



Southfields Academy: Malpractice Policy

Author: Stephen McCann, Examinations Officer

Date: September 2017

Review: September 2018

Reviewed by: Principal/Headteacher

September 2017



Southfields Academy

Malpractice Policy

In principle, the Academy follows the requirements and guidelines of the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments, 2016-17*, and any particular requirements for qualifications not covered by JCQ.

Its practices will be reviewed annually in the light of the most recent guidance from JCQ and awarding bodies.

The Exams Officer will inform the Head Teacher and learning teams of any new requirements.

Malpractice may be defined as an action or omission which may compromise the integrity of an assessment, and thereby breach the rules of an awarding body. Malpractice may be carried out by a student or a member of staff. It may be deliberate, or the result of error, carelessness or ignorance of rules.

This policy is available to all staff via the intranet.

Students will be made aware of this policy at the start of their course, and staff are expected to reinforce its requirements throughout the course. Subject leaders have a vital role in the promotion of integrity in working practices.

Examples of student malpractice:

- Submitting and authenticating work which has been wholly or partly written by someone else;
- Downloading material from the internet and presenting it as original work;
- Damaging another student's work.

Examples of staff malpractice:

- Falsification of students' records;
- Allowing students to plagiarise or accepting work which is known not to have been done by the student;
- Making false certificate claims;
- Failure to retain students' work as required by the awarding body;
- Maladministration of external assessments;
- Failing to carry out internal assessment and verification as required by the awarding body.

This list is not exhaustive.



All staff members have the responsibility of reporting suspected malpractice, irrespective of whether it is thought to be deliberate or not. Any staff member who is informed about suspected malpractice must report it to the Principal. Once malpractice is suspected, it must be reported without delay.

Students and parents/carers may also report suspected malpractice.

As far as possible, reports of suspected malpractice should contain the following information:

- Name of individual suspected of malpractice
- Names of any students who are affected
- Names of any witnesses
- The qualification concerned
- Detail about what happened and when

The Principal will carry out a preliminary investigation to decide if the matter should in principle be reported to the awarding body, or can be dealt with by the Academy. Any material collected in the investigation must be kept securely, and retained for the period required by the awarding body. The awarding body may refer the matter back to the Principal for a full investigation, or appoint its own investigators.

In the event of an investigation instigated by an awarding body, staff and students involved will be formally advised that their personal data may be shared, in accordance with the regulations of the awarding body.

Any investigation by the awarding body will not fetter the Academy's right to carry out its own investigations and proceedings under its disciplinary codes for staff and students.

After a formal investigation, the Principal will inform staff of any action points and set times for their implementation.

The Principal must ensure that all documents related to a case are retained securely for at least three years.

Possible actions for students:

- Cancellation of some or all of the student's work
- Removal from the course
- Exclusion, for example if another student's work has been damaged.

Possible action for staff:



- A training programme to ensure the staff member meets professional standards;
- Barring staff from assessing or moderating for a period of time.
- Formal disciplinary action under the Academy Staff Discipline Code; the consideration of dismissal where there has been gross professional misconduct.

Revised September 2017

To be reviewed annually