



Kibworth Mead Academy

Malpractice Policy

2025-26

Issue 1	17/08/20	
Issue 2	26/04/21	
Reviewed	14/12/21	
Reviewed	30.1.24	
Reviewed	06/11/24	P Thompson (VP) & V Cropley (EM)
Reviewed	05/05/2025	V Cropley (EM)
Reviewed	10/09/2025	V Cropley (EM)

Malpractice Policy

Malpractice is any deliberate act or practice which compromises or threatens to compromise the integrity of an assessment and as a result the validity of the result. While maladministration is not a deliberate act as it may be accidental or a result of incompetence it may also compromise the assessment's integrity.

Kibworth Mead Academy (KMA) will not tolerate actions (or attempted actions) of malpractice by staff or students. KMA is committed to investigating all cases of suspected malpractice and where proven, is fully committed to take appropriate action including applying disciplinary measures and reporting suspected malpractice to the relevant awarding body to ensure that the integrity of the assessment is maintained.

All staff have a professional duty to ensure that they uphold this policy. Whilst the policy sets out the general principles, staff must also ensure that they abide by the specific assessment requirements laid down by the awarding body.

Purpose:

- To increase the awareness and understanding of the actions that constitutes malpractice or maladministration by students and teachers.
- To reduce the breach of regulations risk through ignorance.
- To aid detection of irregularities.
- Identify strategies to minimise the risk of student malpractice.
- Outline how alleged malpractice will be dealt with.

Examples of Staff Malpractice

The list below is not exhaustive and the school at its discretion may consider other instances of malpractice.

- Improper assistance to students
- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work where there is insufficient evidence of the students' achievement to justify the marks given
- Failure to keep students' coursework/portfolio/non-examined assessment work secure
- Assisting students in the production of their work, where the support has the potential to influence the outcome
- Intentionally submitting inflated grades and/or fabricating evidence to support an inflated grade
- Falsifying witness statements
- Allowing material to be included for assessment which is known or believed not to be the students' own work
- Failure to appropriately authenticate a student's work
- Misusing the students access arrangements
- Fraudulent certificate claims i.e. claiming for a certificate before the student has completed all the tasks.
- Over direction of students in preparation for common assessments
- Grades created for students who have not been taught a sufficient amount of the course.
- Staff informing students of their final centre assessed grades.
- Failure to retain evidence to support final teacher assessed grades.

Examples of Student Malpractice

Again, this list is not exhaustive and the school at its discretion may consider other instances of malpractice.

- A breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator or member of staff in relation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations.
- Failing to abide by the rules of supervision which maintain the security of examinations or assessments
- Collusion – working collaboratively with other students beyond what is allowed
- Copying from another candidate. This includes the use of ICT to aid the copying.
- Using artificial intelligence (AI) to generate coursework/portfolio/NEA work (this is when students have not used their own words and have instead copied from another source like an AI tool)
- Allowing your work to be copied including posting coursework etc. on social media.
- Disruptive behaviour in the exam rooms or during an assessment session, this includes the use of offensive language.
- Exchanging, obtaining, receiving or passing on information (or attempting to) which could be examination related by means of talking, writing or electronic communication.
- Falsely declaring that your controlled assessment/coursework/portfolio or non-examined assessment is all your own work.
- Falsely declaring work in assessment record portfolio as your own work when it is not.
- Accepting assistance from others in the production of your controlled assessment/coursework/portfolio or non-examined assessment or assisting others with their controlled assessment/coursework/portfolio or non-examined assessment.
- Bringing into the exam or assessment unauthorised materials as dictated by the Joint Council for Qualification (JCQ) and awarding body stipulations. For example, study notes, inappropriately annotated texts, if notes are allowed those that are in the wrong format, calculators, dictionaries, mobile phones, iPods including earphones, MP3 players, watches etc.
- Including inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in an exam paper, controlled assessment, coursework, portfolio or non-examined assessment
- Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from published materials including web based or incomplete referencing
- Behaving in a manner that undermines the integrity of the exam
- The alteration or falsification of any results documents, including certificates
- The misuse or attempted misuse of examination or assessment materials or resources (e.g. uploading pre-release materials to social media)
- Being in possession of confidential material in advance of the exam
- The unauthorised use of a memory stick where a candidate uses a word processor.

Implementation of the Policy

Informing Students

The school will provide the students with the JCQ regulations via the following:

- Class teachers and Tutors have the responsibility to ensure that the students are made aware of the JCQ regulations before they undertake any assessed work which will contribute to their exams.
- At the start of the academic year the Exams Officer will ensure that the updated JCQ regulations are available on the school's website.
- At the start of the academic year the Exams Officer will email to all members of staff the current JCQ regulations relevant to exams with advice that the information must be disseminated to the students.
- All students will be issued with updated JCQ regulations, the warning notice and no mobile phones notice via email or satchel one
- All exam students are issued with an examination rules and regulation booklet for the Summer season.
- All JCQ guidelines linking to students will be made available on the school website

Implementing the assessment practices

- Heads of Department and class teachers have responsibility for implementing assessment practices that reduce the opportunity for malpractice including:
 - Supervised study during which evidence for the examination is produced by the student, for example the supervised controlled assessments/NEA.
 - Ensuring that access controls to the network computers prevent a student accessing other students work or restricted sites. This also prevents students from accessing AI opportunities.
 - Ensuring that the students sign the awarding body authentication forms.
 - Ensure teachers and Heads of Departments are clear about their responsibilities to only authenticate and submit work for assessment to the awarding body that they are confident is the students' own.

Procedure for dealing with allegations of malpractice

Reporting suspected malpractice

All KMA staff have a duty to report any suspected incidences of staff or student malpractice through the appropriate channels.

Equally, allegations of suspected malpractice may be made by the awarding bodies and reported to KMA.

- **Allegations made by KMA staff** – allegations of suspected staff or student malpractice should be submitted to the relevant Head of Department. If the allegation is about the Head of Department the allegation should be submitted to the Principal.
- **Allegations made by the student** – all staff have the responsibility to ensure that any allegation reported to them must be taken seriously and reported through the correct channels.

KMA will consider all allegations that are made verbally but will request in all cases that allegations are put in writing with any supporting evidence that is available.

- **To the Awarding Bodies** – KMA accepts the responsibility to report any suspicion of student or staff malpractice to the appropriate awarding body. The only exception to this relates to malpractice in coursework, controlled assessments/NEA that is discovered prior to the student signing the declaration of authenticity form. In this case the incident will be dealt with internally by KMA.
- In all other instances of suspected malpractice, the Principal will submit the fullest details of the case at the earliest opportunity to the relevant awarding body as per the awarding body preferred method and the Joint Council of Qualifications regulations.

Investigating suspected malpractice

If assessment malpractice is suspected by **KMA staff** there will be an investigation commissioned by the Principal to establish the full facts, circumstances and evidence. The investigation will be under the terms of KMA's Staff Disciplinary Policy because of the seriousness of the matter.

The Principal will nominate an investigating officer however to avoid conflicts of interest investigations will not be conducted by the Head of Department who works with the member of staff.

Any disciplinary investigation will follow the Staff Disciplinary Policy which includes provision for:

- The member of staff to be informed about the concerns and possible consequences
- Possible suspension depending on the circumstances
- The member of staff to be accompanied at any subsequent investigation meetings
- Collection of evidence related to the alleged malpractice
- The review of evidence and production of a report
- A decision to be made on whether or not to proceed to a formal disciplinary hearing
- If necessary, a formal hearing with a right of representation.

Artificial Intelligence – should AI have been used before the declaration has been signed by the student, this will be dealt with by KMA under this policy and by the Head of Department. The awarding body may be contacted for advice.

Possible actions taken by KMA

Following an investigation and hearing in cases where it is believed that there is clear evidence of malpractice

- The appropriate awarding body will be informed via their preferred method by the Principal of KMA of the allegation and supporting evidence provided.
- KMA will take commensurate disciplinary action. There will be a right of appeal against any formal disciplinary warning or dismissal.

In any instance where suspected malpractice is reported to the awarding body KMA will provide the member(s) of staff with a completed copy of the form or letter used to notify the awarding body.

Incidences of **student malpractice** will be investigated in a similar manner by the investigator, nominated by the Principal. As with staff malpractice, potential conflicts of interest will be avoided by nominating an investigating officer who is external to the management of the student or subject.

The investigation will proceed through the following stages:

- The student and their parent/guardian or carer will be informed about the issues, possible consequences and right to appeal
- Evidence related to the alleged malpractice will be collected, this may include witness statements, notes etc.
- The evidence will be reviewed and a report produced
- A formal meeting between the Principal/SLT staff and the student along with their parent/guardian or carer will take place.

Possible Actions taken by KMA

In cases where it is believed that there is clear evidence of malpractice

- The appropriate awarding body will be informed by KMA of the allegation, and they will be given the supporting evidence
- KMA will take internal disciplinary action in line with school policy. The action will be commensurate with the seriousness of the malpractice.

In any instance where suspected malpractice is reported to the awarding body KMA will provide the individual(s) with a completed copy of the form or letter used to notify the awarding body of the malpractice.

Maladministration

Failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of controlled assessments, coursework, non-examined assessments and examinations or malpractice in the conduct of the examinations/assessments and/or the handling of examination papers, candidate scripts, mark sheets, assessment records, results and certificates.

For example

- Failing to ensure that students' coursework to be completed under controlled conditions is appropriately monitored and supervised
- Inappropriate members of staff assessing the students for access arrangements who do not meet the criteria as detailed by the JCQ regulations
- Failure to use current assignments for assessment
- Failure to train invigilators adequately, leading to non-compliance with JCQ regulations
- Failing to issue to students the appropriate notices and warnings
- Failing to post notices relating to the examination or assessment in all rooms (including music and art rooms) when examinations and assessments are being held
- Not ensuring that the examination venue conforms to awarding body requirements

- The introduction of unauthorised materials into the examination room, either during or prior to the exam.
- Failing to ensure that mobile phones are removed from the exam rooms and failing to remind candidates that any phones or unauthorised items found in their possession must be handed to the invigilator prior to the exam starting
- Failing to invigilate in accordance with the JCQ regulations
- Failure to keep accurate records of very late arrivals or overnight supervision arrangements
- Failing to keep accurate and up to date records of access arrangement applications
- Granting access arrangements or special consideration to students that do not meet the requirements set by the JCQ
- Granting access arrangements without approval from the awarding bodies
- Failing to supervise effectively the printing of assignments or exam papers
- Failing to retain the students'-controlled assessment/coursework or non-examined assessment in secure conditions after the authentication statements have been signed
- Failing to maintain the security of the students' scripts prior to dispatch to the awarding body or examiner
- Failing to dispatch the students' scripts/controlled assessment/NEA to the moderators in a timely manner
- Failing to report an instance of suspected malpractice in the exams or assessments to the appropriate awarding body as soon as possible after the incident is discovered
- Failing to conduct a thorough investigation into suspected exam or assessment malpractice when asked to do so by an awarding body
- Exam entries created for students who have not studied the course of entry or had not intended to enter for the June series.