

eat.uk.com

@EthosAcadTrust

Company Registration Number: 10745840 (England and Wales)

Ethos Academy Trust

Malpractice Policy

2024 - 2025

1	Summary	This policy how Malpractice is dealt with in examinations within Ethos College.			
2	Responsible person	Head of Centre / SLT			
3	Accountable ELT member	Mandeep Bains			
4	Applies to	Ethos College			
5	Trustees and/or individuals who have overseen development of this policy	N/A			
6	Headteachers/Service Heads who were consulted and have given approval (if applicable)	Mandeep Bains			
8	Ratifying committee(s) and date of final approval	Head Teacher			
9	Version Number	1.1			
10	Available on	Every	Y	Trust Website Academy Website Staff Portal	N N N
11	Related documents (if applicable)				
12	Disseminated to	Entire College			
13	Date of implementation (when shared)				
14	Date of next formal review	November 2025			
15	Consulted with Recognised Trade Unions	N/A			

Date	Version	Action	Summary of changes
20/09/2023	1.0	New Policy for 23-24	
17/10/24	1.1	No Changes	

Contents

Section	Description	Page
1.	Introduction	2
2.	Response to allegations of suspected malpractice	3
3.	Definitions of Malpractice	4

1.0 Introduction:

This policy has been written in line with guidance from JCQ: Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Malpractice_Sep24_FINAL.pdf and should be read in conjunction with the Ethos College Exam Policy. Ethos College believes malpractice is deemed to be those actions and practices which threaten the integrity of public examinations, and/or damage the authority of those responsible for conducting them.

JCQ define malpractice as: ‘Malpractice’, which includes maladministration and non-compliance with the Regulations, means any act, default or practice which is a breach of the Regulations or which:

- compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate; and/or
- damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre.

Failure by a centre to notify, investigate and report to an awarding body all allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself.

Also, failure to act as required by an awarding body, as detailed in this document, or to cooperate with an awarding body’s investigation, constitutes malpractice.

JCQ also states:

Instances of malpractice arise for a variety of reasons:

- some incidents are intentional and aim to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment;

- some incidents arise due to ignorance of the regulations, carelessness or forgetfulness in applying the regulations;
- some occur as a direct result of the force of circumstances which are beyond the control of those involved (e.g. a fire alarm sounds and the exam is disrupted).

It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the centre's examinations process to read, understand and implement this policy. Members of staff involved with examinations should be fully conversant with all JCQ regulations and are recommended to consult the relevant documents. To ensure internally and externally set examinations are carried out in accordance with JCQ Guidelines and meets the statutory responsibilities of Examination Centres the school has in place the following Team:

- Headteacher (Head of Centre for Examinations)
- Exams Officer
- SENDCo (oversight of Health and Care Plans and associated access arrangements)
- Subject Teachers (responsible for supplying accurate candidate examination entries)

2.0 Response to allegations of suspected malpractice

Ethos College investigates allegations of malpractice swiftly and thoroughly. Such investigation would be led by the Head of Centre (Headteacher) and a full written report of any case then submitted to the relevant examination board including:

- A statement of the facts; a detailed account of the circumstances of the alleged malpractice and detail of any investigation carried out by the centre
- The evidence relevant to the allegation; such as written statement(s) from the invigilator(s), assessor, internal verifier(s), or other staff who are involved
- Written statement(s) from the candidate(s)
- Any exculpatory evidence and/or mitigating factors
- Information about the school's procedures for advising candidates of examination board regulations
- Seating plans showing the exact position of candidates in the examination room
- Any unauthorised material found in the examination room
- Any of the candidate's work and associated material, e.g. relevant source material for coursework

JCQ has its own policies and procedures for dealing with allegations of malpractice and our school adheres to these:

The Head of Centre must:

- 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

nonexamination assessments before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate. 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);

