



Procedure name	Exam Malpractice (plus Conflicts of Interest)
Status	Final
Procedure owner	Assistant Headteacher – Data and Outcomes
Authorised by	Headteacher
Authorisation date	Feb 2020
Review date	Oct 2024
Equality assessment	Neutral

### Ringwood School - Assessment malpractice statement

- This statement is located on the Ringwood School website accessible by staff, parents and students
- This statement is intended for all those involved the administration of qualifications at KS4 or KS5
- This statement should be read in conjunction with the school’s Examination Policy and *JCQ Suspected Malpractice – Policy and procedures 2023-2024*
- When implemented the awarding bodies will be contacted using the appropriate forms and or on headed paper and emailed in the first instance
- This policy details how candidates are informed about how to avoid committing malpractice, as well as how suspected malpractice should be reported and escalated.

Ringwood School treats all cases of suspected malpractice very seriously and will investigate all suspected reported incidents of possible malpractice.

#### What is malpractice and maladministration?

‘Malpractice’ and ‘maladministration’ are related concepts, the common theme of which is that they involve a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This policy and procedure uses the word ‘malpractice’ to cover both ‘malpractice’ and ‘maladministration’ and it means any act, default or practice which is:

- a breach of the Regulations
- a breach of 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 any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre (SMPP 1)

Individuals involved in malpractice may be

- candidates;
- teachers, lecturers, tutors, trainers, assessors or others responsible for the conduct, administration or quality assurance of examinations and assessments including examination officers, invigilators and those facilitating access arrangements (e.g. readers, scribes and practical assistants);
- assessment personnel such as examiners, assessors, moderators or internal and external verifiers;
- other third parties (e.g. parents/carers, siblings or friends of the candidate).

The purpose of this statement is to set out some guidelines of the type of possible malpractice. The following are types of malpractice:

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

AI Use in assessments: (with references to the JCQ document AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications).

Candidates are informed about the use of AI in NEA and other assessments through assemblies to them when they are in Year 10 and Year 12 and beginning their qualifications; this is also shared with parents and carers and added to our website for students, parents and carers to make ongoing reference to. These assemblies are delivered by the assistant headteacher with responsibility for Examinations during the first term of the academic year. They detail: what AI is, (the use of AI tools to obtain information and content) what AI misuse is (the use of AI tools and the failure to properly acknowledge this use) and that it constitutes malpractice, how to reference it and how to avoid malpractice. The JCQ Information sheets are shared with teachers, including Information Sheet for Teachers and Senior Leader Presentation for Teachers.

Students complete the majority of their exams under close staff supervision, where there is no possibility to use or to misuse AI. Developments in AI tools are irrelevant here, as students will not be able to access such tools when completing these assessments. However, there are some assessments when access to the internet is permitted either during the research or production stage of the assessments; the overwhelming majority of these will be Non Examined Assessments or Coursework. The guidance put together by JCQ to help students avoid misusing AI tools is followed in all of these cases.

### **General principles**

In accordance with the regulations Ringwood School will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place (GR 5.11)

- 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 (GR 5.11)
- As required by an awarding body, gather evidence of any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures** and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require

#### **Steps taken to prevent malpractice:**

Ensuring that all staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the following JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance: *Instructions for conducting coursework 2023-2024; Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2023-2024; A guide to the special consideration process 2023-2024; Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2023-2024; Plagiarism in Assessments; AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications; A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2023-2024.*

Ensuring that examination officers are appropriately trained, resourced and supported.

Ensuring that exams at alternative sites are conducted in accordance with JCQ ICE requirements.

Ensuring that all staff who manage and implement special consideration and access arrangements are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced.

Ensuring that members of staff do not communicate any confidential information about examinations and assessment materials, including via social media.

Ensuring that the centre has a culture of honesty and openness so that any concerns of potential malpractice can be reported and investigated

#### **Steps taken to inform and advise students against malpractice:**

Students are kept informed about what is and how to avoid malpractice through powerpoint presentations delivered in tutor time at the beginning of their final year, through recorded assemblies specifically focusing on NEA and the use of AI in Assessments delivered to them in year 10 and year 12 (academic year 2023-2024 and thereafter), through an Examination Handbook shared electronically to all students, parents and carers and available on our website and through flagging the link to the JCQ Information for Candidates which can be accessed through our website.

#### **Steps taken to inform and advise students against malpractice involving AI:**

The school follows the steps set out in the section "Centre Engagement with and Discussion of AI"

#### **Staff Malpractice statement (including individuals appointed by the centre such as invigilators)**

##### **Introduction**

This statement sets out the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding staff malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications (such as AQA/Edexcel/OCR/WJEC controlled assessments/NEA) and also regarding examinations invigilated by staff at the school and marked externally.

