malpractice include, but are not limited to:
  - 3.2.1 possession or use of unauthorised materials or devices;
  - 3.2.2 copying, collusion, or unauthorised communication with another candidate or third party;
  - 3.2.3 impersonation or facilitating impersonation;
  - 3.2.4 obtaining, recording, reproducing, retaining, or sharing examination content without authorisation;
  - 3.2.5 removal or attempted removal of examination materials from the examination venue;
  - 3.2.6 falsification of documents, records, or candidate information;
  - 3.2.7 failure to comply with examination regulations or instructions issued by examination personnel;
  - 3.2.8 disruptive, abusive, threatening, or inappropriate behaviour;
  - 3.2.9 conduct that compromises the integrity, security, fairness, or reputation of the examination.
- 3.3 The examples above are illustrative only and are not exhaustive. The UCL Consortium reserves the right to determine whether particular conduct constitutes malpractice having regard to the circumstances of each case.

## 4. Identification and Immediate Action

- 4.1 Suspected malpractice must be reported immediately to the Lead Examiner.
- 4.2 Incidents must be recorded by the Lead Examiner using the Lead Examiner Malpractice Report Form. Candidates will normally be allowed to continue unless there is risk, disruption or compromise.
- 4.3 Following an initial assessment by the Lead Examiner, the candidate may be permitted to continue the examination where doing so does not pose a risk to examination integrity, examination security, candidate safety, or the fairness of the assessment process.
- 4.4 The Lead Examiner may immediately remove a candidate from the current examination session, the remainder of the examination diet, or any examination area where there are reasonable grounds to believe that:
  - 4.4.1 the integrity or security of the examination may be compromised;
  - 4.4.2 the candidate may obtain, record, retain or communicate further examination content;
  - 4.4.3 the candidate's behaviour poses a risk to safety; or
  - 4.4.4 the candidate's behaviour is disruptive to the examination process.
- 4.5 Any decision to remove a candidate from the examination shall not constitute a determination that malpractice has occurred but shall be treated as a precautionary measure pending investigation and formal consideration under this policy.
- 4.6 Evidence will be confiscated and retained.
- 4.7 The candidate will be informed of the allegation.

## 5. Classification

- 5.1 Allegations will be reviewed by the Lead Examiner with appropriate consultation.
- 5.2 Cases will be classified as minor or major infringements.
- 5.3 Unsafe or dishonest behaviour will normally be treated as major.
- 5.4 UCL retains full discretion in classification.

## 6. Investigation Process

- 6.1 All cases will be investigated by the UCL ORE Consortium Administrative Team.
- 6.2 Evidence and statements will be gathered.
- 6.3 The candidate will be notified in writing and given opportunity to respond.
- 6.4 Results may be withheld pending outcome.

## 7. Conduct Panel

- 7.1 Cases will be referred to a Conduct Panel where appropriate.
- 7.2 The Panel will review evidence, determine outcome, and recommend sanctions.
- 7.3 The Panel will operate in accordance with fairness and proportionality.

## 8. Outcomes and Sanctions

- 8.1 Where malpractice is suspected or established, the UCL Consortium will report all incidents to the General Dental Council (GDC). The GDC will determine any sanctions to be applied, which may include:
- Formal written warning
  - Annulment of results for specific components
  - Annulment of the entire examination attempt
- 8.2 Barring from future ORE attempts for a defined or indefinite period
- 8.3 Referral for fitness to practise consideration or character referral
- 8.4 The UCL Consortium reserves the right to immediately disqualify a candidate from the examination on the day where there is evidence of serious malpractice or where necessary to protect the integrity of the examination.
- 8.5 In cases of serious malpractice, annulment of all results for the examination diet will normally apply.
- 8.6 Sanctions will be applied at the Consortium's discretion, taking into account severity, intent, and impact on examination integrity.
- 8.7 The Consortium's decision is binding, subject only to formal review procedures.

## 9. Escalation to the GDC

- 9.1 Confirmed cases of malpractice may be referred to the GDC Examination Board.
- 9.2 Referral will normally occur in cases involving dishonesty, fraud, impersonation, or behaviour incompatible with professional standards.
- 9.3 The GDC may undertake its own investigation and impose further sanctions independently of the UCL Consortium.

## 10. Record Keeping

- 10.1 All documentation will be securely retained by the UCL Consortium.
- 10.2 Records may be used for audit, reviews, and regulatory reporting.

## 11. Reviews of outcomes

- 11.1 Candidates may request a review of the outcome in accordance with the reviews process that sits with the GDC, details on this can be found in the [ORE Complaints and Reviews Policy](#).