

Full name of policy:	ASSESSMENT MALPRACTICE AND MALADMINISTRATION POLICY
Requirement for policy:	To comply with JCQ/Awarding Body requirements
Name and post of person responsible:	Dan Browning – Executive Principal Christos Christofi – Exams Officer
Highest School body approving the policy:	School Leadership Team
Date of approval:	November 2017
Frequency of review:	Annual
Dates of previous reviews:	October 2016
Date of next formal review:	October 2017
Policy Reference:	All policies can be located on the school drive (01-STAFF-EXAMS POLICIES)
Total number of pages: (Including appendices and front sheet)	10 pages
Comments:	This policy should be read in conjunction with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific Awarding Body requirements and guidelines • Examinations Policy • Controlled Assessment Policy and Procedure

Assessment Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Context

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.

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.

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 students, teachers, trainers, and other staff
- to reduce risk of breach of regulations through ignorance;
- to aid detection of any irregularities;
- explaining how students and staff will be made aware of this policy;
- identifying strategies to be employed to minimize risk of student malpractice;
- describing how instances of alleged malpractice will be dealt with.

St. John's School will not tolerate actions (or attempted actions) of malpractice by staff or students. The School is committed to investigating all cases of suspected malpractice. Where cases of suspected malpractice are proven, the School 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.

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.

Examples of Staff Malpractice

This list below is not exhaustive and the School at its discretion may consider other instances of malpractice. A more comprehensive list including examples of maladministration is provided in the Appendix of this policy.

- 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 students 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 student;
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the student has not generated;
- Allowing evidence to be included for assessment which is known by the staff member not to be the student's own;
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation;
- Misusing the conditions for special student requirements;
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud;

- Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the student completing all the requirements of assessment;

Examples of Student Malpractice

This list below is not exhaustive and the School 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 or 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 and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited), instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries, reading pens, translators, wordlists, glossaries, iPods, mobile phones, MP3 players, pagers or other similar electronic devices;
- Behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.

Actions to Implement the Policy

Informing Students

The School will communicate the Student Assessment Malpractice Policy to students through the following means:

- “Information for Students” (JCQ Document available on the school website)
- Teachers have responsibility for ensuring that students are made aware of this policy before undertaking any assessed work which has the potential to contribute to the awarding of a qualification.
- In addition, information for candidates relating to written examinations, onscreen tests, controlled assessment and coursework will be made available via the school website, teachers and the Exams Officer.

Procedure for dealing with allegations of malpractice

1. Reporting suspected malpractice

a. Within School

School staff have a responsibility for reporting any suspected incidences of staff or student malpractice through the appropriate channels. Students will be made aware of the procedure for reporting any allegations of suspected malpractice via the Student Assessment Malpractice Policy. In addition allegations of suspected malpractice may be made by external moderators, verifiers, examiners and reported to the School via the awarding organisation.

Allegations made by school staff:

- Allegations of suspected staff / student malpractice to be made to the relevant School Head;

Allegations made by students:

All School staff have a responsibility to ensure that any allegations made to them in their professional capacity are taken seriously and reported through the correct channels:

- Allegations of suspected staff malpractice and/or student malpractice to be reported to the School Head;

The School 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.

b. To Awarding Organisations

The School accepts the responsibility to report any suspicion of student or staff assessment malpractice to the appropriate awarding organisation. The only exception to this relates to assessment malpractice in coursework or controlled assessment which is discovered prior to the student signing the declaration of authentication. In these cases the incident need not be reported to awarding bodies, but will be dealt with in accordance with the School’s disciplinary / student management procedures. Any work which is not the students own will not be given credit; in addition a note will be added to the cover sheet to detail any assistance that has been given.

In all other instances of suspected malpractice the school will submit the fullest details of the case at the earliest opportunity to the relevant awarding body as per Joint Council of Qualification regulations.

2. Investigation of suspected malpractice

If assessment malpractice is suspected by **school staff** there will be a process of investigation, usually commissioned by the Head of School, to establish the full facts and circumstances of any allegations or evidence.

The person responsible for coordinating the investigation will depend on the qualification being investigated. 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.

Possible Actions Taken by the School

In cases where it is believed, following an investigation and hearing, that there is clear evidence of malpractice, St. John's 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

There will be a right of appeal against any formal disciplinary warning or dismissal.

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

Investigations will proceed through the following stages:

- The student 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 School Head and the student against whom an allegation has been made.

Possible Actions Taken by the School

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

- The appropriate awarding body will be informed by the school of the allegation of malpractice and they will be given the supporting evidence;
- The School will take internal disciplinary action in line with school student management policy and procedures. This action will be commensurate with the seriousness of the malpractice.

Appendix

Examples of Malpractice¹

This more detailed list of examples of malpractice by staff and students has been drawn from the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments* (September 2015 to August 2015). These lists are not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by the School at its discretion.

Staff Malpractice

Breach of security

Any act which breaks the confidentiality of question papers or materials, and their electronic equivalents or the confidentiality of candidates' scripts or their electronic equivalents.

It could involve:

- failing to keep examination material secure prior to an examination;
- discussing or otherwise revealing secure information in public, e.g. internet forums;
- moving the time or date of a fixed examination beyond the arrangements permitted within the JCQ publication Instructions for conducting examinations.
- Conducting an examination before the published date constitutes centre staff malpractice and a clear breach of security;
- failing to supervise adequately candidates who have been affected by a timetable variation; (This would apply to candidates subject to overnight supervision by centre personnel or where an examination is to be sat in an earlier or later session on the scheduled day.)
- permitting, facilitating or obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination;
- failing to retain and secure examination question papers after an examination in cases where the life of the paper extends beyond the particular session. For example, where an examination is to be sat in a later session by one or more candidates due to a timetable variation;
- tampering with candidate scripts or controlled assessments or coursework after collection and before despatch to the awarding body/examiner/moderator; (This would additionally include reading candidates' scripts or photocopying candidates' scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body/examiner. The only instance where photocopying a candidate's script is permissible is where he/she has been granted the use of a transcript.)
- failing to keep candidates' computer files which contain controlled assessments or coursework secure.

Deception

Any act of dishonesty in relation to an examination or assessment, but not limited to:

- inventing or changing marks for internally assessed components (e.g. coursework) where there is no actual evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks awarded;
- manufacturing evidence of competence against national standard

¹ JCQ Suspected malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policy and Procedures

- fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements;
- entering fictitious candidates for examinations or assessments, or otherwise subverting the assessment or certification process with the intention of financial gain (fraud);
- substituting one candidate's controlled assessment or coursework for another.

Improper assistance to candidates

Any act where assistance is given beyond that permitted by the specification or regulations to a candidate or group of candidates, which results in a potential or actual advantage in an examination or assessment.

For example:

- assisting candidates in the production of controlled assessments or coursework, or evidence of achievement, beyond that permitted by the regulations;
- sharing or lending candidates' controlled assessments or coursework with other candidates in a way which allows malpractice to take place;
- assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers; permitting candidates in an examination to access prohibited materials (dictionaries, calculators etc.);
- prompting candidates in an examination/assessment by means of signs, or verbal or written prompts;
- assisting candidates granted the use of an Oral Language Modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader, a scribe or a Sign Language Interpreter beyond that permitted by the regulations.

Maladministration

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 question 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 who do not meet the criteria as detailed within the JCQ publication Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments ;
- failure to use current assignments for assessments;
- failure to train invigilators adequately, leading to non-compliance with the JCQ publication Instructions for conducting examinations ;
- failing to issue to candidates the appropriate notices and warnings, e.g. JCQ Information for candidates documents;
- failure to inform the JCQ Centre Inspection Service of alternative sites for examinations;
- failing to post notices relating to the examination or assessment outside all rooms (including music and art rooms) where examinations and assessments are held;
- not ensuring that the examination venue conforms to the requirements as stipulated in the JCQ publication Instructions for conducting examinations ;

- the introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room, either prior to or during the examination; (N.B. this precludes the use of the examination room to coach candidates or give subject-specific presentations, including power-point presentations, prior to the start of the examination.)
- failing to remind candidates that any mobile phones or other unauthorised items found in their possession must be handed to the invigilator prior to the examination starting;
- failure to invigilate examinations in accordance with the JCQ publication Instructions for conducting examinations ;
- failure to keep accurate records in relation to very late arrivals and overnight supervision arrangements;
- failure to keep accurate and up to date records in respect of access arrangements which have been processed electronically using the Access arrangements online system; granting access arrangements to candidates who do not meet the requirements of the JCQ publication Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments ;
- granting access arrangements to candidates where prior approval has not been obtained from the Access arrangements online system or, in the case of a more complex arrangement, from an awarding body;
- failure to supervise effectively the printing of computer based assignments when this is required;
- failing to retain candidates' controlled assessments or coursework in secure conditions after the authentication statements have been signed or the work has been marked;
- failing to maintain the security of candidate scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body or examiner;
- failing to despatch candidate scripts / controlled assessments / coursework to the awarding bodies or examiners or moderators in a timely way;
- failing to notify the appropriate awarding body of an instance of suspected malpractice in examinations or assessments 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.

Candidate malpractice

For example:

- the alteration or falsification of any results document, including certificates;
- 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 IT to aid the copying);
- allowing work to be copied e.g. posting written coursework on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment;
- the deliberate destruction of another candidate's work;
- 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 or coursework;
- the misuse, or the attempted misuse, of examination and assessment materials and resources (e.g. exemplar materials);
- being in possession of confidential material in advance of the examination;
- 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;
- theft of another candidate's work;
- bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material, for example: notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators (when prohibited), dictionaries (when prohibited), instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries (when prohibited), translators, wordlists, glossaries, iPods, mobile phones, MP3/4 players, pagers or other similar electronic devices;
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick where a candidate uses a word processor;
- Behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.