Staff malpractice may be committed by:

a member of staff, contractor (whether employed under a contract of employment or a contract for services) or a volunteer at a centre; or

an individual appointed in another capacity by a centre such as an invigilator, a Communication Professional, a Language Modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader or a scribe

### **Examples of Malpractice**

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- Tampering with candidates' work prior to external moderation/verification
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements

The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regard to examinations; this list is not exhaustive:

- Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance
- Failing to supervise candidates who have been affected by a timetable variation
- Permitting, facilitating or obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone/iPhone/internet or go to the toilet unsupervised
- Releasing candidates early from a timetabled assessment
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place.

Furthermore, the failure to notify the Awarding body about allegations of or suspected malpractice or indeed to carry out the actions then required by that Awarding Body is also malpractice.

### **Process**

Such malpractice is regarded as misconduct under the School's Discipline Policy. Any allegations of malpractice will follow the disciplinary investigation, sanction and appeals processes as set out in that policy.

## **Candidate Malpractice statement**

### **Introduction**

This statement 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 ASDAN/CoPE/ncfe/AQA/Pearson/OCR/CIE/WJEC controlled assessments) and also regarding examinations marked externally.

Attempted or actual malpractice will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards 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 that 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 candidate has been specifically told not to use
- The alteration of any results document

If a teacher suspects a candidate of malpractice, the candidate will be informed and the allegations will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their account of events/actions before any final decision is made. If the candidate accepts that malpractice has occurred, he/she may be given the opportunity to repeat the assignment. If malpractice is confirmed following an investigation, the teacher may decide to re-mark previous assignments and these could also be rejected if similar concerns are identified.

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to 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 the examination, such as a book or notes
- Leaving the examination room without permission
- Passing notes or papers or accepting notes to, or accepting notes or papers from another candidate

The following are examples of AI misuse but is not exhaustive. AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

If a teacher suspects a candidate of malpractice during an examination, the candidate will be informed and the allegations will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their account of events/actions before any final decision is made. If malpractice is confirmed or suspected following an investigation, the Awarding Body will be informed and the candidate's examination paper may be withdrawn.

The Head of Centre is responsible for ensuring the relevant Awarding Body is informed of any allegation of malpractice.

Steps taken to eliminate malpractice by candidates include:

Ensure that all JCQ notices, e.g. Information for candidates, nonexamination assessments, coursework, on-screen tests, written examinations, social media, plagiarism are distributed to candidates prior to assessments/examinations taking place.

Ensure candidates are informed verbally and in writing about the required conditions under which the assessments are conducted, including warnings about the introduction of prohibited materials and devices into the assessments, and access to restricted resources.

Ensure that candidates are aware of actions that constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice.

Ensure that candidates are aware of the sanctions of passing on or receiving (even if the information was not requested) confidential assessment materials. If a candidate receives confidential information, they must report it to a member of centre staff immediately.

Ensure that candidates involved in examination clash arrangements are aware of appropriate behaviour during supervision, i.e. ensuring that candidates cannot pass on or receive information about the content of assessments, thereby, committing candidate malpractice.

Ensure that candidates completing coursework or non-examination assessments are aware of the need for the work to be their own.

Including clear guidance for students on how to reference properly as follows:

1. When you use material from a book, show the name of the author, the year of publication and the page number, for example: Morrison, 2000, p29.
2. When you use any material from the internet, you should show the date you downloaded the material and the precise webpage – not just the search engine. Eg  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/october/28/newsid\\_2621000/2621915.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/october/28/newsid_2621000/2621915.stm),  
downloaded 5 February 2024.

With AI:

1. Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, you must acknowledge this by showing the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2023.
2. You must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a noneditable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.
3. This must be submitted with the work

If a suspected incident of malpractice is reported Ringwood School will:

notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice. The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate (see paragraph 4.5). If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the head of centre must inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate(s);

report malpractice using the appropriate forms: Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used (SMPP 5.37)

be accountable for ensuring that the centre and centre staff comply at all times with the awarding body's instructions regarding an investigation;

ensure that if it is necessary to delegate the gathering of information to a senior member of centre staff, the awarding body's agreement is obtained and the senior member of centre staff chosen is independent and not connected to the department or candidate involved in the suspected malpractice. The head of centre should ensure there is no conflict of interest which might compromise the investigation;

respond speedily and openly to all requests for an investigation into an allegation of malpractice. This will be in the best interests of centre staff, candidates and any others involved;

make information requested by an awarding body available speedily and openly;

co-operate with an enquiry into an allegation of malpractice and ensure that their staff do so also, whether the centre is directly involved in the case or not;

ensure staff members and candidates are informed of their individual responsibilities and rights as set out in this document;

forward any awarding body correspondence and evidence to centre staff and/or provide staff contact information to enable the awarding body to do so;

at all times comply with data protection law;

pass on to the individuals concerned any warnings or notifications of sanctions and ensure compliance with any requests made by the awarding body as a result of a malpractice case.

### **Communicating malpractice decisions**

Once a decision has been made, it will be communicated in writing to the head of centre as soon as possible. The head of centre will communicate the decision to the individuals concerned and pass on details of any sanctions and action in cases where this is indicated. The head of centre will also inform the individuals if they have the right to appeal. (SMPP 11.1)

### **Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice**

Ringwood School will:

Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal, where relevant

Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ publication A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes