



INTEGRITY • COMMITMENT • RESPECT

ST JOHN'S
SCHOOL



Ministry
of Defence

ST. JOHN'S SCHOOL

Centre No: 74089

**Assessment Malpractice and
Maladministration Policy**

Academic Year 2024-25

Introduction

Assessment Malpractice and Maladministration Policy Context

What is malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are related concepts, the common theme of which is that they involve a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This policy and procedure use the word 'malpractice' to cover both 'malpractice' and 'maladministration' and it means any act, default or practice which is:

- a breach of the Regulations
- a breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered
- a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification which:
 - gives rise to prejudice to candidates•
 - compromises public confidence in qualifications•
 - compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate
 - damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre

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.

Candidate malpractice

'Candidate malpractice' means malpractice by a candidate in connection with any examination or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the writing of any examination paper. (SMPP 2)

Centre staff malpractice

'Centre staff malpractice' means malpractice committed by:

- a member of staff, contractor (whether employed under a contract of employment or a contract for services) or a volunteer at a centre;

or

- an individual appointed in another capacity by a centre such as an invigilator, a Communication Professional, a Language Modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader or a scribe (SMPP 2)

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.

General principles

In accordance with the regulations St Johns School will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place (GR 5.11)
- Inform the awarding body immediately of any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice or maladministration, involving a candidate or a member of staff, by completing the appropriate documentation (GR 5.11).
- As required by an awarding body, gather evidence of any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11)

Preventing malpractice

St Johns School has in place:

- Robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures. (SMPP 4.3)
- This includes ensuring that all staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the following JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance: General Regulations for Approved Centres 2024-2025; Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2023-2024; Instructions for conducting coursework 2024-2025; Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2024-2025; Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2023-2024; A guide to the special consideration process 2024-2025; Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2024-2025; Plagiarism in Assessments; AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications; A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2024-2025 (SMPP 3.3.1)

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 NEA, coursework or the contents of a portfolio;
- Allowing others to assist in the production of NEA, coursework or assisting others in the production of NEA 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, NEA, 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, NEA 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 has 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:

School staff has 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.

Communication Malpractice Decisions

Once a decision has been made, it will be communicated in writing to the head of centre as soon as possible. The head of centre will communicate the decision to the individuals concerned and pass on details of any sanctions and action in cases where this is indicated. The head of centre will also inform the individuals if they have the right to appeal (SMPP 11.1)

Appeals Against Decisions Made in Cases of Malpractice

St. John's School will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process for submitting an appeal, where relevant.
 - Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ publication A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes
- Additional Information

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

AI - Use in Assessments

AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications.

While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice. Teachers and students should also be aware that AI tools are still being developed and there are often limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

AI chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. Users can ask follow-up questions or ask the chatbot to revise the responses already provided. AI chatbots respond to prompts based upon patterns in the data sets (large language model) upon which they have been trained. They generate responses which are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate. AI chatbots can complete tasks such as the following:

- Answering questions
- Analysing, improving, and summarising text
- Authoring essays, articles, fiction, and non-fiction
- Writing computer code
- Translating text from one language to another
- Generating new ideas, prompts, or suggestions for a given topic or them
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or format

What is AI Misuse

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice:

Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of “making a false declaration of authenticity” and “plagiarism” include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the student’s own
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student’s own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

Acknowledging AI Use

If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.

In addition to the above, where students use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. This allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether that use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2025. The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication
Malpractice Policy 5

purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.

This must be submitted with the work so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should act to assure themselves that the work is the student's own

See <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/> for further information