



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	Oct 2024
Equality assessment	Neutral

Ringwood School - Assessment malpractice statement

- This statement is located on the Ringwood School Sharepoint 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 2022-2023* [Malpractice 22-23 FINAL2.pdf](#)
- When implemented the awarding bodies will be contacted using the appropriate forms and 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).

Individuals involved in malpractice may be

- candidates;
- teachers, lecturers, tutors, trainers, assessors or others responsible for the conduct, administration or quality assurance of examinations and assessments including examination officers, invigilators and those facilitating access arrangements (e.g. readers, scribes and practical assistants);
- assessment personnel such as examiners, assessors, moderators or internal and external verifiers;

- other third parties (e.g. parents/carers, siblings or friends of the candidate).

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

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.

Staff malpractice may be 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

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.

Steps taken to eliminate malpractice include:

Ensure that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the JCQ documents above and any further awarding body guidance.

Ensure that examination officers are appropriately trained, resourced and supported.

Ensure that exams at alternative sites are conducted in accordance with JCQ ICE requirements.

Ensure that all staff who manage and implement special consideration and access arrangements are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced.

Ensure that members of staff do not communicate any confidential information about examinations and assessment materials, including via social media.

Ensure that examination clash arrangements are planned and managed effectively.

Ensure that staff delivering/assessing coursework or non-examination assessments have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting plagiarism or other potential candidate malpractice.

Ensure that the centre has a culture of honesty and openness so that any concerns of potential malpractice can be reported and investigated

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.

Steps taken to eliminate malpractice by candidates include:

Ensure that all JCQ notices, e.g. Information for candidates, nonexamination assessments, coursework, on-screen tests, written examinations, social media, plagiarism are distributed to candidates prior to assessments/examinations taking place.

Ensure candidates are informed verbally and in writing about the required conditions under which the assessments are conducted, including warnings about the introduction of prohibited materials and devices into the assessments, and access to restricted resources.

Ensure that candidates are aware of actions that constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice.

Ensure that candidates are aware of the sanctions of passing on or receiving (even if the information was not requested) confidential assessment materials. If a candidate receives confidential information, they must report it to a member of centre staff immediately.

Ensure that candidates involved in examination clash arrangements are aware of appropriate behaviour during supervision, i.e. ensuring that candidates cannot pass on or receive information about the content of assessments, thereby, committing candidate malpractice.

Ensure that candidates completing coursework or non-examination assessments are aware of the need for the work to be their own.

If a suspected incident of malpractice is reported Ringwood School will:

notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice. The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate (see paragraph 4.5). If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the head of centre must inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate(s);

report malpractice using the appropriate forms as detailed in paragraphs 4.4 and 4.6;

be accountable for ensuring that the centre and centre staff comply at all times with the awarding body's instructions regarding an investigation;

ensure that if it is necessary to delegate the gathering of information to a senior member of centre staff, the awarding body's agreement is obtained and the senior member of centre staff chosen is independent and not connected to the department or candidate involved in the suspected malpractice. The head of centre should ensure there is no conflict of interest (see below) which might compromise the investigation;

respond speedily and openly to all requests for an investigation into an allegation of malpractice. This will be in the best interests of centre staff, candidates and any others involved;

make information requested by an awarding body available speedily and openly;

co-operate with an enquiry into an allegation of malpractice and ensure that their staff do so also, whether the centre is directly involved in the case or not;

ensure staff members and candidates are informed of their individual responsibilities and rights as set out in this document;

forward any awarding body correspondence and evidence to centre staff and/or provide staff contact information to enable the awarding body to do so;

at all times comply with data protection law;

pass on to the individuals concerned any warnings or notifications of sanctions and ensure compliance with any requests made by the awarding body as a result of a malpractice case.

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.
- For the 2021 Awarding season, any members of staff involved in the assessment of work of candidates where there are Conflicts of Interest are identified, along with the mitigations being put into place

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).