# Assessment & Verification Policy

| Version: | 3 |
|---|---|
| New or Replacement: | Replacement |
| Approved by: | SLT |
| Date approved: | 20 June 2022 |
| Effective date: | September 2022 |
| Author: | Deputy Principal Curriculum & Quality |
| Responsible Committee: | SLT |
| Corporation Committee (if applicable): | |
| Date of next review: | June 2024 |
| Equality Impact Assessment Date: | |
| Lead responsibility: | |
| Policy Category: | Quality |

# 1. Purpose

The Assessment and Verification Policy is designed to ensure that all employees are aware of and compliant with all aspects of assessment and verification.  As a result of this policy all our learners will experience timely, accurate and fair assessment which is underpinned by robust verification processes and outcomes.

# 2. Scope

This policy applies to all teachers, trainers, assessors, verifiers, learning support staff and learners and apprentices within the organisation.  The policy aims to:

- To provide assurance about the quality of assessment and verification/moderation
- To support excellence in teaching, learning, assessment and verification/moderation
- To support teachers' ambitions to improve their approaches to assessment and verification/ moderation and meet awarding body standards
- To focus on the process of raising standards in assessment and verification/moderation
- To maintain the integrity of assessment judgements and provide support for improvement in raising standards of assessment and internal verification/moderation
- To support an inclusive approach by identifying and enabling the sharing of good practice across curriculum teams
- To support an inclusive approach by enabling learners to make a formal appeal against an assessment decision

The policy as covers:

- Assessment
- Internal Quality Assurance
- Appeals
- Academic Misconduct (Learners)
- Academic Malpractice (Staff)

# 3. Assessment

The College recognises that assessment is an integral aspect of effective teaching and learning and takes seriously its responsibility for ensuring the quality and reliability of assessment, marking and feedback practices.

- This policy covers all internal and external assessments and matters relating to assessment.
- Outcomes from assessment may be to support and guide learning (initial, diagnostic and formative) or provide a measure of achievement of a learning objective (summative) or both[1].
- Whatever the type or purpose, learners are entitled to assessment, marking and feedback practices that:
  - Inform learners of their individual progress
  - Maximise the chances of successful learner outcomes

---

[1] *See Appendix 1 – Formative and Summative Assessment*

- o Comply with the requirements, instructions, guidelines and quality standards of awarding and/or validation organisations
- o Are fair and open, in line with the College Equality, Diversity & Inclusivity Policy.
- o Provide learners with appropriately timed assessments and an overview of the schedule of these at the start of each academic year
- o Provide learners with a range of appropriate methods for assessment
- o Provide learners with a clear procedure for submitting/re-submitting work and the consequences of not meetings deadlines in line with awarding organisation regulations
- o Provide timely constructive feedback using clear, fair systems of marking to support and enhance the development of learners' knowledge, skills and understanding
- o Record and monitor achievements towards objectives and qualifications using Markbook, One File, etc. (or similar) to ensure that learners are able to monitor their own progress via the Learner Portal, or in the case of off-site delivery at Progress Reviews or e-portfolios.
- o Include regular verification/moderation throughout the year in addition to a minimum of two standardisation sessions every year (at the beginning of Terms 1 & 2)
- o Standardisation of assessment and academic standards should be a standing item on curriculum team meetings.
- o Include a procedure for dealing with failure to follow regulations and academic misconduct, including plagiarism and collusion
- o Provide learners with knowledge of the Appeals Procedure in the event of a disagreement concerning an assessment decision
- o Ensure learners are made aware of all their assessment related entitlements via course handbooks at the start of each academic year.

## 3.1 Working practices to support these principles

Assessment practice must demonstrate:

- **Authenticity** to ensure that the evidence for assessment is the learner's own work.
- **Validity** relevant to the criteria against which the evidence is being assessed.
- **Sufficiency** there is enough evidence to cover all learning outcomes as specified in the evidence requirements and assessment strategy
- **Reliability** of the assessment result; it must be replicable and consistent either under different circumstances or with a different assessor
- **Fairness** ensure that everyone has an equal chance of getting an accurate assessment
- **Safety** this covers both physical and psychological. It also covers ensuring that evidence is sufficiently robust to make a reliable judgement about the learner's ability to meet the assessment criteria.
- **Inclusiveness** in its design and implementation to allow all learners to achieve, by using a range of assessment methods.  A state of fair treatment that is right for all people regardless of their culture, ability, gender, race, religion, wealth or sexual orientation.

## 3.2 Monitoring and evaluation:

- The arrangements for assessment/verification sit within the curriculum in the first instance, with monitoring and reporting of any awarding body blocks or actions being notified to the relevant Assistant Principal and Quality Team.

- It is the responsibility of line managers/internal verifiers.to ensure that any new staff are inducted to awarding body procedures promptly and prior to teaching and assessment[2]
- Integration of external verifier recommendations into the College quality cycle will be achieved by the circulation of SV/EQA reports and action plans to all relevant assessors/verifiers.
- Resulting changes to processes to meet the College/awarding organisation's quality standards will be embedded in future practice.

### 3.3    Induction and preparation

All learners must receive:

- A initial assessment which may include a diagnostic test if appropriate to ensure that they have the skills and knowledge to operate at the level of the qualification resulting in full achievement.
- A full induction to the College and the course requirements, including guidance on plagiarism, referencing
- A course handbook giving learners information on assessment, verification, malpractice and appeals processes and details of the qualifying standards
- A planned calendar/schedule of assessments for the year to ensure an even distribution of workload according to reasonable deadlines and dates
- A clear written statement of what learners need to do to achieve particular grades.
- Clear information about support they are entitled to before an assessment is completed and after it is returned.
- Information about re-assessment opportunities
- Their awarding body registration details

### 3.4    Setting Assessments

- Practical Assessments must be planned by the member of staff carrying out the assessment and appropriate notice given to learners.
- Learners must be fully prepared to undertake the practical assessment having ensured that all the performance criteria can be met and achieved.
- All written assignments will be issued with submission deadlines.  Deadlines may only be modified in exceptional circumstances at the discretion of the Programme Lead/ Deputy or Head of Curriculum and in accordance with Awarding Body requirements.
- If applicable, penalties for late submission must be explicitly stated in the assessment and grading criteria (dependant on Awarding Body regulations).

### 3.5    Assessment & Feedback

- Assessment/Marking is taken to be allocation of points, marks or grades to indicate the quality and accuracy of learners' work, and feedback is the commentary which guides the learners' progress.
- Feedback usually accompanies marking but is also part of a routine discussion during learning when marking may not be involved.

---

[2] *See Appendix 2 – Roles & Responsibilities*

- Assessment/marking and/or feedback are important because they:
  - Significantly affect learner progress
  - Lead to or sustain an agreed course of action by the learner
  - Aid learner retention, as part of a continuing experience of recognition and reward
  - Conform to standards agreed within the course team and are understood by learners
  - Are often parts of one integrated process (highlighted in the Principles of Assessment)

They can be:

- In written or verbal forms, which are commonly integrated in best practice
- May be presented through various learning activities and in various situations, for example in the field, workplace, classroom, workshop, laboratory, studio or salon, etc.

### 3.6    Assessment/Marking

Learners can expect that assessment/marking:

- Where practicable, will be guided self-marking, to encourage reflection on what contributes to successful learning
- Clearly defined assessment/grading criteria, as devised by the awarding body (or the College), to ensure that teachers/trainers and learners are aware of the requirements of the assessment.
- A clear mark scheme so learners can understand how their marks or grades have been arrived at, in accordance with awarding body (College) assessment/grading criteria
- Highlights (annotates) what has been done well within an assignment using assessment criteria, comments or signs that are consistent and understood by them
- Conforms where required, with awarding-body regulations (on assessment, deadlines, late submissions, re-submissions, claims against assessment, etc.)
- Is valid, accurate and fair, supported by standardisation and/or by internal verification, as appropriate
- To be applied to work that is set and returned to learners no more than 10 College working days after the deadline
- Will help them progress by 'bite-size' stages to lengthier or complex tasks, key assessments or examinations
- Uses a variety of relevant assessment methods (e.g. timed exercises, workbooks, orals, performance, experiments, presentations, ILT formats, etc.) for which they will receive adequate training
- Will provide stretch and challenge for all learners and opportunities for support where required
- Will indicate, where appropriate, further attempts or alternative exercises to enable a successful outcome
- Will support differentiation, where possible, so that learners are challenged according to varying abilities, stages in learning and preferred learning styles.
- Supports where possible the development of functional and employability skills

### 3.7 Feedback

Learners can expect that feedback:

- Will be provided in a timely fashion (within a maximum of 10 College working days from the deadline)
- Is clearly linked to learning outcomes
- Matches their individual needs, that relates, where possible, to their Individual Learning Plans, personal targets, progress reviews, etc.
- Provides, from the start of the course, regular stimulus in reaching targets and supports progress monitoring
- To be clearly written, plain, and concise
- That builds on what has gone before
- That is relevant, useful and supports them in taking progressive approach to their studies
- Will encourage them to embrace good standards and pride in their work
- That provides 'medal and mission', i.e. specific praise (medal) for what is done well and incentive (mission) for further learning, as well as constructive correction
- That supports equality of opportunity (gender, age, ability, ethnicity)
- That clarifies why marks/grades are allocated or withheld
- That guides the learner to action, exemplars and sources of information, as required
- That guides the learner in developing their literacy and/or numeracy skills, as required
- That is recorded for learner and lecturer so that progress can be monitored
- That is expressed in appropriate forms, e.g. written comments at end; feedback sheets; log-book; Google Classroom for group-feedback; individual e-mail, etc.
- That incorporates opportunities for reflection and self-analysis (e.g. on feedback sheet)
- That only occasionally takes the form of group feedback, providing the same advice for all (Individual comment is shown to be more effective; a mix may be a good compromise)
- That uses vocational or academic terms, which are useful to the learner's development
- That is presented with regard for the learner's situation, e.g. in class, in private tutorial, in the workplace, at home (on-line)
- That is combined, where possible, with oral feedback to gives learners an opportunity to discuss, raise questions, self-assess, etc.

In common good practice, learners can expect verbal (oral) feedback to:

- Conform with the statements above, for written feedback, as appropriate
- Take place in a suitable environment (not overheard, as appropriate, etc.)
- Include open questions
- Encourage them to raise points and express evaluations
- Be recorded, as appropriate, in the learner's log-book, action plan or similar
- Relate to the learner's current or recent activity in the workplace, class, workshop

Assessors are required to ensure that feedback to learners of assessed evidence involving summative assessments, where a re-submission/retake by the learner is permitted/required to achieve the assessment criteria, is in accordance with the Awarding Body/Organisation's guidelines on Feedback.

In some cases, this may be limited to indicating which assessment/grading criteria was achieved/not achieved with general guidance as to where learners may obtain the resources to prepare their re-submission/retake.

However, specific instructions on how to improve their assessments may in some cases not be permissible and may constitute "coaching" or "polishing", which would be in breach of some Awarding Body/Organisation's guidelines and is to be avoided. Assessors/IQAs need to familiarise themselves with the relevant Awarding Body/Organisation's guidelines on feedback prior to assessment.

### 3.8    External Assessments (Exams)

- Formative assessment tasks must be planned according to the scheme of work and set regularly to help learners succeed in the summative assessments required to achieve their qualification.
- Standardisation and verification schedules must be planned to demonstrate consistency across curriculum teams, campuses, and in the case of off-site delivery across the programme.
- On-line or Awarding Body paper-based assessment, examination and resits must be administered, conducted and marked using Awarding Body criteria on the given dates, conditions and timings, etc.
- Assessors must ensure that they do not invigilate their own learners during an examination and any exam must be conducted in line with JCQ guidelines[3].
- The Exams Office must be included in the planning of any proposed on-line or externally set assessment of the date, the title of the examination, list of learners taking the exam, room number, invigilator and the teacher/assessor, etc.

### 3.9    Progression on multiple year programmes

- All learners on multiple year programmes with assessed units/projects must be completed before the commencement of the following year of the course unless there are exceptional circumstances to be considered.
- This includes timely completion deadlines on Apprenticeship frameworks. Learners not completing all compulsory first year units may be required to repeat the first year of the course or submit work as an external candidate, and will be required to pay External Candidate Re-Submission Fees.

### 3.10    Other considerations

Any specific requirements of Awarding Bodies regarding assessment not covered by this policy must be adhered to at all times.

## 4.    Internal Quality Assurance (IQA)

- Any qualification with an element of internal assessment is subject to internal verification or moderation.  This activity must not be seen as something that takes

---

[3] *(See:* www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office*)*

place at the end of a course, but should take place at appropriate stages during the course in accordance with the following principles:

- Internal quality assurance is the quality system used to monitor assessment practice and decisions, to ensure that assessment is consistent across the programme; assessment instruments are fit for purpose; and assessment decisions accurately match learner work to the unit assessment criteria.
- Internal verification/moderation is a central part of the quality assurance, improvement and enhancement systems of the College and the internal verifier/moderator is 'at the heart' of leading these processes.
- Internal verification/moderation is much more than a checking mechanism for assessment decisions. Properly organised and implemented, it is the primary method of ensuring that courses operate effectively and in accordance with national standards.
- Effective verification/moderation guarantees the levels of accuracy, fairness, reliability, validity and authenticity in the assessment process and thereby embeds both rigour and quality in the course structure.
- The system for internal verification/moderation is set within the quality assurance framework of the College, where the primary responsibility for the quality of delivery and assessment rests with the Head & Deputy Head of Curriculum. Cross-College systems support the internal verifier/moderator in this context by, for example, helping to standardise documentation and levels between courses.
- Curriculum Areas' approach to internal verification/moderation is closely aligned to the expectations of the relevant awarding body/organisation from whom we follow up-to-date guidance at all times. Where there is any discrepancy between this policy and the awarding body/organisation regulations regarding Internal Quality Assurance, the awarding body/organisation regulations shall take precedence.

- Each qualification will have its own strategy devised in accordance with the requirements of the relevant awarding body, using the awarding body quality assurance documentation (where provided). For clarity, the term Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) will be deemed to include Internal Verification (IV) and Internal Moderation (IM) when referring to the College's internal quality assurance procedures.
- Each course should have a Lead IQA or Lead IV with responsibilities for co-ordinating the internal verification activities and arrangements for that qualification.

### 4.1 Monitoring and evaluation:

- The arrangements for assessment/verification and EQA activities sit within the curriculum in the first instance, with monitoring and reporting of any awarding body blocks or actions being notified to the Quality Team or other appointed team member.
- It is the responsibility of line managers/internal verifiers.to ensure that any new staff are inducted to College and awarding body quality assurance procedures promptly and prior to teaching and assessment[4]
- Integration of external verifier recommendations into the College quality cycle will be achieved by the circulation of EQA reports and action plans to all relevant assessors/verifiers.
- Resulting changes to processes to meet the College/awarding organisation's quality standards will be embedded in future practice.

---

[4] *See Appendix 2 – Roles & Responsibilities*

### 4.2    BTEC

In order to gain Lead Internal Verifier accreditation an online standardisation exercise using their OSCA platform, accessed via Edexcel Online. OCSA must be completed by the send of September.

### 4.3    Requirements for Assessors (NVQ only)

Those making assessment decisions must have the necessary expertise and qualifications to do so. Assessors must adhere to the QCA NVQ Code of Practice[5] and the quality assurance standards as specified by the awarding body/organisation for that qualification.

All those who assess NVQ qualifications must:

- already hold the qualification they are assessing (or a recognised equivalent)
- have up-to-date working knowledge and experience of best practice in assessment and quality assurance for that qualification;
- hold one of the following qualifications or their recognised equivalent:
  - Level 3 Award in Assessing Competence in the Work Environment (QCF); or
  - Level 3 Certificate in Assessing Vocational Achievement (QCF); or
  - A1 Assess candidate performance using a range of methods; or
  - D32 Assess candidate performance and D33 Assess candidate using differing sources of evidence; and
- show current evidence of continuing professional development in assessment and quality assurance.

### 4.4    Requirements for Internal Quality Assurance (NVQ only)

All those who are involved with the quality assurance of these qualifications internally must, in addition to the above:

- hold one of the following internal quality assurance qualifications or their recognised equivalent:
  - Level 4 Award in Internal Quality Assurance of Assessment Processes and Practice (QCF);or
  - Level 4 Certificate in Leading the Internal Quality Assurance of Assessment Processes and Practice (QCF);or
  - V1 Conduct internal quality assurance of the assessment process; or
  - D34 Internally verify the assessment process

### 4.5    Elements to the IQA (IV/IM) process

There are two elements to the IQA (IV/IM) process:

---

[5] *Please note that although the QCA NVQ Code of Practice has been withdrawn, the College continues to follow the guidelines as applies to Assessment and Internal Verification. For further details see:*
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/371279/2006-12-15-qca-06-2888_nvq_code_of_practice_r06.pdf

1. **Verification of Assignment Briefs (where applicable)** [6]
   All assignment briefs must be verified before being issued to learners to ensure that they are 'fit for purpose'. The IQA will use appropriate forms to provide the assessor with feedback on the assignment. Any remedial action must be completed and signed off before the form is filed in the course quality file and the assignment brief is handed out to the learners.

2. **Verification of Learners' Assessed Work**
   At the beginning of the programme the Lead IQA will complete a sampling plan the IV plan is a working document and is used to plan and record IV activity. The IQA will provide written feedback to assessors using an appropriate recording document and action plan as necessary. Any remedial action must be completed and signed off before the form is filed in the course quality file.

## 4.6    Sampling & Standardisation

- Another useful way of ensuring that assessment decisions are fair, authentic, valid and reliable is through standardisation. Standardisation involves reviewing assessment and verification decisions with the course team or teams from other related courses. Before verification of learners' assessed work, curriculum teams must ensure they conduct regular standardisation meetings of assessment and marked work at team meetings or as separate meetings to support good practice in assessment. This should be a minimum of twice per year and should take place at the beginning of each term.

- In checking the evidence of learners' competence, it is also the IQA's responsibility to become familiar with the ways in which assessments are carried out on the course. This will often mean identifying both strengths and weaknesses within the assessment practice and then planning any necessary development in light of this. In practice, this means studying the evidence of competence submitted by the assessment team. This may involve a close inspection of a number of assignments or portfolios. It might also include observation of assessed activities and of other situations from which evidence of competence is derived.

- IQAs are not required to sift through every last piece of evidence or to double mark. At the beginning of each course, the Lead IQA should work with the Assessment Team to devise a sampling plan based on the agreed sampling strategy and a standardised approach to verification for each qualification.

- In selecting the make-up of a sample, the following principles should be considered:
  - check assessment decisions for every assessor in any given period using a risk-based approach, e.g. sample more decisions for inexperienced team members; new units; low achieving units; units where there have been External Quality Assurance (EQA) issues previously, etc.
  - all new or trainee assessors must be sampled within eight weeks of starting the assessment process with candidates
  - increases in sampling should be identified where the risks to compliance are identified by the IQA and documented on the sampling plan
  - sample a full range of assessment methods and evidence types
  - ensure that every unit is sampled
  - ensure that every learner is sampled

---

[6] *Note: For Quality Assurance documentation, please refer to the Quality page on the Staff Portal*

- o check a range of assessment decisions e.g. pass, merit, distinction and referrals (where such grading is used)
- o check borderline grades/decisions
- o ensure that any awarding body requirements are implemented
- o sample across all assessment sites where the qualification is being delivered
- o sample all assessors where delivery of a unit is split between more than one assessor
- o the strategy must include a minimum of one interim and one final sample on all assessors and dates for sampling should be agreed in advance to meet requirements
- o completed IV sampling reports should include feedback to the assessor on the assessment process and when actions are set these must be followed up to ensure completion
- o concerns about the assessment process or appeals from candidates must be documented and copied to the EQA for the qualification
- o where an assessor does not comply with an IQA request for action then the non-compliance procedure should be activated immediately so that a candidate is not disadvantaged (see Non-Compliance below)
- o IQAs should carry out observations of assessment practice annually and interview a sample of candidates, especially with NVQ courses
- o there must be a clear trail of IV activity that can be audited by external verifiers throughout assessment records
- o completed IQA records must be archived as stipulated by the awarding body.
- o the Lead IQA should collate all sampling plans and sample a range of IQA reports to ensure the strategy is being met and that assessors are adequately supported by IQAs.

## 4.7   Retention of Learner Evidence and Assessment Records

Heads or Deputy Head  of Curriculum must ensure that original learner evidence, assessment records and quality assurance documentation must be kept current, safe and secure and made available upon request after certification of learners, in accordance with the conditions and durations as specified in the Awarding Body/Organisation Quality Assurance requirements.

## 4.8   Non-Compliance
- If an assessor fails to comply with an IQA request for action following a sampling activity this may disadvantage a candidate and risks sanctions being imposed by the awarding body.
- Any assessor identified in an external moderation or verification report as needing to improve his/her practice should immediately be dealt with under Stage 2 (see below).
- The IQA records must include a record of the action taken in relation to a non-compliant assessor including dates and follow-up findings.

## 4.8.1   Stage 1
If the assessor fails to comply with IQA feedback within the required time frame the IQA should:

- increase the frequency/volume of the sampling process
- keep detailed, dated records of all feedback and support to the assessor
- inform the Heads or Deputy Head  of Curriculum of concerns and agree actions to be

taken

### 4.8.2  Stage 2
- Continued non-compliance will result in a meeting held with the assessor, IQA and Heads or Deputy Head of Curriculum to clarify issues with the assessor's practice and what action is required to ensure compliance.
- The Manager will write formally to the assessor outlining the discussion; the support proposed; and details of action the assessor must take to become compliant.

### 4.8.3  Stage 3
- If the next monitoring activity following receipt of the formal letter shows the IQA that there has been no improvement, they should inform the Assistant Principal who will request support from Human Resources to advise on the College's Disciplinary and Performance procedure.
- The Heads or Deputy Head of Curriculum will instruct the assessor to carry out no further assessment and will allocate an alternative assessor to the candidates affected in order to ensure that the candidates' access to fair assessment and opportunities for achievement are maintained.
- The IQA should forward details of any further feedback, training and support given to the assessor to the Heads or Deputy Head of Curriculum.  The relevant manager should inform the EQA of any pending action.

### 4.9  Monitoring of External Quality Assurance Reports (EQA)
- The system of EQA and moderation applies to the vast majority of the courses that the College delivers.  Awarding Bodies will have a variety of names for the people that carry out their External Quality Assurance (EQA) e.g. Standards Verifiers, External Verifiers External Examiners, External Moderators, External Quality Assurers, etc. yet they all have a dual role: they assess the accuracy and consistency of assessors' and internal verifiers' decisions as well as supporting the assessment team.

- External Quality Assurance visits and reports generated from these activities are an important source of evidence showing the level of quality our courses have attained and are useful instruments for improving the quality of provision across the College as a whole. It is important that these reports are used to improve the quality of our delivery and inform the progress of those courses.  They need to both inform the process of self-assessment and be the subject of an action plan in their own right.
- The EQA report and its action plan is one of the key sources of evidence for the Course In-Year Review Process and the end-of-year SAR (Self-Assessment Review).

### 4.10  External Quality Assurance Procedures
- Please advise your External Quality Assurance (EQA) to add the appriortae Assistant Principal to their contact list as it is vital they are aware of all external QA sampling.
- Contact with EQA should be made by the Lead IQA/Course Co-ordinator as soon as possible in the academic year to agree arrangements
- A list of evidence required by the EQA should be established prior to their visit
- When visiting the College, the EQA should always meet a Heads or Deputy Head of Curriculum and, wherever possible, the Quality Nominee/Contact

- Any difficulties with EQAs should be reported to the relevant Assistant Principal and the Quality Nominee/Contact will take up those issues with the awarding body.
- Reports from Awarding Bodies are usually sent to the programme's Lead Internal Quality Assurer (Lead IQA)/ Course Co-ordinator.
- Reports should to be forwarded immediately to the Deputy Principal Curriculum & Quality where the outcomes are recorded and analysed
- EQA reports should be shared with the course team and an action plan agreed to meet any issues arising. A copy of the action plan should be sent to the Assistant Principal within 10 working days of receiving the report
- If the report highlights serious concerns, the Assistant Principal and Teaching & Learning Improvement Managers will work with the course team to draw up an appropriate action plan and provide support and training if necessary. A copy of the report and action plan will also be copied to the Deputy Principal Curriculum & Quality.
- The Assistant Principal and Teaching & Learning Improvement Managers will monitor and verify the completion of the action plan to measure improvements
- If an EQA report contains statements which are partial, inaccurate or unfair the Quality Nominee/Contact, in consultation with the Course Team should challenge the report formally.

## 4.11   End Point Assessment (Apprenticeships Only)

- All Apprenticeship Standards are assessed through an End Point Assessment (EPA), conducted by an external assessor appointed by the End Point Assessment Organisation (EPAO).
- EPAs are a way of testing the Apprentice's knowledge, skills and behaviours that they have developed over their Apprenticeship. It can take different forms depending on the subject, but could include an exam, a practical demonstration, an interview, a presentation or a combination of all of these.
- Learners can only be booked in for their EPA once they have passed through the 'Gateway' and have completed all the mandatory qualifications of that Apprenticeship (including English and Maths) and have acquired the full knowledge, skills and behaviours as set out in the standards.

# 5.   Appeals

The College recognises that learners studying qualifications that are either internally or externally assessed have a right to seek a review of assessment decisions that affect them. Academic appeals may be lodged on the following grounds:

- that in the assessment or marking, the stipulated assessment procedure was not followed, or
- information is, or was, available which could have had a bearing on the assessment or mark, but which was not taken into account by the examining board/assessors or was unreasonably rejected.