- complete Form JCQ/M1 (suspected candidate malpractice) or Form JCQ/M2a (suspected malpractice/maladministration involving centre staff) to notify the awarding body/bodies whose qualifications are involved in an incident of malpractice. Each form is available from the JCQ website <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/> Notifications in letter format will be accepted providing the information given covers the same points as Form JCQ/M1 or JCQ/M2a;
- supervise personally, and as directed by the awarding body, all investigations resulting from an allegation of malpractice unless the investigation is being led by the awarding body or another party;
- ensure that if it is necessary to delegate an investigation to a senior member of centre staff, 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 can otherwise 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;
- speedily and openly make available information as requested by an awarding body;
- co-operate and ensure their staff do so with an enquiry into an allegation of malpractice, whether the centre is directly involved in the case or not;
- inform staff members and candidates of their individual responsibilities and rights as set out in these guidelines;
- forward any awarding body correspondence and evidence to centre staff and/or provide staff contact information to enable the awarding body to do so;
- pass on to the individuals concerned any warnings or notifications of penalties, and ensure compliance with any requests made by the awarding body as a result of a malpractice case.

3.0 Definitions of Malpractice:

Centre Staff Malpractice The following are examples of malpractice by Centre staff. The list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered and acted upon.

- Moving the time or date of a fixed examination (beyond that permitted) without notifying the relevant Awarding Body.
- Failing to keep examination papers secure prior to the examination.
- Obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination.

- Assisting candidates in the production of coursework, beyond that permitted by the regulations.
- Allowing candidates unsupervised access to coursework exemplar material, whether this is the work of former students or that provided by the Awarding Body.
- Failing to keep student computer files secure.
- Assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers.

Candidate Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates. The list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered and acted upon.

- Misuse of examination material.
- Behaving in such a way as to undermine the integrity of the examination.
- Failing to abide by the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor or the Awarding Body in relation to the examination rules and regulations.
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations.
- Disruptive behaviour in the examination room (including the use of offensive language).
- Introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room e.g. notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited), personal stereos, mobile phones or other similar devices and watches.
- Introducing into the examination room notes in the wrong format (when notes are permitted) or incorrectly annotated texts (in open book examinations).
- Obtaining, receiving, exchanging or passing on information which could be examination related (or the attempt to) by means of talking or written paper/notes.
- Personation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another to take one's place in an examination.
- The inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts or coursework.
- Copying from another candidate (including the misuse of ICT to do so).
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates.
- Plagiarism: the failure to acknowledge sources properly and/or the submission of another person's work as if it were the candidate's own.
- Theft of another's work.
- The deliberate destruction of another's work.

- The alteration of any results documents, including certificates.
- The use of AI to create work and pass it off as your own

Procedures for informing candidates of Awarding Bodies' regulations

All candidates receive a copy of the Awarding Bodies' regulations regarding coursework and examinations. During the course of the examination period, notices are displayed both in the area immediately outside the examination room and on display in the examination area.

Verbal Announcements

Before the beginning of every exam, candidates are given a verbal reinforcement of the Awarding Body's regulations. In addition, candidates are given the opportunity to hand in mobile phones that are kept at the front of the exam room until the end of the exam.

Procedures for investigating alleged malpractice

All cases of malpractice are reported to the Examinations Officer who will inform the Head Teacher/Head of Centre. The Examinations Officer / SLT will obtain written statements from those concerned, whether the malpractice is by members of staff or candidates.

Investigation by the School into alleged malpractice by candidates

The Examinations Officer will conduct a full enquiry into the malpractice in conjunction with the Head Teacher. If malpractice is deemed to have taken place then a full written report (using Form JCGQ/M/01 where appropriate) is submitted to the Awarding Body with supporting evidence.

- Candidates accused of malpractice are made fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice, and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven. The parents/guardians of the candidates are also notified - preferably in writing - of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences.
- Candidates accused of malpractice must be given the opportunity to respond (preferably in writing) to allegations made.
- Candidates accused of malpractice should be made aware of the avenues for appealing should a judgement be made against him or her. Full details of an Awarding Body's appeals procedure will be sent to the candidate and parents/guardians if the judgement goes against the candidate.
- The candidate and parents/guardians will be informed in writing of the outcome of the Awarding Body's decision.

