



Hartshill Academy

The best in everyone™

Part of United Learning

Examinations Malpractice Policy 2023-2024

This plan is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Date of next review	September 2024
---------------------	----------------

Key staff involved in the plan

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Lorraine Taylor
Exams officer line manager (Senior leader)	Suzi Shepherd
Exams officer	Rebecca Spencer
ALS lead/SENCo	Laura Stubbs

Introduction

This policy 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 assessed qualifications (such as GCSE, GCE, BTEC, EL, EPQ etc.

Hartshill Academy follows the JCQ guidance about Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures

Reporting to Awarding Bodies

The Centre will adhere to the Awarding Bodies' Malpractice and Maladministration policies and procedures in reporting any instances of Malpractice

What is Malpractice?

Malpractice which includes maladministration and non-compliance, means any act, default or practice which is a breach of the Regulations or which:

- compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate; and/or
- damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre

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 candidate-controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments after collection and before despatch to the awarding body/examiner/moderator
- failing to keep candidates' computer files secure which contain controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements

Staff Malpractice Procedure

Investigations into allegations will be coordinated by the Head of Centre or a member of the senior leadership team that they appoint, who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out in a timely fashion. 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.

The member of staff will be:

- informed 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, JCQ, Ofqual, the police and/or professional bodies including the GTC

If work is submitted for moderation/verification or for marking which is not the candidate's own work, the awarding body may not be able to give that candidate a result.

Staff Malpractice Sanctions

Where a member of staff is found guilty of malpractice, JCoSS may impose the following sanctions:

- 1) Warning: Issue the member of staff with a verbal or written warning making clear 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

Appeals

The member of staff may appeal against sanctions imposed on them. Appeals will be conducted in line with the organisations Appeals Policy.

Candidate Malpractice Policy

Introduction

This policy 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 assessed qualifications (such as GCSE, GCE, BTEC, EL, EPQ etc.

Northampton Academy follows the JCQ guidance about Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures

Examples of Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates. This list is not exhaustive:

- Plagiarism: the copying and passing of as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another person's work allowing work to be copied e.g., posting work on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment
- 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
- The use of AI - is treated as malpractice Students must make sure that work submitted for assessment is demonstrably their own. If any sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified by the student and they must understand that this will not allow them to demonstrate that they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded (please see the AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications and Acknowledging AI Use (<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>); Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the students' own (in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres); and where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate and take appropriate action. Please also refer to the contingency plan.

Candidate Malpractice Procedure

Investigations into allegations will be coordinated by the Head of Centre or a member of the senior leadership team that they appoint, who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out in a timely fashion. 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 candidate(s) concerned, and any potential witnesses will be interviewed, and their version(s) of events recorded.

The candidate and their parent(s)/carer (s) will be:

- informed 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
- informed of applicable exam board's appeals process, 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, JCQ, Ofqual, the police.

Appeals

In the event that a malpractice decision is made, which the candidate feels is unfair, the candidate has the right to appeal in line with the Appeals Policy.