



Linwood School (Exams) Malpractice Policy

Version	Date	Author	Details
1.0	01102018	SJClark	Merged overall policy with BTEC policy Aligned and included reference to JCQ regulations
1.1	18/11/19	M A Price	Logos amended, maladministration reference added, Pearson and ASDAN docs referenced.

Contents

Scope	2
Aim.....	3
Candidate Malpractice: internal investigation	3
Appeals	3
Appendix A: Examples of Malpractice.....	4

Scope

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding malpractice. This policy includes all qualifications offered at Linwood School: externally set examinations, controlled assessments, portfolio-based assessment, non-examination assessments (NEA), coursework; and applies to both staff and learners.

In all instances of malpractice that occur, Linwood School will follow the guidelines set out by the Joint Council for Qualifications and therefore this policy should be read in conjunction with:

- JCQ publication *Instructions for Conducting Examinations section 9 Resources for examinations, and section 24 Malpractice*;
- JCQ publication *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*

Where appropriate, Linwood School will also follow the guidelines set out in:

- For BTEC Qualifications - Pearson Centre Guidance: Dealing with malpractice and maladministration in vocational qualifications.
- ASDAN Policy, Procedures and Guidance on Malpractice and Maladministration

Except where: malpractice occurs by a candidate in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component and is discovered **prior** to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication. In this instance the malpractice will be dealt with internally and will not be reported to the awarding body.

Aim

- To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or learners
- To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively
- To standardise and record any investigation of malpractice to ensure openness and fairness
- To impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on learners or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven
- To protect the integrity of this centre and qualifications delivered

In order to do this, the centre will:

- seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and the student handbook to inform learners of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice
- show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources
- ask learners to declare that their work is their own
- ask learners to provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used
- conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the Head of Centre and all personnel linked to the allegation.
- make the individual fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven
- give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made
- inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgment made
- document all stages of any investigation

Candidate Malpractice: internal investigation

If a candidate is suspected of malpractice, the candidate will be informed and the allegations 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, he/she will be given the opportunity to repeat the assessment. If found guilty of malpractice following an investigation, the teacher may decide to re-mark previous assignments and these could also be rejected if similar concerns are identified.

If the internal investigation indicates that malpractice has occurred awarding body procedures, as set out in the documents referred to above, will be followed.

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 the Appeals Policy.

Appendix A: Examples of Malpractice

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion:

By learners	By centre staff
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plagiarism of any nature • collusion by working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work • copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying) • deliberate destruction of another's work • fabrication of results or evidence • false declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework • impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test • 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 • 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 to, or accepting notes or papers from another candidate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improper assistance to candidates • inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made • failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure • fraudulent claims for certificates • inappropriate retention of certificates • assisting learners in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves centre staff producing work for the learner • producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated • allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the learner's own, to be included in a learner's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework • facilitating and allowing impersonation • misusing the conditions for special learner requirements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as an amanuensis, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment • falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud • fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment. • Serious maladministration – where maladministration is any unintentional activity or practice that leads to non-compliance with awarding-body regulations.