

# Assessment Malpractice and Maladministration Policy (including Plagiarism)



<b>Assessment Malpractice and Maladministration Policy (including Plagiarism)</b>			
<b>Current Status</b>	Operational	<b>Last Review:</b>	October 2025
<b>Responsibility for Review:</b>	Group Quality Manager / Group Head of Exams and SIS Projects	<b>Next Review:</b>	October 2026
<b>Roles Responsible for Review:</b>		<b>Originated:</b>	September 2023
<b>Approved by:</b>	SET Curriculum	<b>Committee:</b>	
<b>Type of Policy:</b>	Staff / Students	<b>Quality Assured by:</b>	Policy Team

## 1. Introduction

1.1 This policy applies to all staff and any other personnel associated with Eastern Education Group (EEG), which includes:

- Abbeygate Sixth Form College
- Chalk Hill Academy
- Duke of Lancaster School
- Exning Primary School
- One Sixth Form College
- Priory School
- Stanton Primary School
- Stone Lodge Academy
- Sunrise Academy
- West Suffolk College (including all PPL centres)

## 1.2 The purposes of the procedures are:

- a) To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or students.
- b) To identify and minimise maladministration by staff.
- c) To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively.
- d) To standardise and record any investigation of malpractice to ensure openness and fairness.
- e) To impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on students or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven.
- f) To define the processes involved in investigating and taking action against students who are suspected of assessment malpractice, that is, seeking or gaining unfair advantage in assessment.

## 1.3 In order to do minimise malpractice, EEG will:

- a) Seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period in colleges or the introduction to an assessment in schools to inform students of the centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice.
- b) Show students the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources, including artificial intelligence (AI) tools.
- c) Train staff in how to spot malpractice in student work, including the use of AI, following the latest guidance from Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ).
- d) Provide staff with up-to-date information and guidance on malpractice and maladministration, following the latest guidance from JCQ.
- e) Make students aware of the internal appeals policy, where applicable.
- f) Ask students to declare that their work is their own where required by the awarding body.
- g) Make the individual fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice or maladministration and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.
- h) Give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.
- i) Inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgment made.
- j) Document all stages of any investigation.

## **2 Definition of Gaining Unfair Advantage - Student**

2.2 The following actions are defined as constituting the gaining of an unfair advantage in the context of the assessment process. This is not an exhaustive list but provides guidance on the main forms of student malpractice:

- a) **Plagiarism** - The presentation by a student, as their own work, material which is wholly or partially the work of another, either in concept or expression, without acknowledgement of source through the correct use of quotations, references and a bibliography. It can take several forms, including:
  - directly copying another person's work, for example from the internet, a book, another student's assignment; the work may include text, statistics, figures, photographs, pictures, diagrams etc.
  - paraphrasing another person's work
  - cutting and pasting together sections of the work of others into a new whole
  - receiving material help from other people while producing an assignment, without express permission or instruction from a teacher.

- Using AI to generate work where this is not permitted by the specification or and not acknowledging AI as a source where it is not prohibited by the specification.
- b) Seeking to obtain / obtaining access to examination papers prior to the commencement of the examination process.
- c) Any infringement of EEG's procedures for the conduct of written examinations, including failure to comply with invigilator's instructions.
- d) Offering a bribe or other inducement to any person connected with the assessment process.
- e) Being party to an arrangement whereby a person, other than the named student to be assessed, fraudulently represents them in that assessment.
- f) Any other arrangement intended to gain unfair advantage.
- g) Collusion by working collaboratively with other students to produce work that is submitted as individual student work which contravenes published guidance. (Students should not be discouraged from teamwork, but mechanisms for making this explicit must be made clear to the student.)
- h) Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment, examination or test.
- i) Fabrication of results or evidence relating to an assessment.
- j) Introduction or use of unauthorized material contra to the requirements of a supervised assessment, examination or test conditions, for example: notes, study guides, personal organisers, calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited), personal stereos, mobile phones or other similar electronic devices.
- k) Obtaining, receiving, exchanging or passing on information which could be assessment, examination or test related (or the attempt to) by means of talking or written papers during supervised assessment, examination, or test conditions.
- l) Behaving in such a way as to undermine the integrity of the assessment, examination or test.
- m) The alteration of any results document, including certificates.

## **2.3 Action to be taken when a student is suspect of malpractice in written examinations**

- 2.3.1 Where an invigilator suspects a student of infringing EEG's procedures for the conduct of written examinations, the following action should be taken, if possible, in the presence of another invigilator to act as a witness.
- a) Confiscate any unauthorised material in the student's possession.

- b) Inform the Exams officer/team immediately via the floating invigilator. The exams officer will determine if immediate action is required and be available to speak to the candidate during or at the end of the examination. The exams officer will speak with the student accompanied by a member of senior staff. Note: brief details of the incident in the invigilator's report and draw the incident to the attention of the Examinations Officer.
- c) The Examinations Officer shall be responsible for notifying the appropriate senior managers, as well as the awarding bodies.
- d) EEG will follow the requirements from the awarding bodies on how to proceed with each incident, including any required investigations or sanctions.
- e) Where appropriate the Examinations Officer will communicate the incident, procedure and potential outcomes with any relevant stakeholders (such as a students' parent, guardian or carer).

#### **2.4 Action to be taken when a student is suspect of malpractice in all other forms of assessment**

- 2.4.1 Where an assessor suspects a student has acted in a way that would gain unfair advantage and a student has not signed a declaration, this will be handled under the relevant student disciplinary/behaviour policy. The student will forfeit this submission, and a resubmission should be made in accordance with the awarding body guidance.
- 2.4.2 Where an assessor suspects a student has acted in a way that would gain unfair advantage and a student has already signed a declaration, the assessor will:
  - a) Endorse the student's work or mark sheet (as appropriate) with a note detailing the nature of the suspected infringement.
  - b) Raise the suspicion with the centre's exams team and EEG's quality team ([EEGQuality@easterneducationgroup.ac.uk](mailto:EEGQuality@easterneducationgroup.ac.uk)). They will then liaise to report the suspected infringement to the awarding bodies, including the gathering of any evidence required for the initial report.
  - c) EEG will follow the requirements from the awarding bodies on how to proceed with each incident, including any required investigations or sanctions.
  - d) Where appropriate the quality team will communicate the incident, procedure and potential outcomes with any relevant stakeholders (such as a students' parent, guardian or carer).

### **3 Definition of Malpractice by Staff**

- 3.2.1 This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by the centre at its discretion:

- a) **Breach of security** - Any act which breaks the confidentiality of question papers or materials, and their electronic equivalents, or the confidentiality of candidates' scripts or their electronic equivalents.
- b) **Deception** – Any act of dishonesty in relation to an examination or assessment including, but not limited to:
  - inventing or changing marks for internally-assessed components (e.g. non-examination assessments) where there is no actual evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks awarded;
  - manufacturing evidence of competence against national standards;
  - fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements;
  - entering fictitious candidates for examinations or assessments, or otherwise subverting the assessment or certification process with the intention of financial gain (fraud);
  - substituting one candidate's controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment for another's;
  - providing misleading or inaccurate information to an awarding body, candidates and/or parents.
- c) **Improper assistance to candidates** - Any act where assistance is given beyond that permitted by the specification or regulations to a candidate or group of candidates which results in a potential or actual advantage in an examination or assessment.
- d) **Failure to co-operate with an investigation**

## **4 Definition of Maladministration by Staff**

- 4.1 Failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of controlled assessments, coursework, examinations and non-examination assessments, or malpractice in the conduct of examinations/assessments and/or the handling of examination question papers, candidate scripts, mark sheets, cumulative assessment records, results and/or certificate claim forms, etc.

For example:

- failing to ensure that candidates' controlled assessment, coursework, non-examination assessment or work to be completed under controlled conditions is adequately completed and/or monitored and/or supervised;
- Failure, on the part of the head of centre, to adhere to awarding body specification requirements in the delivery of non-examination assessments, Endorsements and other projects required as part of a qualification. These include the GCSE Computer Science Programming Project, GCSE English Language Spoken Language Endorsement and/or the GCE A level Biology, Chemistry, Geology and Physics Practical Skills Endorsement;

