



CARDINAL NEWMAN
CATHOLIC SCHOOL

2018/9

Date of next review:
September 2019

**Student Examination
Malpractice Policy**

STUDENT EXAMINATION MALPRACTICE POLICY

Cardinal Newman Catholic School and Newman College, Hove

Centre: 56810

Member of staff responsible: Principal - Head of Centre

Principles

- 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.
- Malpractice is dealt with in accordance with the guidance provided by the Joint Council for Qualification (JCQ) and supplementary guidance provided by appropriate Awarding Bodies.

Aims

- To ensure that all staff involved in the setting, supervision and assessment of coursework and staff involved in the administration and supervision of examinations are aware of the school malpractice procedures.
- To ensure that all candidates sitting examinations (and their parents/carers) are aware of the school malpractice procedures

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), iPods, mobile phones, smart watches or other similar devices.
- 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.

Practice

Essentially the school policy is to follow the guidelines as described in the following JCQ Documents:

- Instructions for conducting examinations. (ICE Document)
- Instructions for conducting coursework/portfolios.
- Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments – Policies and Procedures' (SMEAPP)

All staff involved in assessment and invigilation are provided with the appropriate guidance and procedures on an annual basis and this is a key feature of the Examination training.

Malpractice by Candidates during an Examination

Examples would include:

- attempting to communicate with other candidates
- possession of unauthorised materials or electronic equipment
- failing to abide by the conditions of supervision
- failing to follow the instructions given by the invigilator.

The Invigilator should report the incident to the Examinations Officers so that a member of the Senior Leadership Team will:

- Interview invigilator(s)
- Interview candidates(s)
- Check any unauthorised materials.
- Check scripts if required.

All individuals involved to be informed of rights, responsibilities and possible outcomes as laid out in the SMEAPP document page 4.

If there is sufficient evidence to constitute a suspected malpractice as defined in the SMEAPP document the Awarding Body will be contacted and a report will be produced using form JCQ/M1. A copy of this report will be kept by the school.

Other individuals (Parents/Carers, Progress & Pastoral Leaders, Senior Leadership Team) informed and involved in the process as appropriate.

The outcome will be dependent on Awarding Body decisions.

Malpractice by Candidates in Coursework and Assignments

Examples would include:

- Submitting work that is not their own
- Allowing other candidates to copy work
- Assisting others in the production of coursework
- Copy work directly from books or the internet
- Submit work word processed by a third person without acknowledgment.

Providing that internal assessment and moderation is carried out as directed by the Awarding Body, any malpractice should be detected before work and marks are submitted.

All coursework assessment and moderation should be carried out under the supervision of the Subject Leader who should ensure that:

- internal assessment procedures for all subjects in their faculty follow those required by the subject and Awarding Body– copies of regulations are regularly distributed
- copies of all documents related to the assessment and moderation process – assessment grids, mark schemes, OMR sheets etc.- are stored until all appeals concerning results are completed (the best advice would be to store all documents for one year).
- a moderation process to standardise marks is carried out as specified by the Awarding Body the date and persons present should be recorded
- all work is checked for possible malpractice as listed above.

If malpractice is suspected before the submission of work and/or marks being submitted to the Awarding Body, Subject Leaders should carry out an internal investigation. Minor transgressions can be resolved by requiring a candidate to resubmit some or all of the coursework. If the coursework is not resubmitted by the candidate, marking should be adjusted and details of any work which is not the candidates own should be recorded on the coursework cover sheet. A record of all such investigations should be kept including details such as dates and all persons involved.

If malpractice is discovered after the submission of marks, the Examination Manager/Officer must be informed immediately. An investigation led by a member of the Senior Leadership Team will be set up and a report submitted to the Awarding Body in accordance with the SMEAPP.

If an Awarding Body suspects malpractice the school will either be required to carry out an internal investigation under the direction of the Principal or be subjected to an investigation by the Awarding Body. In either case Subject Leaders will be required to produce all relevant documentation.

Failure to carry out the correct procedures could result in the centre being found 'non-compliant'. If this happens Awarding Bodies can impose a range of sanctions from a written warning to withdrawal of the centre recognition.

Roles and Responsibilities

These are described within the procedures.

Dissemination

This policy is shared with staff and parents and carers through the Cardinal Newman Catholic School website (www.cncs.co.uk).

Date of Next Review: September 2019