



THE
ADEYFIELD ACADEMY

Longlands, Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire HP2 4DE
t: 01442 406020 f: 01442 406025
e: admin@adeyfield.aetrust.uk
www.adeyfield.herts.sch.uk

Malpractice in Examinations and Assessment Procedure

Date: September 2024
Review Date: September 2025
Co-ordinator: Mr A Hoque

Signed by..... Dawn Mason (Principal)

Signed by..... Kim Bristow (Chair of Governors)

1. Rationale

To ensure the Head of Centre, Examination Officer and all others involved in managing the delivery of general and vocational qualifications understand that Malpractice includes maladministration and non-compliance of any act, default or practice that is a breach of the Regulations 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
- Failure by a centre to notify, investigate and report to an awarding body allegations of suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice
- Failure to take action as required by an awarding body as detailed in Appendix 1

Where references are made to JCQ regulations and/or guidelines, further details can be found at www.jcq.org.uk

2. Aims

- To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or students
- 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 protect this centre against all allegations of malpractice in relation to examinations and assessment that might undermine the integrity and validity of the examination or assessment, the certification of qualifications and/or damage the authority of those responsible for conducting the assessment and certification.
- To identify advances in technology to protect the integrity of qualifications, in particular the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and to provide teachers the information they need to manage the use of AI and guide students in NEAs and other internal assessments (REF JCQ AI Use in Assessments - updated February 2024).

3. Procedure

The Adeyfield Academy will not tolerate actions or attempted actions of malpractice by candidates or staff. Every case of malpractice must be reported to the Head of Centre, the Examinations Officer or to the Quality Nominee for BTEC qualifications. (Appendix 1)

The Adeyfield Academy will ensure that candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments by sharing the content of the following JCQ Notices at the beginning of the course, during the NEA process and before examinations:

- Information for Candidates (NEA), AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of the Qualification, AI - A quick guide for students Plagiarism in Assessments, Information for Candidates (Social Media), Information for candidates (Written examinations) Warning to Candidates, Unauthorised items poster.
- Candidates are informed how to avoid malpractice in the classroom, via the school website, communication with parents/carers and instructions in the Exam Handbook issued to students before the public examination season.

In all instances of malpractice reference will be made to the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments, Policies and Procedures, 1 September 2024 to 31 August 2025. This document can be downloaded from the JCQ website at: <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>. The document sets out examples of malpractice by staff and candidates and

details the procedures for investigating and following up instances of alleged or actual malpractice and the sanctions to be applied:

In accordance with the regulations, The Adeyfield Academy will inform the awarding body of any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice or maladministration, involving a candidate or member of staff, by completing the appropriate documentation (Form JCQ/M1 Suspected candidate malpractice or Form JCQ/M2 Centre Staff malpractice/maladministration).

As required by an awarding body, the head of centre will gather evidence of any alleged or suspected malpractice/maladministration in accordance with the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures and within the deadlines set by the awarding body.

If, in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence to implicate an individual, that individual (candidate or a member of staff) will be informed of the rights of the accused individual.

The awarding body will determine the application of a sanction according to the circumstances and qualification involved.

The head of centre will communicate the decision to the individual concerned and provide the individual with information on the process for submitting an appeal, where relevant.

4. Monitoring

The Adeyfield Academy monitors and reviews its policies and procedures on a regular basis to ensure that there is compliance.

The policy will be reviewed every two years in order to reflect JCQ updates.

This policy will be maintained regularly through line management meetings with a member of the senior leadership team, the exams officer and the Head of Centre to ensure all procedures are undertaken accurately and robustly.

Appendix 1

BTEC Assessment Malpractice Policy Statement The Adeyfield Academy

AIM

- To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or students
- 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 students or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven
- To protect the integrity of this centre and BTEC qualifications

IN ORDER TO DO THIS, THE CENTRE WILL

- Seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and the student handbook to inform students of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice
- Show students the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources
- Ask students to declare that their work is their own
- Ask students 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:
 - The allegation
 - The awarding body's response
 - The investigation
 - The report
 - The decision
 - The appeal
- Make an 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 judgement made
- Document all stages of any investigation
- Where malpractice is proven, this centre will apply penalties/sanctions with reference to the JCQ Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessment Policies and Procedures

DEFINITION OF MALPRACTICE BY STUDENTS

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

- Plagiarism of any nature
- Collusion by working collaboratively with other students to produce work that is submitted as individual student work
- Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying)
- Using AI programmes to write part of or all the student's work

- Not referencing quotes/paragraphs that have come from other sources appropriately
- 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

DEFINITION OF MALPRACTICE BY 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 where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievements to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made
- Failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure
- Fraudulent claims for certificates
- Assisting students 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 student
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the student has not generated
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the student's own, to be included in a student's assignment
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation
- Misusing the conditions for special student requirements, for example where students are permitted support, such as an amanuensis (scribe), 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 student completing all the requirements of assessment