



IFIELD SCHOOL

Malpractice Policy

Date: November 2022

Review Date: November 2024

DATE	Amendments		Page
02/11/2022	Policy Reviewed by SB	SB	All
02/11/2022	Changed order of signatures at the bottom of policy to reflect order of signature process of policies	MAJ	5
03/11/2022	Added Logos front cover	RT	Front Cover

Malpractice Policy

Ifield School follows the JCQ '*Suspected Malpractice – Policies and Procedures*' document should any case of suspected malpractice arise. For awarding bodies that do not follow JCQ regulations, this Malpractice Policy will be followed.

Definition of Malpractice

Malpractice is an act which is in breach of the examination regulations.

'*Suspected malpractice*' means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice. If a centre fails to investigate allegations of suspected malpractice this also constitutes malpractice by the centre.

Centre Staff Malpractice

This relates to malpractice committed by a professional. This could be a teacher, invigilator, prompter, reader, sign language interpreter, scribe or a sign language interpreter.

Some examples of this could be:

- breach of security - failing to keep question papers or materials secure, adjusting the time of the examination or tampering with candidates work prior to moderation
- deception - changing marks for Non Examination Assessments (NEAs), making up assessments or internal verification records
- improper assistance to candidates - assisting candidates with their work, when not allowed, permitting prohibited items into an exam room, prompting candidates during examinations
- Maladministration - failure to ensure coursework and NEAs have been completed under controlled conditions, failing to inform the awarding body of an alternative site for examinations/assessments, access arrangements being used incorrectly for examinations or assessments.

Candidate Malpractice

This relates to malpractice by a candidate in any examination or assessment – including NEAs.

Some examples of this could be:

- Copying from another candidate or allowing work to be copied
- Being in possession of confidential material in advance of the examination
- Allowing others to assist in the production of work when not allowed
- Plagiarism
- Using books, internet or other sources without acknowledgement
- Bringing unauthorised material into the examination room or assessment
- Behaving in a manner which undermines the integrity of the examination or assessment.

Suspected malpractice identified by a centre

Where suspected malpractice is identified by a centre, the Head of Centre must inform the awarding body immediately. They will then investigate all allegations. The full facts will be determined and noted on the relevant form (Appendices 1, 2 and 3). This will include a statement of facts, a detailed account of the alleged malpractice and details of any investigations carried out by the centre.

Some awarding bodies (such as ASDAN) may have their own '*notification of malpractice*' form, so this must be used if one exists.

Centre Staff Malpractice Procedure

The member of staff in question will be informed in writing of the allegation against them and be invited to attend a meeting with the Head of Centre and another Senior Leadership Team member. This meeting will give them the opportunity to respond to the allegation made against them and present their statement.

The member of staff will also be told at the end of the meeting about the Appeals Process should a decision be made against them. This will be the awarding body's own Appeals Policy.

Any witnesses to the suspected malpractice will also be contacted in writing and interviewed separately. They will be asked to provide a written statement before attending an interview.

The full report will be sent to the awarding body in question for them to respond to the Head of Centre. If they feel that a sanction is necessary, they will advise the school.

Where a member of staff has been found guilty of malpractice, an awarding body may impose sanctions. Examples of these could be:

- A written warning – this could state more serious sanctions if malpractice occurs again
- Further training – it could be a condition that this is undertaken by the member of staff should they be involved with future assessments
- Special conditions – it could be stated that any work undertaken by the member of staff is supervised, should they be involved with any future assessments
- Suspension from assessments – this may be for a set period of time
- Dismissal - if the malpractice constitutes gross professional misconduct.

Candidate Malpractice Procedure

The candidate in question will be informed in writing of the allegation against them and be invited to attend a meeting with their parent/carer, Head of Centre and another Senior Leadership Team member. This meeting will give them the opportunity to respond to the allegations made against them and share their statement.

The candidate and their parent/carer will also be told at the end of the meeting about the Appeals Process should a decision be made against them. This will be the awarding body's own Appeals Policy.

Any witnesses to the suspected malpractice will also be contacted in writing and interviewed separately. They will be asked to provide a written statement before attending an interview.

The full report will then be sent to the awarding body in question for them to respond back to the Head of Centre. If they feel that a sanction is necessary, they will advise the school.

Where a candidate has been found guilty of malpractice, an awarding body may impose sanctions. Examples of these could be:

- A warning
- loss of marks for a section
- loss of marks for a component
- loss of all marks for a unit
- disqualification from a unit
- disqualification from all units in one or more qualification
- disqualification from a whole qualification
- disqualification from all qualifications taken in that series

The Exams Policy, including the Malpractice Policy, is accessible to candidates and their parents/carers on the school's website. Candidates are informed of these policies by the staff teaching them. Staff have access to all school policies as a hard copy or online. Staff are made aware of the policies via the staff handbook and via email following any policy being reviewed and ratified by the Governing Body.

Single Equalities Scheme Impact Assessment (Equalities Act 2010)

This policy has been developed to ensure that there is no negative or adverse impact on any individual or group in terms of disability, race, belief, gender, sexual orientation or age. All opportunities for potential positive impact on individuals, groups and the community are embedded within the ethos, vision and values of the school.

Ifield School is committed to achieving Best Value in all decisions made. We use the principles of Best Value as they apply to securing continuous improvement in this school.

This policy is to be reviewed by the Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee.

Signed by Headteacher:

Signed by Chair of Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee:

Signed by Chair of Governors:



Centre Staff Malpractice Form and Report

Awarding Body

Centre Number

Centre Address

Head of Centre Name:

Contact telephone number:

Head of Centre Email:

Date of Incident:

Name and position of centre staff involved in suspected malpractice:

Details of qualification affected:

Nature of suspected malpractice:

Could the candidate(s) have been unfairly advantaged or disadvantaged – if so, provide details:

Details of investigation and findings:

Name:

Position:

Date:



Candidate Malpractice Form and Report

Awarding Body

Centre Number

Centre Address

Head of Centre Name:

Contact telephone number:

Head of Centre Email:

Date of Incident:

Candidate Name & Number:

Details of qualification affected:

Name of invigilator and/or witness(es):

Describe the nature of the suspected malpractice:

Details of investigation and findings:

Name:

Position:

Date: