



MALPRACTICE and MALADMINISTRATION POLICY
DORIN PARK SCHOOL
(Exams/Assessments Suite)

REVIEWED: Senior Leadership Team

DATE: AUTUMN 2025

NEXT REVIEW DATE: AUTUMN 2026

This document is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

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 and also regarding examinations invigilated by staff at the school and marked externally.

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

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 or go to the toilet unsupervised
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place.

Staff Malpractice Procedure

Investigations into allegations will be instructed by [the Headteacher](#), who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out within **10** working days. The person responsible for coordinating the investigation will be [a member of the Senior Leadership Team](#) and 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, 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, **Dorin Park School** may impose the following sanctions:

- 1) **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
- 2) **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
- 3) **Special conditions:** Impose special conditions on the future involvement in assessments by the member of staff
- 4) **Suspension:** Bar the member of staff in all involvement in the administration of assessments for a set period of time
- 5) **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.

Candidate Malpractice Policy

Introduction

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding candidate malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications and also regarding examinations marked externally.

Examples of 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 off as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another person's work, including the improper use of the internet and Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools. (See [Appendix 2: Artificial Intelligence \(AI\)](#)).
- 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. If the candidate accepts that malpractice has occurred, he/she will be given the opportunity to repeat the assignment. If found guilty of malpractice following an investigation, the teacher may decide to re-mark previous assignments and these could also be rejected if similar concerns are identified.

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 a teacher suspects a candidate of malpractice during an examination, 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. If the candidate is found guilty of malpractice, the Awarding Body will be informed and the candidate's examination paper will be withdrawn. It is unlikely that the candidate will have the opportunity to repeat the examination.

Appeals

In the event that a malpractice decision is made, which the candidate feels is unfair, the candidate has the right to appeal in line with the [Complaints Policy](#).

Preventing Malpractice: Informing and Advising Candidates

Teaching staff inform and advise candidates to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessment. This is done within classes at the start of, and throughout, courses.

A copy of this policy is available to all candidates on our school website's examinations page.

Maladministration Policy

Introduction

Maladministration is any activity or practice which results in non-compliance with administrative regulations and requirements and includes the application of persistent mistakes or poor administration within a centre (e.g., inappropriate learner records).

Examples of Maladministration

The categories listed below are examples of centre and learner maladministration. This list is not exhaustive:

- Persistent failure to adhere to learner registration and certification procedures
- Persistent failure to adhere to centre recognition and/or qualification requirements and/or associated actions assigned to the centre
- Late learner registrations (both infrequent and persistent)
- Unreasonable delays in responding to requests and/or communications
- Inaccurate claim for results and/or certificates
- Failure to maintain appropriate auditable records, e.g., certification claims and/or forgery of evidence
- Withholding of information, by deliberate act or omission, which is required to assure the awarding body the centre's ability to deliver qualifications appropriately

Maladministration mitigations

Entries: Delivery and entries are discussed and agreed early in the academic year between SLT, delivery staff and the Exams Officer. The Exams Officer then makes the entries.

Communications: The Exams Officer forwards relevant awarding body information, requests and actions to appropriate centre staff and works with them to meet the awarding body's requirements in a timely manner.

Claims: What is to be claimed is first confirmed between SLT, delivery staff and the Exams Officer. The Exams Officer then makes the claims.

Appendix 1: ASDAN Notes

Dorin Park School will adhere to its responsibilities as outlined in ASDAN's *Malpractice and Maladministration Policy and Procedure*, section 2.5.

Dorin Park School will adhere to its responsibilities as outlined in ASDAN's *Retention of Assessment Materials Policy*.

Appendix 2: Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools are now widespread and easy to access. Staff, pupils and parents/carers may be familiar with generative chatbots such as ChatGPT and Google Bard. **Dorin Park School** recognises that AI has many uses to help pupils learn, but may also lend itself to cheating and plagiarism.

Pupils may not use AI tools:

- During assessments, including internal and external assessments, and coursework
- To write their homework or class assignments, where AI-generated text is presented as their own work

Pupils may use AI tools:

- As a research tool to help them find out about new topics and ideas
- When specifically studying and discussing AI in schoolwork, for example in IT lessons or art homework about AI-generated images. All AI-generated content must be properly attributed
- Where a pupil uses an AI tool, the pupil should retain a copy of the question(s) asked and the AI-generated responses. Pupils must submit this along with the assessment.

Staff should:

- Be aware that AI tools are still being developed and should use such tools with caution as they may provide inaccurate, inappropriate or biased content
- Make students aware of the risks of using AI tools and that they need to appropriately reference AI as a source of information to maintain the integrity of assessments

For more information on AI misuse, see JCQ's *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*. Any misuse of AI tools may be treated as malpractice.