

# The Aylesbury Vale Academy Trust



## Centre Malpractice Policy

<b>Policy Reference:</b>	AVA. 020
<b>Description:</b>	This policy is to minimise the risk of malpractice/maladministration by staff and learners
<b>Status:</b>	Policy
<b>Policy Audience:</b>	Staff
<b>Academy Contact:</b>	Exams Officer
<b>Other Related Policies and Procedures:</b>	Staff Conduct, Whistleblowing
<b>Governor Committees:</b>	Full Governing Body
<b>Approved by the Governing Board on:</b>	06.07.2022
<b>Latest Date for Next Review:</b>	06.07.2023
<b>Version + Schedule of Amendments:</b>	
<b>Signed:</b>	
<b>Date of Signature</b>	06.07.2022

In reviewing this policy the Governing Board has had regard to the Equality Act 2010 and carried out an equality impact assessment. It is satisfied that no group with a protected characteristic will be unfairly disadvantaged by this policy.

## Contents

Purpose of the plan .....	2
Causes of potential Malpractice to the exam process .....	2
1. Disruptive candidates in the exam/assessment .....	2
2. Candidate has unauthorised material on their person .....	2
3. Head of Centre is aware of any malpractice cases regarding a student.....	2
4. Head of Centre is aware of a malpractice case regarding a member of centre staff.....	3
5. Candidates should be informed of potential penalties .....	3
6. With suspected malpractice cases correct forms must be completed.....	4
Further guidance to inform and implement contingency planning .....	4

## Purpose of the policy

This policy examines potential risks and issues that could arise due to malpractice/maladministration by centre staff or learners.

This plan complies with JCQ general regulations (section 5.11) in that:

*a) take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place*

*b) inform the awarding body **immediately** of any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice or maladministration, involving a candidate or a member of staff, by completing the appropriate documentation*

*c) as required by an awarding body, investigate any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the JCQ publication Suspected malpractice - Policies and procedures, 1 September 2020 to 31 August 2021 and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require'*

## Causes of potential Malpractice to the exam process

### 1. Disruptive candidates in the exam/assessment

#### Criteria for implementation of the plan

Where a candidate is being disruptive, the invigilator must warn the candidate that he/she may be removed from the examination room. The candidate must also be warned that the awarding body will be informed and may decide to penalise them, which could include disqualification.

The invigilator must record what has happened

### 2. Candidate has unauthorised material on their person

#### Criteria for implementation of the plan

Wherever possible, the invigilator should remove and keep any unauthorised material that a candidate may have in the examination.

If necessary, the invigilator should summon assistance

### 3. Malpractice cases regarding a student

#### Criteria for implementation of the plan

If a teacher or exams staff suspect malpractice including plagiarism, copying, deliberate destruction of another's work, fabrication of results or evidence, false declaration of authenticity in relation to contents of a portfolio or coursework or impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce work for another.

The head of centre must report to the awarding body immediately all cases of suspected or actual malpractice in connection with the examination.

Form JCQ/M1 - Report of suspected candidate malpractice:

<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice> must be completed.

The head of centre has the authority to remove a candidate from the examination room but should only do so if the candidate would disrupt others by remaining in the room.

#### **4. Malpractice case regarding a member of centre staff**

##### Criteria for implementation of the plan

- Persistent/deliberate failure to adhere to exam board procedures.
- Persistent/deliberate failure to adhere to qualification requirements and/or associated actions assigned to the centre.
- Late learner registrations.
- Unreasonable delays in responding to requests and/or communications from exam boards.
- Inaccurate/fraudulent claim for certificates.
- Persistent instances of maladministration within the centre following notification or warning.
- Denial of access to premises, records, information, learners and staff to any authorised exam board representative and/or the regulatory authorities.
- Failure to carry out invigilation, internal assessment, internal moderation or internal verification in accordance with exam board requirements.
- Deliberate failure to maintain appropriate auditable records.
- Intentional withholding of information from exam boards which is critical to maintaining the rigour of quality assurance and standards of qualifications.
- Learners still working towards qualification after certificate claims have been made.
- Deliberate contravention by a centre and/or its learners of assessment arrangements.
- Loss, theft or a breach of confidentiality in any assessment materials.
- Plagiarism by learners/staff.
- Unauthorised amendment, copying or distributing of exam/assessment papers/materials.
- Inappropriate assistance to learners.
- Deliberate submission of false information to gain a qualification or unit.
- Deliberate failure to adhere to the requirements of exam boards Reasonable Adjustments and Special Considerations policy.

Malpractice cases should be reported to the Exams Officer in the first instance if regarding a student or invigilator, if it is related to the exams Officer then the Head of Centre should be informed

The head of centre has a duty to monitor and report potential malpractice by invigilators and centre staff to the awarding body immediately.

#### **5. Candidates should be informed of potential penalties**

##### Criteria for implementation of the plan

Where candidates commit malpractice, the awarding body may decide to penalise them, which could include disqualification.

Candidates should be warned of the possible penalties an awarding body may apply as detailed in the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures, 1 September 2021 to 31 August 2022:  
<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>

## **6. With suspected malpractice correct forms must be completed to aid the investigation**

### Criteria for implementation of the plan

In cases of suspected malpractice, examination scripts must be packed as normal (see section 28) and Form JCQ/M1 must be submitted separately to the relevant awarding body

## **Further guidance to inform in regards of malpractice**

### **Ofqual**

*Exam boards rightly expect schools and colleges to take malpractice, and the risk of malpractice, seriously. They expect schools and colleges to have proper processes in place for investigating and dealing with allegations of malpractice.*

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/regulating-gcses-as-and-a-levels-guide-for-schools-and-colleges/malpractice-cheating-and-exam-fraud>

### **JCQ**

*General regulations*

<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations>

*Instructions for conducting examinations*

<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/ice---instructions-for-conducting-examinations>

*A guide to the special consideration process*

<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/access-arrangements-and-special-consideration/regulations-and-guidance>

### **GOV.UK**

*A guide to support schools with malpractice incidents*

<https://www.gov.uk/search/all?keywords=exams+2021>