- failing to adhere to awarding body key dates and deadlines relating to the delivery of examinations and assessments (such as those relating to the return of scripts, reporting of internal assessment marks/grades, making entries/claims, and Head of Centre Declarations);
- inappropriate members of staff assessing candidates for access arrangements who do not meet the criteria detailed within Chapter 7 of the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments;
- failure to use the correct tasks/assignments for assessments;
- failing to ensure that artificial intelligence is not the sole means of marking candidates' work;
- failure to train invigilators and those facilitating access arrangements adequately, e.g. readers and scribes, leading to non-compliance with the JCQ documents;
- failing to issue to candidates the appropriate notices and warnings, e.g. JCQ Information for candidates documents;
- failure to inform the JCQ Centre Inspection Service of alternative sites for examinations;
- failing to post notices relating to the examination or assessment outside all rooms (including Music and Art rooms) where examinations and assessments are held;
- not ensuring that the examination venue conforms to the requirements stipulated in the JCQ document Instructions for conducting examinations;
- failing to prevent the introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room, either prior to or during the examination (NB this precludes the use of the examination room to coach candidates or give subject-specific presentations, including PowerPoint presentations, prior to the start of the examination);
- failing to remind candidates that any mobile phones or other unauthorised items found in their possession must be handed to the invigilator prior to the examination starting;
- failure to invigilate examinations in accordance with the JCQ document Instructions for conducting examinations;
- failure to have on file for inspection purposes accurate records relating to overnight supervision arrangements;
- failure to have in place a malpractice policy;
- failure to have on file for inspection purposes appropriate evidence, as per the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments, to substantiate approved access arrangements processed electronically using the Access arrangements online system;

- granting access arrangements to candidates who do not meet the requirements of the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments;
- granting access arrangements to candidates where prior approval has not been obtained from the Access arrangements online system or, in the case of a more complex arrangement, from an awarding body;
- failure to provide the correct access arrangements to candidates where approval has been granted;
- failure to supervise effectively the printing of computer-based assignments when this is required;
- failing to retain candidates' controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments securely after the authentication statements have been signed or the work has been marked;
- failing to maintain the security of candidate scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body or examiner;
- failing to despatch candidates' scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments to the awarding bodies, examiners or moderators in a timely way;
- failing to notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice;
- failing to conduct a thorough investigation into suspected examination or assessment malpractice when asked to do so by an awarding body;
- breaching the published arrangements for the release of examination results;
- inappropriate retention or destruction of certificates;
- failing to recruit learners with integrity, including the recruitment of learners who have not met the qualification's minimum entry requirements wherever stipulated and/or the recruitment of learners who are unable or otherwise unlikely to complete the qualification;
- failing to ensure that, where candidates are producing work for assessments which are not completed under examination conditions, teaching staff check that the assessment tasks being completed and the approach candidates are taking are appropriate, giving due consideration to ethical standards and the centre's safeguarding responsibilities.

## **5 Action to be taken when staff are suspected of malpractice/maladministration**

- 5.2 All suspected malpractice by centre staff must be reported to the relevant awarding body immediately before any further action is taken, in accordance with the JCQ guidance. The awarding body will authorise any investigation that may need to take place.



- 5.3 Where malpractice against a member of staff is proven, the EEG - Staff Code of Conduct and Behaviour Policy will be applied and where the offence constitutes gross misconduct this could result in dismissal.

## **6 Safeguarding and wellbeing**

- 6.2 EEG takes the wellbeing of both students and staff seriously. Where possible, the EEG will follow the principles outlined in Appendix 11 of the [JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures](#).

### **Revision History – Assessment Malpractice Policy**

<b>Revision date</b>	<b>Reason for revision</b>	<b>Section number</b>	<b>Changes made</b>
November 2020	Review	Details box	Change title of person responsible for review.
		Throughout	References to the college have all been updated to refer to the trust.
September 2021	Annual Review	Rubik	Change reviewer to Quality Manager
		5.1.1.	Update chair of review to Quality Manager
		7.1 and 7.3	Update chair to Head of Centre
November 2022	Annual Review		Dates amended - No other changes
October 2023	Annual review	Throughout	OSFC & ASFC Policies merged to form EEGT version
		1.2, 1.2b, 1.2c, 1.2 d	Wording changed in section heading, clause 1.2 b) clarified 1.2 C) additional clause on AI added. 1.2 D) change of policy title
		2.1 a)	Definition of plagiarism adjusted to include examples
		4	Wording of section heading adjusted to include reference to students
		Old sections 5 now 4.3	Numbering adjusted
		Section 5	Wording of section heading adjusted to include reference to students
		Section 7	New section added on actions if staff malpractice



**Assessment Malpractice and  
maladministration Policy (including  
Plagiarism)**



October 2025	Bi-Annual Review	Throughout	The document has undergone a substantial rewrite to reflect the changes in the JCQ regulations and to merge malpractice, plagiarism and maladministration policies into a single comprehensive document. The policy has also been reworked to apply across regulated qualifications in DfE funded provision across the group.
--------------	------------------	------------	---