



Peacehaven Community School

Malpractice and maladministration Exams Policy

Head of Centre	Rachel Henocq
Date	September 2022
Date for Review	September 2023
Responsibility for Review	Head of Centre

Peacehaven Community School (PCS) will not tolerate actions, or attempted actions, of malpractice by staff or learners. Our school is committed to investigating all cases of suspected malpractice. Where cases of suspected malpractice are proven, PCS is fully committed to take appropriate action, including applying punitive measures and reporting suspected malpractice in order to maintain the integrity of assessment and certification.

The purpose of this policy is to reduce the risk of malpractice and/or maladministration by:

- increasing awareness and understanding of the actions that constitute malpractice and/or maladministration by learners, teachers, trainers and other staff to reduce risk of breach of regulations through ignorance, and to aid detection of any irregularities;
- explaining how learners and staff will be made aware of this policy;
- identifying strategies to be employed to minimise risk of learner malpractice;
- and describing how instances of alleged malpractice will be dealt with.

All staff have a professional duty to ensure that they uphold this policy. Whilst the policy sets out general principles, in addition, staff must also ensure that they abide by the specific assessment requirements for each course as laid down by the awarding organisation for each subject specification. All learners have a responsibility to also adhere to the relevant exam regulations.

Malpractice

Malpractice refers to any deliberate act or practice which compromises, or threatens to compromise the process and integrity of assessment, and as a result the validity of the result or certificate awarded.

N.B: Assessment processes and outcomes can also be put at risk through maladministration; whilst malpractice is a deliberate act, maladministration may be accidental or a result of incompetence or a simple mistake.

Examples of Staff Malpractice:

The following examples are not exhaustive and PCS, at its discretion, may consider other instances of malpractice.

- Improper assistance to candidates
- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made;
- Failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure;
- Assisting learners in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves producing work for the learner;
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example, for evidence the learner has not generated;

- Allowing evidence to be included for assessment which is known by the staff member not to be the learner's own;
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation;
- Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements;
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example, by alteration, substitution or by fraud;
- Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment;
- Invigilating an examination where there are conflicts of interests, i.e. the staff member is a relative of a candidate taking the examination.

Course co-ordinators are responsible for implementing assessment practices that reduce the opportunity for malpractice including, for example:

- Periods of supervised sessions during which evidence for assessments is produced by the learner;
- Altering assessment assignments/tasks/tools on a regular basis;
- Using oral questions with learners for a single assignment/task in a single session for the complete cohort of learners;
- Ensuring access controls which prevent learners from accessing and using other people's work when using networked computers;
- Requiring learners to sign to declare that their work is their own when submitting assessments.

Examples of Learner Malpractice

The following examples are not exhaustive and PCS, at its discretion, may consider other instances of malpractice.

- A breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor or the awarding body in relation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations;
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments;
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates, beyond what is permitted;
- Copying from another candidate (including the use of ICT to aid the copying);
- Allowing work to be copied, e.g. posting written coursework on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment;
- Disruptive behaviour in the examination room or during an assessment session (including the use of offensive language);
- Exchanging, obtaining, receiving, passing on information (or the attempt to) which could be examination related, by means of talking, electronic, written or non-verbal communication;
- Making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of controlled assessments, coursework or the contents of a portfolio;
- Allowing others to assist in the production of controlled assessments/coursework, or assisting others in the production of controlled assessments/coursework;

- Bringing into the examination room notes in the wrong format (where notes are permitted in examinations), or inappropriately annotated texts (in open book examinations);
- The inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or portfolios;
- Impersonation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one's place in an examination or an assessment;
- Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from published sources or incomplete referencing;
- Bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material, for example: notes, study guides, own blank paper, translators, glossaries, calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited), iPods, mobile phones, MP3 players, smart watches or other similar electronic devices;
- Behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.

Course co-ordinators have the responsibility for ensuring that learners are made aware of the relevant awarding bodies' regulations, before undertaking any assessed work which has the potential to contribute to the awarding of a qualification.

Awarding bodies' information for candidates relating to written examinations, onscreen tests, controlled assessment and coursework is displayed outside each exam venue within the centre, and in the Exams section of the school website. Hard copies are also distributed to students before they sit their examinations and carry out controlled assessments.

Whistleblowing - Procedure for dealing with allegations of malpractice

All staff and learners have a responsibility to report any suspected incidences of staff or learner malpractice through the appropriate channels.

The Examinations Officer will consider allegations that are made verbally but will request in all cases that allegations are put in writing, with any supporting evidence that is available. The Examinations Officer will inform the Head of Centre of any allegations that are made.

