



George Stephenson
High School

Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

**Valid from October
2023**

Purpose of the Policy

This policy addresses malpractice and maladministration under the specific arrangements for the delivery, assessment, moderation/verification and administration of qualifications.

This policy is sent to all students/parents at the start of commencing their GCSE or Vocational qualifications and covers all awarding bodies and subjects that George Stephenson High School has approval to teach.

All staff involved are made aware of this policy at the start of each academic year.

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation in the assessment of internally marked qualifications and regarding examinations invigilated by school staff and marked externally.

Definition

Malpractice refers to any deliberate act or practice which compromises, or threatens to compromise the process and integrity of assessment, and as a result the validity of the result or certificate awarded.

Assessment processes and outcomes can also be put at risk through **maladministration**; whilst malpractice is a deliberate act, maladministration may be accidental or a result of incompetence or a simple mistake. . Maladministration, if serious enough, may be treated as malpractice

Prevention

To prevent malpractice and maladministration, George Stephenson High School will:

- **Provide clear information for staff**, ensuring that all staff involved are aware of the assessment requirements and relevant standards and guidance. Staff are also aware of the procedures to follow should they become aware of either centre staff or candidate malpractice or maladministration occurring.
- **Identify the key roles of staff**: Identify roles and responsibilities for the various aspects of the management, delivery and administration of assessments (assessors/tutors, internal moderator, exams officers and other administrative staff).
- **Provide clear information for candidates**: Candidates should be clear over the consequences of collusion, copying or allowing their work to be copied
- **Only assist candidates where permitted**: Assessors must be clear over how they may “assist candidates” in relation to assessments/portfolios. Candidates with access arrangements must not be assisted beyond what is permitted by the regulations.
- **Deal with staff and candidate malpractice in the correct and appropriate manner**: If staff or candidates are suspected of engaging in any of the behaviour/actions detailed in this policy this needs to be dealt with in the following way.
- 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.

- investigate any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require

Failing to report an instance of suspected malpractice in examinations or assessments to the appropriate awarding body as soon as possible after such an instance occurs, or is discovered **is in itself malpractice**

Candidate Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity 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 of as the candidates 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 side of the story before any final decision is made. Where a candidate might attempt to gain an unfair advantage George Stephenson High School will submit a report of suspected candidate malpractice to the relevant awarding body.

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

If an Exam Invigilator suspects a candidate of malpractice during an examination, the candidate will be informed, and the allegations will be explained. The Awarding Body will be informed and a written statement will be submitted by the Candidate and Exam Invigilator for the awarding body to investigate, this could lead to the candidate being disqualified from that examination and in extreme cases all future examinations too.

Centre staff malpractice and maladministration

George Stephenson High School will report any instances of potential malpractice (which includes maladministration) where any centre staff fail to follow the published requirements for determining grades. In all instances a report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned.

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 Grades created for students who have not been taught sufficient content to provide the basis for that grade or not supported by evidence or that they know to be inaccurate
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance including deliberate disclosure of mark schemes and assessment materials, to support an inflated grade
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements or failure to retain evidence used in the determination of grades
- A systemic failure to follow the centre's policy in relation to the application of Access Arrangements or Special Consideration arrangements for students in relation to assessments
- Grades being released to students (or their parents/carers) before the issue of results

The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regards to **examinations**:

- Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone or go to the toilet unsupervised
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place
- Failing to implement the required Access Arrangement for the candidate.

Investigations into allegations will be coordinated by the Headteacher, or delegated senior member of staff, who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out within **ten working days**. The investigation will involve establishing the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true. Where appropriate, the staff member concerned, and any potential witnesses will be interviewed, and their version of events recorded on paper.

The member of staff will be:

- informed in writing of the allegations made against them
- informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven
- given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegation
- given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- given the opportunity to seek advice and to provide a supplementary statement
- informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice will be shared with the relevant awarding body, and may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators (Ofqual), the police and/or professional bodies

Sanctions

Where a member of staff is found guilty of malpractice, the following sanctions may be imposed:

Written warning: the member of staff will be issued with a written warning stating that if the offence is repeated within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied.

Training: the member of staff will be required to undertake specific training or mentoring, within a particular period of time, including a review process at the end of the training.

Special conditions: special conditions may be imposed on the future involvement in assessments by the member of staff.

Suspension: the member of staff may be suspended from all involvement in the administration of assessments for a set period of time.

Dismissal: should the degree of malpractice be deemed gross professional misconduct; the member of staff could face dismissal from their post.

Appeals

The member of staff may appeal against sanctions imposed on them. Appeals will be conducted in line with school policies

Maladministration

Maladministration is any unintentional activity or practice that leads to non-compliance with awarding body requirements. In most cases, maladministration will relate to administrative of quality assurance procedures, and may involve any of the following: candidates, centre staff, awarding organisation staff.

Examples of maladministration could include:

- Incorrect registering of qualifications or units
- Incorrect candidate names

In the event of an error occurring, the awarding body will be notified immediately.

All staff have a professional duty to ensure that they uphold this policy