Heads & Deputy Head of Curriculum are responsible for ensuring that all learners are aware of the Appeals Process prior to assessment commencing, e.g. Learner Handbooks, Induction, etc.

## 5.1   Monitoring and evaluation:

- The arrangements for appeals sit within the curriculum in the first instance, with monitoring and reporting of any awarding body blocks or actions being notified to the Assistant Principal or other appointed team member.
- It is the responsibility of line managers/internal verifiers.to ensure that any new staff are inducted to awarding body procedures regarding the Appeals process promptly and prior to teaching and assessment
- Copies of all appeals will be held by the curriculum areas for 3 years

### 5.2 External Assessment

- Where a learner is an approved entry of the College and wishes to request a clerical re-check or review of marking, etc., of the grade or result of an external test/ examination, the learner must lodge the appeal in accordance with the appropriate awarding body/ organisation's appeals guidelines and documentation process through the College[7].
- Learners must submit their request for an appeal to their subject teacher within 5 working days of the publication of examination results. The subject teacher will provide the learner with the outcome of their decision to support or not the learner's request to appeal within 3 working days. If the subject teacher supports the learner's request, they will assist the learner in completing the awarding body/organisation's appeals form (where provided) and submit this to the awarding body/organisation for a clerical re-check/review for marking.
- If the subject teacher does not support the learner's request for a re-check/review, then the learner may appeal this decision by submitting a College Appeals Request Form within 5 working days of being informed of this decision to the Lead IQA. The Lead IQA will convene an Appeals Panel with the Heads & Deputy Head of Curriculum within 5 working days of receiving the learner's request for an appeal. The Appeals Panel will provide the learner with the outcome of the decision for their request to appeal within 3 working days. If the Appeals Panel decide to over-rule the original decision, the Lead IQA will submit the learner's request to the awarding bod/organisation for a re-check/review as outlined above. However, if the Appeals Panel uphold the original decision of the lecturer not to support the learner's request for a clerical re-check/review of marking, no further action will be taken and the learner will have exhausted the College's appeals process.
- Further to receiving the outcome of the awarding body/organisation's clerical re-check/review of marking the learner is still not satisfied, the learner may request to appeal the awarding body/organisation's decision.
- Learners must submit their request to appeal the outcome of the re-check/review to the Heads & Deputy Head of Curriculum within 5 working days of receiving the outcome of the awarding body/organisation's clerical re-check/review of marking. The Heads & Deputy Head of Curriculum will provide the learner with their decision as to whether to support their request for an appeal or not within 3 working days. If the Heads & Deputy Head of Curriculum supports the learner's request, they will assist the Deputy Principal in submitting an appeal to the awarding body/organisation. However, if the Heads & Deputy Head of Curriculum's decision is not to support the learner's request to appeal the outcome of the awarding body/organisation's clerical re-check/review of marking, then the learner may request to appeal that decision by submitting a College Appeals Request Form to the relevant Assistant Principal, who

---

[7] *Only private candidates taking the exam at the College, may submit an appeal directly to an awarding body*

will convene an Appeals Panel with the Deputy Principal Curriculum & Quality within 5 working days of receiving the learner's request for an appeal.

- The Appeals Panel will provide the learner with the outcome of their decision whether to pursue an appeal with the awarding body/organisation within 3 working days. If the Appeals Panel decide to over-rule the original Head or Deputy Head of Curriculum's decision, the Deputy Principal will proceed to submit an appeal to the awarding body/organisation to review the outcome of their clerical re-check/review of marking stating clearly the grounds for the appeal, e.g. marking error, failure to apply correct procedures, etc. However, if the Appeals Panel uphold the original decision of the Head or Deputy Head of Curriculum not to support the learner's request for an appeal of the awarding body/organisation's clerical re-check/review of marking, no further action will be taken and the learner will have exhausted the College's appeals process.

## 5.3 Internal Assessment

### 5.3.1 Stage 1 – Informal

- In most cases where there is confusion/disagreement regarding an assessment decision, these situations are best resolved informally through discussion and clarification between the learner and the assessor.
- When a learner disagrees with the assessment/grade given they must explain the reasons for this to the assessor concerned, as soon as possible. In most cases this will be immediately after receiving the assessment/grading decision but should take place within 5 working days of being notified of the assessment/grading decision.
- The assessor will consider the learner's appeal and provide a response within 2 working days resulting with either:

  o a clear explanation/reiteration (as appropriate) of the assessment/grading decision following a re-evaluation of the evidence
  o an amendment of the learner's assessment/grading record (if appropriate).

- If, after discussion, the learner agrees with the decision thus provided, then the appeal need not proceed further. Where the learner remains unhappy with the decision, the appeal may proceed to Stage 2.

### 5.3.2 Stage 2 – Lead Internal Quality Assurer (Lead IQA/Internal Moderator/Internal Verifier)

- If the learner is not satisfied with the Assessor's review of their appeal in Stage 1, they may request that the appeal proceeds to Stage 2 by completing, signing and dating the Appeal Stage 2 Form and submitting it to the Assessor within 5 working days of being notified of the appeal decision outlining the specific grounds for re-assessment.
- The assessor will then forward the original assessment record, candidate evidence and Appeal Stage 2 Form to the nominated Lead IQA (Internal Verifier/Moderator) within 2 working days of the date of receiving the learner's request to proceed to Stage 2.
- The Lead IQA (Internal Verifier/Moderator) will reconsider the assessment decision which will
- normally involve an evaluation of the:

  o learner's evidence and associated records
  o assessor's rationale for the assessment decision
  o Stage 2 Appeal Form detailing the learner's rationale for appealing the assessment decision

- The Lead IQA (Internal Verifier/Moderator) will complete an Internal Quality Assurance of Assessment Decision Form (Awarding Body's IQA Documentation, if provided) and the Outcome of Appeal section of the Stage 2 Appeal Form.  The Lead IQA (Internal Verifier/Moderator) will provide the learner with the reconsidered decision within 5 working days of receiving the learner's request to proceed to Stage 2.
- Where the learner remains unhappy with the reconsidered assessment decision, the appeal may proceed to Stage 3.

### 5.3.3   Stage 3 – Appeals Panel

- Where the learner remains unhappy with the decision made at Stage 2 they have the right to forward their case to an Appeals Panel by completing, signing and dating the Stage 3 Appeal Form and returning it to the Lead IQA (Internal Verifier/Moderator) within 5 working days of receiving the Lead IQA decision.
- The Lead IQA (Internal Verifier/Moderator) will forward the relevant details to the Head or Deputy Head of Curriculum which will include:

  o   Learner Appeal Forms – Stage 2 and 3 with appropriate sections completed
  o   Learner's evidence and associated records
  o   Assessor's rationale for the assessment decision
  o   IQA Form of Learner's assessed evidence
  o   any written comments by the Lead IQA (Internal Verifier/Moderator) providing relevant background details.

- The Head or Deputy Head of Curriculum will convene, within 10 working days of the date of the learner's request to proceed to Stage 3, a panel comprising:

  o   Head or Deputy Head of Curriculum
  o   Stage 2 Lead IQA (Internal Verifier/Moderator)
  o   Original assessor

- The learner (who may be supported by an advocate if they so wish), will be asked to present their case to the Appeals Panel for consideration. After considering all the relevant information the Appeals Panel will inform the learner within 5 working days of their decision both orally and in writing.  The Appeal Stage 3 Form will be completed at this stage.
- Records of all Stage 3 Appeals are to be logged with the Quality Team and made available on request to the External Quality Assurer (EQA/External Verifier/Standards Verifier/External Moderator).
- Where the learner remains unhappy with the decision of the Appeals Panel, learner may proceed to Stage 4, the final stage of the College Academic Appeals Process.

### 5.3.4   Stage 4 – Final Stage

- If, after the above procedures have been undertaken, the learner still feels that an inappropriate decision has been reached, then they may appeal to the relevant Assistant Principal in writing stating the reasons for their dissatisfaction within 5 working days of the Appeal Panel.  The Assistant Principal (who may nominate a suitable alternative) will then investigate the grievance, including holding interviews with the appropriate parties concerned.  The Assistant Principal's decision will be final and communicated to the learner in writing within 10 working days.
- This represents the final stage in the College's Appeals process.
- If the final decision of the Assistant Principal is not to support the learner's appeal, the learner has the right to appeal independently to the Awarding Body/Accreditation

Board and the learner will be provided with the contact details/procedures for proceeding with an appeal to the Awarding Body/Accreditation Board at this stage.

## 6.    Academic Misconduct (Learners)

- Academic Misconduct refers to any act, default or practice, including plagiarism and collusion, which is a breach of the Academic Regulations of the College or the Awarding Body/ Organisation. This refers to Academic Misconduct by a learner or candidate in the course of any examination or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments or coursework, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the writing of any examination paper.  Other instances of Academic Misconduct may be considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion.
- Academic Misconduct in a coursework component or a controlled assessment component of a specification discovered prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication need not be reported to the awarding body, but must be dealt with in accordance with the College disciplinary procedures for learners.
- Candidates who are found to have engaged in activities deemed to be Academic Misconduct after signing the declaration of authentication will be subject to the regulations and possible penalties as laid down by the specific awarding body.  The College is obliged to report such instances and Head or Deputy Head of Curriculum are responsible for providing this information for reporting via the Assistant Principal. Learners who are found to have engaged in such activities will also be subject to the College's Learner Disciplinary procedures.
- The most common forms of Academic Misconduct are Plagiarism and Collusion[8]. The process for investigating many of these allegations and their consequent penalties are subject to and incorporated within the College's Learner Disciplinary Policy and Procedures, however as Plagiarism and Collusion are the most common forms of Academic Misconduct, these will be specifically addressed in this policy.
- Plagiarism, cheating, collusion and attempting to obtain an unfair academic advantage are the most common forms of Academic Misconduct (or Malpractice) and are entirely unacceptable for any learner.  This policy defines what the College means by plagiarism, gives examples of the categories of other forms of unacceptable Academic Misconduct outside examinations, gives guidance to staff to help prevent the occurrence of such Academic Misconduct, determines the procedures to be adopted in suspected cases and indicates the academic penalties which may be appropriate in proven cases.
- In establishing this policy, the College is seeking to maintain the integrity of its academic awards and procedures and to give any learners affected a fair opportunity to respond to any allegation of Academic Misconduct.  Each case will be determined on its own facts and merits.  It includes College-assessed work which contributes towards external examination marks.  The policy is for use outside public examinations, where the examining boards' own procedures will apply.  Where there is any discrepancy between this policy and the awarding body/organisation regulations regarding Academic Misconduct, the awarding body/organisation regulations shall take precedence.

---

[8]*For a more extended list of examples please refer to Appendix 3 - Examples of Candidate/ Learner Academic Misconduct.*

- This policy is designed to provide information to learners and staff on the College's approach to Academic Misconduct, as plagiarism and other forms of cheating undermine the value of qualifications for all concerned because they undermine their credibility. If a learner passes an assessment, or gets a qualification, by unfair means then this is unfair to those who have achieved the same qualification fairly.

### 6.1 Monitoring and evaluation:

- It is the responsibility of line managers/internal verifiers.to ensure that any new staff and learners are inducted to Academic Misconduct policy and procedures promptly and prior to teaching and assessment.
- Responsibility for investigating and sanctioning learners/candidates alleged to have committed Academic Misconduct in the first instance sits with the curriculum area involved with monitoring and reporting of any Awarding Body/Organisation Referrals/Actions being notified to the Deputy Principal.
- Where the learner/candidate is accused of examination related misconduct, the Exams department will forward all relevant information to the curriculum area who will then take responsibility for the investigation with guidance from the Exams department on awarding body/organisation regulations and sanctions.

### 6.2 Plagiarism, Collusion and Use of Artificial Intelligence

### 6.2.1 Plagiarism

- Plagiarism is the notion of a learner taking someone else's intellectual effort and presenting it as their own. The JCQ defines plagiarism as: *"The failure to acknowledge sources properly and/or the submission of another person's work as if it were the candidate's own."*
- In other words, plagiarism is the submission for assessment of someone else's work (written, visual or oral), e.g. words, images, ideas, opinions or discoveries, whether published or not, as one's own; or alternatively appropriating the artwork, images or computer-generated work of others, without properly acknowledging the source, with or without their permission in such a way that the work could be assumed to be the learner's own.
- Plagiarism may take many forms, and examples could include the unattributed use of another person's work, ideas, opinions, theory, facts, statistics, graphs, models, paintings, performance, computer code, drawings, quotations of another person's actual spoken or written words, or paraphrases of another person's spoken or written words.
- Assessors need to ensure that learners are aware that the following examples constitute Plagiarism, to avoid any unintentional breaches of the regulations:

  o **Cutting and pasting from the internet without acknowledgement**
    Information obtained from the internet must be adequately referenced within text and full details included in the bibliography of work submitted.
  o **Verbatim (word for word) quotation without citation**
    Quotations must always be identified by use of quotation marks or indentation with italics and with a full reference of the source quoted.  In written work it should always be made clear what is the independent work of the candidate/learner and where the work uses the language and ideas of others.
  o **Paraphrasing**

The re-ordering or changing of words can be considered plagiarism as the candidate/learner is still copying the structure of the original author's arguments, as well as their ideas without correct reference or citation.

- o **Use of material written by professional agencies or others**
  Candidates/learners must not make use of professional agencies in the writing of their work.  Candidates must not submit material which has been written by someone else, even with the consent of the person who has written it.
- o **Auto plagiarism**
  Candidates/learners must not submit work for assessment that has already been submitted (partially or in full) for other parts of the course/qualification.

### 6.2.2  Collusion

- Collusion is the active cooperation of two or more learners to deceive examiners/markers in one of the ways set out below. Learners will be guilty of collusion if they knowingly allow any of their academic or assessed work to be acquired by another person for presentation as if it were that person's own work.  If a learner offers to provide work to another learner to be passed off as their own, they are guilty of collusion.
- A learner suspected and found to have been part of collusion will be subject to the College's Learner Disciplinary Process.
- Examples of Collusion include:

  - o completing the work jointly with one or more other learners, resulting in handing in almost identical assignments
  - o getting someone else to produce part or all of the work submitted
  - o lending a completed assignment to another learner(s)
  - o cooperation between one or more other learners to plan an assignment together. This joint preparatory work might include discussing how to structure assignments, which cases to refer to, and which sources and references to list. Even if the assignment is completed relatively independently after the discussion, the submitted work may still reveal enough similarities to be considered collusion
  - o any member of a group sharing submitted work with another group.  In this instance, all learners involved will be reported for breaching the Academic Misconduct regulations

### 6.2.3   Artificial Intelligence

Learners are permitted to utilise artificial intelligence tools in preparation for their assessments; however, it is essential that the work submitted must be their own and reflects their own originality, understanding, and effort. The following guidelines outline the acceptable use of AI-generated content:

**1. Originality of Work:** While Learners can use AI-generated content to support their assessments, they are prohibited from copying or paraphrasing AI-generated sections to the extent that the work loses its authenticity as the Learner's original contribution.

**2. Independent Responses:** Learners should refrain from directly copying or paraphrasing entire responses generated by AI. The use of AI should enhance their ability to engage with the material and contribute to their understanding, rather than substitute their own analysis, evaluation, or calculations.

**3. Authenticity of Effort:** The work submitted must genuinely reflect the Learner's individual effort and comprehension. Relying solely on AI to complete sections of an assessment that should involve personal input is against the principles of academic integrity and would be considered as malpractice.

**4. Acknowledgment of AI Usage:** Learners must transparently acknowledge in writing the use of AI tools to include when and how they have been used it e.g. to gather information, research or insights etc.  This should be referenced using the following format: For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/ blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2023.

**5. Comprehensive Acknowledgment:** Adequate acknowledgment of AI tools used in the assessment is crucial. Learners should provide clear and accurate references or citations to the AI-generated content they've utilised where possible. For **Pre-Entry – Level 1 Assessments**, where referencing is not stipulated, Learners will acknowledge the use of AI tools as a note/ list form.

**6. Integrity of References:** References should accurately represent the sources used during the assessment process. Learners are required to independently verify the references used by the AI tool they have used.  These references must be checked for validity, reliability, bias and currency etc as some AI tools have been found to be erroneous.  Failure to do so may result in malpractice sanctions being followed.

*It is the responsibility of both Learners and the teacher to uphold these guidelines and maintain the highest standards of assessment integrity. Violation of these guidelines will result in the College's Disciplinary Process and / or the Awarding Body Disciplinary Procedures.  Please refer to the JCQ guidance on the use of AI in assessments for more details - link below*

JCQ - AI use in assessments: Protecting the integrity of qualifications.pdf

## 6.3    Awareness and prevention

The forms of Academic Misconduct as outlined above will be subject to College's Disciplinary procedures.

To prevent the occurrence of Academic Misconduct, staff should:
- Inform learners clearly of the policy on academic integrity and honesty and of the College's guidelines on Academic Misconduct – this should be done as part of the course induction process, and at other times in the year, and included in their Course Handbook
- Inform learners that Academic Misconduct may result in the learner being subject to the College's formal learner disciplinary procedures and associated sanctions
- Provide learners with guidance on the format of formal acknowledgement of source material
- Inform learners, in writing if possible, of the extent to which they can collaborate in coursework.  Assessors should refer to the notes in the guidelines from the relevant awarding body as to what is, and is not, allowed when collaborating
- Be aware that the vast majority of learners are very computer literate and may be tempted to use the internet for model essays.  It may be required for learners to prepare their work under controlled conditions in order to ensure that Academic

Misconduct is minimised

- Ensure that learners are aware that staff will be actively checking for plagiarism and collusion using plagiarism detection software (e.g. Unicheck) – ideally learners will also use this software to raise their level of awareness of mechanisms used by the College and other institutions (e.g. universities)
- Encourage learners to use plagiarism detection software on a draft version of their assignment / coursework to ensure that they do not submit work (either knowingly or unknowingly) that has been plagiarised
- Devise procedures for assessing work in such a way that plagiarism cheating and collusion are more detectable. This might include: ensuring that coursework assessment is supported by unseen and supervised work under test conditions; changing assignment topics yearly, or at least a three-yearly cycle; making less use of generic assignments in favour of tailored assignments; getting to know the style of learners' writing submissions early on in the course and comparing subsequent work to initial assessment tests. Ideally, mark/assess a class group's coursework on a single occasion, to enhance the likelihood of the assessor spotting plagiarised passages
- Assessors should routinely make use of personal interviews to determine the authenticity of submitted work
- Fully investigate all instances of suspected Academic Misconduct utilising the proper disciplinary procedures as published in this document and the Learner Disciplinary Procedures, and consider how the outcomes from this could be used as a deterrent to others
- Double-counting: Learners are also not permitted to re-present any assessment already submitted for one module/unit as assessment in another module/unit. Double counting of assessed work is not normally allowed. If submitting work previously included in another assessment the learner should attribute the section of text from the earlier work. This may be taken into account by the markers and clearly annotated by assessors for Internal/External Quality Assurance purposes.

