

Exams Malpractice Policy

Highworth Warneford School



Reviewed by:	Exams Officer	Approved by	Headteacher
Last reviewed in:	January 2023	Approved on:	2 February 2023
Next review due:	January 2024		

Contents

Introduction	2
Centre Staff Malpractice	2
Examples of Staff Malpractice	2
Staff Malpractice Procedure	2
Staff Malpractice Sanctions	3
Appeals.....	3
Candidate Malpractice	4
Examples of Candidate Malpractice	4
Appeals.....	4

Introduction

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding malpractice in the assessment of controlled assessments and coursework and regarding external examinations invigilated by staff at the school. Malpractice, which includes maladministration and non-compliance, means any act, default or practice which is a breach of regulations or any act which compromises or may compromise the process of assessment and the integrity of a qualification or validity of a result or certificate and/or damages the authority, reputation or credibility of an awarding body, a centre or any member of staff belonging to an awarding body or centre.

Highworth Warneford School's Head of Centre will notify the appropriate awarding body at the earliest opportunity of all suspicions or actual incidents of malpractice. The only exception to this is malpractice discovered in controlled assessments and coursework before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate. Guidelines in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments will be adhered to.

Centre Staff Malpractice

Examples of Staff Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- Tampering with candidates' work prior to external moderation/verification
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements

The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regard to examinations

- Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone or go to the toilet unsupervised
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place

Staff Malpractice Procedure

The Head of Centre will monitor and report potential malpractice by invigilators and centre staff to the awarding body as soon as possible. The initial investigation will be carried out within ten working days and, if necessary, it will be delegated to a senior member of staff who is independent and not connected to the department or the candidate suspected of the malpractice; the Head of Centre will retain overall responsibility. The investigation will involve establishing the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true. Where appropriate, the staff member concerned and any potential witnesses will be interviewed and their version of events recorded on paper.

The member of staff will be:

- informed in writing of the allegation made against him or her
- informed what evidence there is to support the allegation

- informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven
- given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations
- given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- given the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required)
- informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him/her
- informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice will be shared with the relevant awarding body and may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators Ofqual, the police and/or professional bodies including the GTC

If work is submitted for moderation/verification or for marking which is not the candidate's own work, the awarding body may not be able to give that candidate a result.

Staff Malpractice Sanctions

Where a member of staff is found guilty of malpractice, Highworth Warneford School may impose the following sanctions:

- 1) **Written warning:** Issue the member of staff with a written warning stating that if the offence is repeated within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied
- 2) **Training:** Require the member of staff, as a condition of future involvement in both internal and external assessments to undertake specific training or mentoring, within a particular period of time, including a review process at the end of the training
- 3) **Special conditions:** Impose special conditions on the future involvement in assessments by the member of staff
- 4) **Suspension:** Bar the member of staff in all involvement in the administration of assessments for a set period of time
- 5) **Dismissal:** Should the degree of malpractice be deemed gross professional misconduct, the member of staff could face dismissal from his/her post

Appeals

The member of staff may appeal against sanctions imposed on them. Appeals will be conducted in line with the school's and awarding body's Appeals Policy.

Candidate Malpractice

Examples of Candidate Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- Plagiarism: the copying and passing of as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another person's work
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as the candidate's only
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision – this may refer to the use of resources which the candidate has been specifically told not to use
- Bringing into the exam room or assessment situation unauthorised material, for example, a mobile phone, notes or wrist watches

If a teacher suspects a candidate of malpractice, the candidate will be informed and the allegations will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their side of the story before any final decision is made. If the candidate accepts that malpractice has occurred, he/she will be given the opportunity to repeat the assignment. If found guilty of malpractice following an investigation, the teacher may decide to re-mark previous assignments and these could also be rejected if similar concerns are identified.

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to examinations. This list is not exhaustive:

- Talking during an examination
- Taking a mobile phone into an examination
- Taking any item other than those accepted by the Awarding Body into the examination, such as a book or notes
- Leaving the examination room without permission
- Passing notes or papers or accepting notes to, or accepting notes or papers from another candidate

If a teacher suspects a candidate of malpractice during an examination, the candidate will be informed and the allegations will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their side of the story before any final decision is made. If the candidate is found guilty of malpractice a full written report of the case will be submitted to the relevant awarding body using Form JCQ/M1 as the basis of the report. It is unlikely that the candidate will have the opportunity to repeat the examination.

Appeals

In the event that a malpractice decision is made, which the candidate feels is unfair, the candidate has the right to appeal in line the school's and awarding body's Appeals Policy.