

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. What Constitutes Malpractice?	1
3. Maladministration	3
4. Steps the centre will take to prevent malpractice and maladministration	4
5. Notification Of Suspected Malpractice	5
6. Appeals	6
7. Other Related Policies and Documents	7
8. Monitoring and Review	7
9. Approval/Amendment	7
10. Questions	7

1. Introduction

Woodford County High School is committed to ensuring that whenever its staff assesses students' work for external qualifications, this is done fairly, consistently and in accordance with the specification for the qualification concerned and JCQ regulations. This policy sets out how Woodford, as an exam centre, will strive to prevent malpractice and maladministration to maintain the integrity and authority of the centre, the qualification and the awarding body. It will also outline the steps that will be taken in the unlikely event that malpractice or maladministration takes place and the appeals process.

2. What Constitutes Malpractice?

Malpractice is any act, default or practice which is:

- A breach of the regulations;
- A breach of the 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 employee or agent of that centre/ awarding body.

Malpractice can be intentional with the aim of giving an unfair advantage and it can be due to lack of awareness. In some cases, it can be due to circumstances beyond the control of those involved resulting in the supervision of the candidates being disrupted (e.g. a fire alarm sounds during an assessment).

The JCQ member awarding organisations divide malpractice into the following types:

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

All persons involved in non-examined assessment must ensure that they **do not** do the following:

- Fail to keep assessment material secure prior to an assessment (including digital materials)
- Discuss or reveal confidential information about the assessments (including via social media or internet forums)
- Move the time or date of an assessment beyond what is allowed by JCQ and the specification
- Fail to adequately supervise candidates during controlled parts of the non-examined assessment
- Tamper with candidate scripts/work after collection and before dispatch to the examiner
- Fail to keep electronic candidate work secure

To do any of the above constitutes a breach of security.

All persons involved in non-examined assessment must ensure that they **do not** do the following:

- Invent or change marks for internally assessed components when there is no evidence for the candidate's achievements to justify such marks
- Fabricate assessment and or internal verification records or authentication statements
- Enter fictitious candidates for assessments
- Substitute one candidate's non-examined assessment work for another's
- Provide misleading or inaccurate information to an awarding body, candidate or parent.

To do any of the above constitutes deception.

Staff must not assist candidates beyond that permitted by the specification (improper assistance). For example, staff must not share or lend candidate work to other candidates, produce answers for candidates, or assist or prompt candidates either verbally, written or by non-verbal signs, beyond that permitted by the specification.

In the context of non-examined assessment, candidates **must not**:

- Submit work which is not their own;
- Lend work to other candidates or allow other candidates to copy their work (including the use of technology to aid the copying);
- Allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material (including the posting on social networking sites);
- Destroy another candidate's work deliberately;
- Assist other candidates to produce work;
- Use books, the internet, Artificial Intelligence or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution;
- Submit work that has been word processed by a third party without acknowledgement;
- Transgress the stipulated guidelines for the controlled conditions related to the specific assessment being completed;
- Inappropriately use unauthorised electronic devices or technology during assessments this includes during remote assessments and remote invigilation;
- Fail to disclose to the centre or awarding body that they or another candidate have had unauthorised access to assessment materials (online or otherwise);
- Misuse or attempt to misuse exemplar material;
- Include offensive comments, obscenities and drawings, discriminatory language remarks or drawings in their NEA;

3. Maladministration

Maladministration is a type of malpractice and is define as the failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of non-examination assessments, the handling of candidate scripts, cumulative assessment records, results and certificate claim forms etc.

This could include the following:

- Failing to ensure that candidates NEA is adequately completed, monitored or supervised
- Failure for the head of centre to adhere to awarding body specification requirements in the delivery of NEA
- Failing to adhere to awarding body deadlines
- Failure to use the correct tasks or assignments for assessments
- Failure to remind candidates about unauthorised items
- Granting access arrangements for candidates where prior approval has not been sought.
- Failure to ensure that work produced outside of examination conditions is approached in an appropriate way by the candidate.

