



# Aldercar High School

## Malpractice procedure

### 2020/21

This procedure is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Leigh Parry	
Date of next review	September 2021

## Key staff involved in the complaints and appeals procedure

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Clare Hatto
Exams officer line manager (Senior Leader)	Leigh Parry
Exams officer	Carly Kyle

## Principles

Malpractice consists of those acts which undermine the integrity and validity of assessment, the certification of qualifications and/or damage the authority of those responsible for conducting the assessment and certification.

As an examination centre, Aldercar High School is vigilant regarding assessment malpractice and where malpractice occurs it will be dealt with in an open and fair manner.

Nothing in this policy shall prejudice the information given in the school examination policy.

## Aims

- ▶ 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 exam board qualifications.

## Ensuring we achieve aims

In order to do this, the centre will:

- ▶ seek to avoid potential malpractice by informing learners of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice
- ▶ ensure staff, involved in preparing learners for GCSE and non-GCSE qualifications read the appropriate policies
- ▶ 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. It will proceed through the following stages:
  - ▶ Advise the appropriate exam board of the suspected malpractice, then
    1. take written statements from the candidate(s) and appropriate members of staff.
    2. interview appropriate staff/students.
    3. consultation between Head of Centre and Assistant Head teacher:
  - ▶ 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

Where malpractice is proven, this centre will apply the following penalties / sanctions as appropriate and in conjunction with the exam board:

1. Cancellation of the appropriate work.
2. All future work supervised by a senior member of staff.
3. Disqualification from the qualification.

## Definition of malpractice be Learners

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

- ▶ plagiarism of any nature
- ▶ collusion by working collaboratively with other learners of 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.

## Definition of malpractice be Centre Staff

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

- ▶ 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
- ▶ 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.