

Ashfield School



MALPRACTICE POLICY 2019-20

Date of policy: September 2018

Review date: September 2020

Malpractice Policy: Candidates

Ashfield School will follow JCQ procedures as laid down in the 'Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessment Policies and Procedures' document for the relevant exam series.

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 marked qualifications such as controlled assessment or practical coursework and also regarding examinations marked externally.

Examples of Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regard 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 which 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 candidates have specifically been told not to use.
- The alteration of any results document.

If a member of staff suspects a candidate of malpractice the candidate will be informed and the allegation will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their side of the story before any final decision is made. If the candidate accepts that malpractice has occurred she/he will be given the opportunity to repeat the assignment as long as the candidate has not already signed the authentication form. If found guilty of malpractice following an investigation, the member of staff may decide to re-mark previous assignments and these could also be rejected if similar concerns are identified.

Should the candidate be found guilty of malpractice after having signed the authentication form then the matter is no longer subject to internal school discipline and must be reported to the relevant awarding body.

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regard to externally assessed **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 an examination such as apple watches, Ipods, books or notes.
- Leaving the examination room without permission.
- Passing notes or papers or accepting notes or papers from another candidate.

If a member of staff suspects a candidate of malpractice during an examination, the candidate will be informed and the allegation will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their side of the story before any final decision is made. If the candidate is found guilty of malpractice, the Awarding Body will be informed and the candidate will be informed of any penalty to be applied in writing.

Appeals

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

Malpractice Policy: Centre Staff

Definition of Maladministration is essentially any activity or practice, which results in non-compliance with administrative regulations and requirements and includes the application of persistent mistakes or poor administration (e.g. within a centre, inappropriate learner records).

Definition of Malpractice is essentially any activity or practice, which deliberately contravenes regulations and compromises the integrity of the internal or external assessment process and/or the validity of certificates. It covers any deliberate actions, neglect, default or other practice that compromises, or could compromise:

Investigation - Centre Staff

If the suspected malpractice concerns the activities of a member of Centre staff, a visit by the exam board representative will be arranged to investigate.

Any breach of the regulations for invigilating and/or marking assessments as detailed in the operational guidance material provided may be considered as malpractice.

Any member of staff accused of malpractice must be made fully aware in writing of the nature of the alleged malpractice and must have the opportunity to respond in writing to allegations made. A member of staff accused of malpractice must be made aware of how to appeal should a judgement go against him or her.

While the suspected malpractice is being investigated, the Approved Centre's accreditation may be suspended in the severest circumstances.

Appeals

In the event that a malpractice decision is made which the centre staff member feels is unfair then they have the right to appeal in line with the Appeals Policy.

General Data Protection Regulation

All data within this policy will be processed in line with the requirements and protections set out in the General Data Protection Regulation.