Teaching staff must have a detailed knowledge and understanding of the non-examined assessment requirements and regulations and must adhere to awarding body deadlines.

4. Steps the centre will take to prevent malpractice and maladministration

Woodford County High School is committed to ensuring that malpractice does not occur and maintaining an open and honest culture to ensure that any concerns can be escalated without fear of repercussion. The steps below will be taken to ensure that malpractice doesn't take place.

Preventing centre staff malpractice

Exams and Non-examined assessments are to be carried out in accordance with JCQ and specification requirements.

Staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these. Staff involved will also understand key dates and deadlines and leaders, managers and the exams officer will work together to ensure that these are met. Staff will be briefed regularly on the regulations and provided with any JCQ updates including those that relate to social media and following appropriate security procedures to ensure information about non-examination assessment is kept confidential. Staff delivering non-examination assessments will be briefed on identifying and reporting plagiarism including AI misuse and other potential candidate malpractice and how to report this if it is suspected.

Staff will engage with standardisation, moderation and other internal and external verification processes and will act on recommendations from awarding bodies about delivery, assessment and or other aspects of their practice.

Exams officers will be appropriately trained and resourced and supported to carry out the role.

Staff who manage and implement access arrangements and special considerations are aware of the requirement and are supported and resourced to carry out the role.

Preventing candidate malpractice

Information for candidates on non-examination assessment will be made available prior to assessments through assemblies, parent meetings, during lessons and in writing. Students will be given warnings about prohibited materials and devices and they will be made aware of the sanctions or potential consequences of those who commit malpractice. Students will be given clear examples of what constitutes malpractice. Students will be given clear instructions on how to avoid plagiarism including the misuse of AI and will be made aware of the need for the work to be their own. Candidates will sign declarations to this effect in line with qualification specifications.

Staff delivering NEA have the right to use electronic platforms that can screen for the use of AI. Staff are also encouraged to ask questions about work which does not seem to fit with their professional knowledge of the student's style of writing, prior academic ability or previous idea development. If there is doubt about the authenticity of the student's work staff must report this to their line-manager and notify the deputy headteacher in the first instance.

5. Notification of Suspected Malpractice

Malpractice or suspected malpractice can be reported by centres, awarding bodies and other individuals.

In the event that malpractice does happen or it is suspected, and it is candidate malpractice the JCQ guidelines stipulate the following:

Irregularities identified by the centre **prior** to the candidate signing the authentication statement

- The centre should deal with the irregularity under its own internal procedures.
- There is no requirement to report the irregularity to the awarding body.
- Details of any work which is not the candidate's own must be recorded on the record form.

Irregularities identified by the centre **subsequent** to the candidate signing the authentication statement

- The head of centre must notify the relevant awarding body at the earliest opportunity using **Form JCQ/M1**.
- If malpractice is found the awarding body will apply a penalty.

Irregularities identified by an examiner or moderator **subsequent** to the candidate signing the authentication statement

- The awarding body will ask the head of centre to conduct a full investigation and report his/her findings.

Suspected malpractice prior to signing of the authentication sheet

If candidates have not yet signed the authentication sheet and malpractice is suspected, teachers should report this to their line-manager and notify the deputy headteacher.

The deputy headteacher will investigate the issue or delegate this to another senior colleague. The deputy headteacher will speak to the candidate and make them aware of the severity of this allegation, the potential consequences and ensure that the candidate's parents are contacted at this point and are aware of the allegation and impending investigation.

The investigator (senior staff member) will establish the facts of the case by gathering evidence, if necessary, in written form, from the relevant teacher(s) and student(s), plus anyone else they consider relevant to the investigation. A record should be kept of all the evidence, including notes of any interviews that have been conducted. The candidate will be given an opportunity to provide a written statement in response to the allegation.