PCS accepts the responsibility to report any suspicion of learner or staff assessment malpractice to the appropriate awarding body, using the relevant paperwork. The only exception to this is if assessment malpractice in coursework or controlled assessment is discovered prior to the learner signing the declaration of authentication. In these cases, the incident will not be reported to the awarding body but will be dealt with in accordance with the school's disciplinary procedure. Any work which is not the learner's own will not be given credit.

In all other instances, the Head of Centre will submit the fullest details of any suspected malpractice cases at the earliest opportunity to the relevant awarding body, as per the relevant regulations.

If assessment malpractice is suspected by staff there will be a process of investigation to establish the full facts and circumstances of any allegations or evidence. The Head of Centre will appoint a senior member of staff, i.e. an Assistant Headteacher or Deputy Headteacher to conduct the investigation. In order to avoid conflicts of interest,

investigation into suspected malpractice will not be delegated to the manager of the section, team or department involved in the suspected malpractice.

Any disciplinary action will proceed and include provision for:

- The member of staff to be informed about the concerns and possible consequences;
- Possible suspension depending on the circumstances of the case;
- The member of staff to be accompanied at any subsequent investigation meeting;
- Collection of evidence related to the alleged malpractice;
- The review of evidence and production of a report;
- A decision to be made on whether or not to proceed to a formal disciplinary hearing;
- If necessary a formal hearing with a right of representation.

In cases where it is believed, following an investigation and hearing, that there is clear evidence of malpractice:

- The appropriate awarding body will be informed immediately by our centre of the allegation of malpractice, and they will be given the accurate, supporting evidence;
- The school will take disciplinary action applicable with the seriousness of the malpractice. There will be a right of appeal against any formal disciplinary warning or dismissal.

In any instances where suspected malpractice will be reported to an awarding body, PCS will provide the individual(s) with a completed copy of the form and/or letter used to notify the awarding body of the malpractice.

Incidences of learner assessment malpractice will be investigated in a similar manner by the Head of Centre. As with staff malpractice, potential conflicts of interest will be avoided by nominating an investigating officer who is external to the management of the learner and/or particular curriculum area.

Investigations into suspected cases of learner malpractice will proceed through the following stages:

- The learner will be informed about the issues, possible consequences and right of appeal;
- Collection of evidence related to the alleged malpractice;
- The review of evidence and production of a report;
- A formal meeting between the Head of Centre and the learner against whom an allegation has been made.

In cases where it is believed that there is clear evidence of malpractice:

- The appropriate awarding body will be informed immediately by our centre of the allegation of malpractice and they will be given the accurate, supporting evidence;
- The school will take internal disciplinary action which is applicable with the seriousness of the malpractice.

In any instances where suspected malpractice will be reported to an awarding body, PCS will provide the individual(s) with a completed copy of the form and/or letter used to notify the awarding body of the malpractice.

Maladministration

Maladministration refers to the failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of controlled assessments, coursework and examinations or malpractice in the conduct of the examinations/assessments and/or the handling of examination papers, candidate scripts, mark sheets, cumulative assessment records, results and certificate claim forms etc.

For example:

- Failing to ensure that candidates' coursework or work to be completed under controlled conditions is adequately monitored and supervised;
- Inappropriate members of staff assessing candidates for access arrangements/reasonable adjustments, who do not meet the criteria as detailed by the JCQ or NCFE regulations;
- Failure to use current assignments for assessments;
- Failure to train invigilators adequately, leading to non-compliance with JCQ and NCFE regulations;
- Failing to issue the candidates the appropriate notices and warnings;
- Failure to inform the JCQ Centre Inspection Service of alternative sites for examinations;
- Not ensuring that the examination venue conforms to awarding body requirements;
- Failing to ensure that mobile phones are placed outside the examination room and failing to remind the candidates that any mobile phones or other unauthorised equipment found in their possession must be handed to the invigilator prior to the examination starting;
- Granting access arrangements to candidates which do not meet the requirements as detailed by the JCQ or NCFE regulations;
- Failing to retain candidates' coursework/controlled assessments in secure conditions after the authentication statements have been signed;
- Failing to maintain the security of candidate scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body or examiner;
- Failing to report an instance of suspected malpractice in examinations or assessments to the appropriate awarding body as soon as possible after such an instance occurs or is discovered;
- Failing to conduct a thorough investigation into suspected examination or assessment malpractice when asked to do so by an awarding body;
- The inappropriate retention or destruction of certificates.

This policy has been reviewed and authorised by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R Henocq'. The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial 'R'.

Rachel Henocq
Headteacher / Head of Centre