



Malpractice Policy

This policy should be read in conjunction with:

- 1) Equal Opportunities Policy 2017

POLICY STATEMENT

Objective:

This policy has been compiled to set out procedures that must be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding staff malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications.

Member of staff responsible for this Policy

Assistant Principal: Curriculum

Next Review of Policy

August 2018

Additional Notes

Policy Number: 2013/09-2

Update History:

Drafted: September 2013
by Mrs Maria Quinn

Update: November 2017 by
Ms Tracy Beare

STAFF MALPRACTICE POLICY

Introduction

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding staff malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications (such as ASDAN, CoPE, Princes Trust) and also regarding examinations invigilated by staff at the school and marked externally.

Definition of Malpractice

Any illegal or unethical activity or practice that deliberately breaches regulations, or might compromise quality assurance or control, or 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.

Examples of Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. 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
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements
- Providing improper assistance to candidates in the production of work for assessment
- Allowing evidence to be included that is known by the staff member not to be the candidates work
- Making claims for certification prior to the candidate completing all the requirements of the assessment

The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regard to examinations;

- Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone/electronic device or go to the toilet unsupervised
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place.

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates;

- Plagiarism of any kind
- Collusion or copying of another candidates work
- Assuming the identity of another person for the purpose of assessment
- Providing false information in relation to exemption from assessment

Staff Malpractice Procedure

Investigations into allegations will be coordinated by the Principal/Deputy Principal who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out within ten working days. The Principal will immediately report any suspected/alleged or actual malpractice/maladministration to the relevant awarding authority. The person responsible for coordinating the investigation will depend on the qualification being investigated. 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 allegation made against him or her
- 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 allegations
- Given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- Given the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required)
- Informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him/her
- 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 including the GTC

If work is submitted for moderation/verification or for marking which is not the candidate's own work, the awarding body may not be able to give that candidate a result.

Staff Malpractice Sanctions

Where a member of staff is found guilty of malpractice, Hazelwood Integrated College may impose the following sanctions:

- 2) **Written warning:** Issue the member of staff with a written warning stating that if the offence is repeated within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied
- 3) **Training:** Require the member of staff, as a condition of future involvement in both internal and external assessments to undertake specific training or mentoring, within a particular period of time, including a review process at the end of the training
- 4) **Special conditions:** Impose special conditions on the future involvement in assessments by the member of staff
- 5) **Suspension:** Bar the member of staff in all involvement in the administration of assessments for a set period of time
- 6) **Dismissal:** Should the degree of malpractice be deemed gross professional misconduct, the member of staff could face dismissal from his/her post

Appeals

The member of staff may appeal against sanctions imposed on them. Appeals will be conducted in line with the organisations Appeals Policy.