If there is sufficient evidence to suspect that the malpractice did in fact occur the deputy head teacher will speak to the candidate and make them aware of this and ensure that the candidate's parents/ carers are notified in writing. Parents/ carers and the student will be made aware that this may impact on the scores that the student

attains. Parents/ carers will also be made aware of their right to appeal and the appeals procedure. The details of any work that is not the candidate's own will then be recorded on the cover sheet for the candidate's work and the exams officer will check this. Centres should not normally give credit to work submitted that is not the candidate's own or has been produced using improper assistance.

The school may decide to impose an appropriate school sanction on the candidate for breaching school rules. This will be considered on a case-by-case basis and at the discretion of the senior team, the head of section and/or head of year.

Malpractice or suspected malpractice after the signing of the authentication sheet

If malpractice is suspected after the signing of the authentication sheet either by the centre or by the awarding body/ examiner or moderator the school will follow JCQ procedures.

In the case of centre staff suspecting malpractice after the signing of the authentication sheet, staff must notify their line manager and the head of centre as soon as possible. The head of centre will then notify the awarding body using the relevant forms. The centre will then follow instructions or provide information to the awarding body as required.

If malpractice is suspected after the signing of the declaration of authentication and at the time of the malpractice there is no entry for the candidate (who the centre expected to enter) the centre is required to submit an entry.

If malpractice is suspected by the awarding body/ examiner or moderator after the candidate has signed the authentication sheet. The head of centre will conduct a full investigation in line with JCQ guidelines and following instructions and providing information to the awarding body. This will include collecting written statements from staff, students and the candidate alongside any other sources of evidence.

Notification of suspected malpractice (staff)

Staff must follow rules and regulations for non-examination assessment as set out by the specifications and awarding bodies. These instructions will likely include the types and amount of support students can have, the use of exemplar materials and which information is and is not confidential.

If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework/ NEA the head of centre must inform the awarding body immediately regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidates. The head of centre will follow the instructions from the awarding body and will provide information and evidence as necessary.

6. Appeals Procedure

Students have the right to appeal the centre decision where an internal investigation has found that malpractice did occur.

Any appeal must be made within ten working days of the individual being informed of the centre's internal decision. An appeal may only be made by the candidate or the candidate's parents or carers on the following grounds:

- The schools' published malpractice procedures were not followed;
- The decision was unreasonable in light of the evidence;
- Further evidence (including medical evidence) has come to light which changes the basis of the decision;
- The sanction imposed is disproportionate to the seriousness of the malpractice.

The following are not grounds for appeal:

- The candidate did not intend to engage in malpractice;
- The candidate has an unblemished academic record and has never done anything like this previously;
- The candidate could be awarded a lower grade or could lose a university/Sixth Form place;
- The candidate regrets their actions.

Appeals should be made in writing to the Headteacher, who will appoint two members of staff who have not been involved in the malpractice decision to investigate the appeal. The purpose of the investigation will be to decide whether any of the grounds of appeal outlined above are valid and, if so, whether this ought to result in accepting and assessing the work in question or allowing resubmission of work (as long as this is in line with awarding body guidelines and deadlines). In the event that the malpractice leads to disqualification the appeal will determine whether this should be overturned.

7. Other Related Policies and Documents

Policy For Non-Examined Assessments (SP05.002); Examinations Policy (SP06.06); Curriculum Policy (SP06.01/002); JCQ Information for candidates – non-examination assessment; JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications.

8. Monitoring and Review

When monitoring this policy through its committee work, the governing board will:

- require the Headteacher to report to the governors on the way the policy is being implemented.

This policy will be reviewed by the Governing Board annually, or earlier if considered necessary.

9. Approval/Amendment

This policy is approved by the Governing Board of Woodford County High School. Any amendments to this Policy require approval by the Governing Board of Woodford County High School.

10. Questions

If you have any questions about this policy, please contact the Deputy Headteacher, Woodford County High School, High Road, Woodford Green, Essex, IG8 9LA.