



Ringwood School

Exam Malpractice (plus Conflicts of Interest)

Procedure name	Exam Malpractice (plus Conflicts of Interest)
Status	Final
Procedure owner	Assistant Headteacher – Data and Outcomes
Authorised by	Headteacher
Authorisation date	Feb 2020
Review date	Feb 2022 – Please change to Sept 23
Equality assessment	Neutral

Ringwood School - Assessment malpractice statement

- This statement is located on the Ringwood School Learning Zone accessible by staff, parents and students
- This statement is intended for all those involved or affected by malpractice incidents
- This statement should be read in conjunction with the school's examination policy and *JCQ Suspected Malpractice – Policy and procedures 2021-2022*
- When implemented the awarding bodies will be contacted using the appropriate forms and or on headed paper and emailed in the first instance

Ringwood School treats all cases of suspected malpractice very seriously and will investigate all suspected reported incidents of possible malpractice.

Malpractice is defined as any act, default, or practice which is in breach of the Regulations. Incidents of malpractice can arise because:

- some incidents are intentional and aim to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment;
- some incidents arise due to a lack of awareness of the regulations, carelessness, or forgetfulness in applying the regulations;
- some occur as a result of the force of circumstances which are beyond the control of those involved (e.g. a fire alarm sounds and the supervision of candidates is disrupted).

The purpose of this statement is to set out some guidelines of the type of possible malpractice. The following are types of malpractice:

- Breach of security
- Deception
- Improper assistance to candidates
- Failure to co-operate with an investigation
- Maladministration
- Candidate malpractice

(This section to be removed – only relevant to last summer's TAG process)

In addition, specific to the 2021 season Awarding of Grades

- failure to appropriately authenticate a student's work;
- over direction of students in preparation for common assessments;
- allegations that centres submit grades not supported by evidence;
- centres enter students who were not originally intending to certificate a grade in the Summer 2021 series;
- failure to engage as requested with awarding organisations during the External Quality Assurance and appeal stages; and
- failure to keep appropriate records of decisions made and teacher assessed grades.
- Undue pressure being applied on teachers by parents or those acting on behalf of students to influence decisions about grading

Parsonage Barn Lane Ringwood Hampshire BH24 1SE T: 01425 475000

E: reception@ringwood.hants.sch.uk www.ringwood.hants.sch.uk

Registered in England and Wales Registration Number: 7552519

Staff Malpractice statement (including individuals appointed by the centre such as invigilators)

Introduction

This statement sets out the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding staff malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications (such as AQA/Edexcel/OCR/WJEC controlled assessments/NEA) and also regarding examinations invigilated by staff at the school and marked externally.

Examples of 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; this list is not exhaustive:

- Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance
- Failing to supervise candidates who have been affected by a timetable variation
- Permitting, facilitating or obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone/iPhone/internet or go to the toilet unsupervised
- Releasing candidates early from a timetabled assessment
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place.

Furthermore, the failure to notify the Awarding body about allegations of or suspected malpractice or indeed to carry out the actions then required by that Awarding Body is also malpractice.

Process

Such malpractice is regarded as misconduct under the School's Discipline Policy. Any allegations of malpractice will follow the disciplinary investigation, sanction and appeals processes as set out in that policy.

Candidate Malpractice statement

Introduction

This statement sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding candidate malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications (such as ASDAN/CoPE/ncfe/AQA/Pearson/OCR/CIE/WJEC controlled assessments) and also regarding examinations marked externally.

Attempted or actual malpractice 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 off 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 instructions of an assessor – This may refer to the use of resources which the candidate has been specifically told not to use
- The alteration of any results document

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 account of events/actions before any final decision is made. If the candidate accepts that malpractice has occurred, he/she may be given the opportunity to repeat the assignment. If malpractice is confirmed 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 account of events/actions before any final decision is made. If malpractice is confirmed or suspected following an investigation, the Awarding Body will be informed and the candidate's examination paper may be withdrawn.

The Head of Centre is responsible for ensuring the relevant Awarding Body is informed of any allegation of malpractice.

Conflicts of Interest:

The Head of Centre is responsible for ensuring that their school/college maintains clear records of all instances where:

- exams office staff have members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (e.g., children) being entered for examinations and assessments either at the school/college itself or other centres
- school/college staff are taking qualifications at their centre which do not include internally assessed components/units
- school/college staff are taking qualifications at other centres.

These records must:

- include details of the measures which have been put in place to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the affected qualifications
- be available for inspection by a visiting JCQ Centre Inspector and/or awarding body staff
- be available if requested in the event of concerns being reported to an awarding body
- be kept until the deadline for reviews of marking has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed (whichever is later).