Investigation by the School into alleged malpractice by members of staff

- Investigations into any case of malpractice or irregularities against a member of staff must normally be carried out in the first instance by the Head Teacher of the school, in conjunction with the Awarding Body.
- Investigations into alleged malpractice or irregularities against the Head Teacher must be carried out by the Chair of the School's Governing Body, or the responsible employer, and reported to the Awarding Body when completed.

- Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must be made fully aware (preferably in writing) at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice, and the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.
- Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must have the opportunity to respond (preferably in writing) to allegations made.
- Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must be made aware of the avenues for appealing should a judgement go against him or her.
- When investigating serious cases or alleged staff malpractice, it may be necessary for a member of the Awarding Body staff to be present at an interview with the staff member concerned. The member of staff being interviewed may be accompanied by a friend or union representative.
- In accordance with the requirements of the Code of Practice and the Arrangements for the Statutory Regulation of External Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, a report on cases where members of staff are found to have committed malpractice, together with details of the action taken by the Head Teacher, the Governing Body or the responsible employer must be forwarded to the regulatory authorities and may be made available to other Awarding Bodies if the Awarding Body decides that the circumstances of the case are sufficiently serious to warrant such reports being made.

Reports

It is the responsibility of the Head Teacher, acting on behalf of the Awarding Body, to submit a full written report of an investigation and to provide the following where appropriate:

- A statement of the facts, a detailed account of the circumstances and details of any investigations carried out by the Centre.
- Written statement(s) from the invigilators or other staff concerned.
- Written statements from the candidate(s) concerned.
- Any mitigating factors (e.g. relevant medical reports).
- Information about the School's procedures for advising candidates of the Awarding Bodies' regulations.
- Seating plans.
- Unauthorised material found in the examination room.
- Any work of the candidate and any associated material (e.g. source material for coursework) which is relevant to the investigation.
- The form JCGQ/M/01 should be used as the basis of the report.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a serious offence in the context of examinations. Advice will always be given to pupils that:

- Plagiarism is using others' ideas and words without clearly acknowledging the source of that information. It is very important that you give credit where it is due.
- How can students avoid plagiarism?

To avoid plagiarism, you must give credit whenever you use:

1. another person's idea, opinion or theory,
2. any facts, statistics, graphs, drawings
3. quotations of another person's actual spoken or written words
4. paraphrase of another person's spoken or written words.

Plagiarism and the World Wide Web

- The World Wide Web has become a more popular source of information for student papers, and many questions have arisen about how to avoid plagiarising these sources. In most cases, the same rules apply as to a printed source: when a writer must refer to ideas or a quote from a website, they must cite that source.
- If a writer wants to use visual information from a website, many of the same rules apply. Copying visual information or graphics from a website (or from a printed source) is very similar to quoting information, and the source of the visual information or graphic must be cited. These rules also apply to other uses of textual or visual information from websites – for example, if a student is constructing a web page as a class project, and copies graphics or visual from other sites, they must also provide details about the source of this information. In this case, it might be a good idea to obtain permission from the website's owner before using the graphics.

Plagiarism and AI

- If candidates use material from a source or generated from a source which is not their own work, they must include the particular part/element/phrase and state where it came from.
- Where computer-generated content has been used (such as AI Chatbot), the reference must show the name of the AI bot used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5. (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>), 25/01/2024
Candidates should remain a copy of the computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes.

Strategies for Avoiding Plagiarism

- Put in quotations everything that comes directly from the text, especially when taking notes.
- Paraphrase, but make sure you are not just rearranging or replacing a few words. Read over what you want to paraphrase carefully: cover up the text with your hand, or close the text so you cannot see any of it (and so are not tempted to use the text as a 'guide'). Write out the idea in your own words without peeking.

- Check your paraphrase against the original text to be sure you have not accidentally used the same phrases or words, and that the information is accurate.
- Using someone else's ideas, but putting them in your own words. This is probably the skill you will use most when incorporating sources into your writing. Although you use your own words to paraphrase, you must still acknowledge the source of the information.