## 6.4 Academic Misconduct (Plagiarism) – actions and outcomes

- Guidance on Academic Misconduct including rules on plagiarism/collusion is to be discussed during Induction at the beginning of the course and within tutor groups throughout the year. Learners should be taught how to use conventional formats for academic referencing (e.g. Harvard Referencing) and tutors need to explain clearly to learners the expectations for referencing materials when submitting assignments for assessment.
- Any instance of proven plagiarism or collusion is regarded as serious Academic Misconduct under the College's Learner Disciplinary Procedure and the matter will be subject to that Procedure and reference will be made to the rules and regulations for coursework and examinations of the Awarding Body/Organisation.
- If a learner is suspected of Academic Misconduct, then the teaching staff that have suspicions regarding the learner's work, which is not examination-based, should deal directly with the issue by arranging a meeting with the learner to hear his/her comments.
- The investigating member of staff may determine the level of seriousness of the incident and consider the appropriate action according the following procedures:

## 6.4.1 Stage 1

- If a minor case is identified, for example this might be in relation to homework or other work that is not formally assessed, or a limited misdemeanour on a formal assessment, the member of staff may choose one or more of the following at their discretion:
  - Discuss the incident with the learner with the evidence and location(s) in the learner's work being identified
  - The learner is questioned, to test knowledge of the work
  - The learner has an opportunity to explain
  - Warn the learner about future conduct
  - If it is felt appropriate, then an opportunity for the learner to re-do the work may be considered; the un-assessed work should be returned to the learner and a new deadline set – this would be considered to be a late submission and there would be no opportunity for further re-submissions
  - Deduct marks from the learner's work, or exclude plagiarised/copied work from assessment, or not accept the work and return the work to be re-done and resubmitted for marking

- Where the learner remains unhappy with the decision, an appeal may be made to the Head of Curriculum who will review the evidence.  Their decision is final.

**Possible outcomes:**
- No Academic Misconduct has taken place and the assignment remains marked as it stands
- The learner accepts that Academic Misconduct has taken place and is allowed to redo and resubmit the work (according the penalties agreed)
- A letter may be sent to the parents/guardian/learner(s) citing the offence and the outcome of the investigation
- If it is clear that an instance of plagiarism/collusion was minor and did not constitute intentional cheating, then guidance and support should be provided to address any underlying issues. This might include revision of appropriate referencing practice. The learner should also be informed clearly of the unacceptability of plagiarism and the need to abide by accepted practices.
- The learner denies Academic Misconduct has occurred – in this case a further interview with the learner may be deemed necessary – this would involve either a Head or Deputy Head of Curriculum and could involve taking action under the Learner Disciplinary Policy

### 6.4.2  Stage 2

- If a serious case is suspected/alleged, for example significant evidence of plagiarism for formally assessed work.  Staff will need to inform their Head or Deputy Head of Curriculum of their concerns and arrange for a meeting to be attended by the relevant teacher(s) and learner(s)

**Possible outcomes:**
- No Academic Misconduct has taken place and the assignment remains marked as it stands
- The learner accepts that Academic Misconduct has taken place.
- Further action may be taken under the Learner Disciplinary Policy
- A standard letter will be sent to the parents/guardian/learner(s) citing the offence and the outcome of the investigation

- If the learner denies Academic Misconduct has occurred, then the matter will automatically be further investigated under the Learner Disciplinary Policy
- The College may be required to inform the relevant awarding body

- Where the learner remains unhappy with the decision, an appeal may be made to the Director of Quality who will review the evidence. Their decision is final.

### 6.4.3 Stage 3

- If a serious case where persistent re-offending behaviour is suspected/alleged, for example repeated examples of plagiarism for formally assessed work. Staff will need to inform their Head or Deputy Head of Curriculum of their concerns and arrange for a meeting to be attended by the relevant teacher(s) and learner(s)

**Possible outcomes:**

- No Academic Misconduct has taken place and the assignment remains marked as it stands
- The learner accepts that Academic Misconduct has taken place.
- Further action will be taken under the Learner Disciplinary Policy
- A standard letter will be sent to the parents/guardian/learner(s) citing the offence and the outcome of the investigation
- If the learner denies Academic Misconduct has occurred, then the matter will automatically be further investigated under the Learner Disciplinary Policy
- The College will be required to inform the relevant awarding body. This would typically mean that the work plagiarised/copied would not be assessed (this could be the whole or part of the assignment)

- Where the learner remains unhappy with the decision, an appeal may be made to the Director of Quality who will review the evidence. Their decision is final.

### 6.5 Collusion – actions and outcomes

Where Collusion (learners have shared work) is suspected / alleged – there are two cases.

1. If the learner has knowingly shared work:

   - The learner(s) will be presented with the evidence and given the opportunity to explain themselves.
   - They should be reminded of the College policy and of the seriousness of colluding and sharing work in education.
   - The actions to be followed and the possible outcomes are as described earlier in the Academic Misconduct (Plagiarism) Stages 1-3

2. If the learner was unaware that their work was copied, and there is unequivocal proof:

   - No further action will be taken against the learner whose work was plagiarised; a conversation reminding the learner about safe storage and plagiarism must be carried out by the teacher
   - The course of action for the learner who has plagiarised (copied) the work is as described earlier in the Academic Misconduct (Plagiarism) Stages 1-3

## 7. Malpractice Policy (Staff)

Malpractice means any act, default or practice which is a breach of awarding bodies / organisation's (AB/AO) regulations or which:

- compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate; and/or
- damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or the College or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or the College.
- includes failure by the College to investigate allegations of suspected malpractice in accordance with the awarding body requirements and adherence to the JCQ code of practice on suspected malpractice.[9]
- WLC does not tolerate any actions (or attempted actions) of malpractice by staff. Malpractice in examinations and assessments is a serious issue that can have a significant impact on the reputation of the College both with Learners and employers, the general public and awarding bodies / organisation's, who have in place sanctions for any centres that are found to have allowed malpractice in examinations or assessment to take place which range from a written warning to withdrawal of centre recognition.
- This policy underpins the complementary guidelines, policies and procedures of the awarding bodies and the College, and underlines the need for the College to work to the standards specified by the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) guidance.
- This policy and the associated AB/AO and JCQ documents to which it relates:

  o identifies the need for the College to comply with awarding bodies' regulations in the context of examinations and assessments
  o sets out the rights and responsibilities of staff (including agents) and awarding bodies in addressing malpractice in examinations and assessments
  o provides procedures to be followed where there is reason to believe that policies, regulations or procedures have been breached
  o recognises that where there is any discrepancy between this policy and the awarding body/organisation regulations regarding Academic Malpractice/Maladministration, the awarding body/organisation and JCQ regulations shall take precedence.

### 7.1 Monitoring and evaluation:

- The arrangements for management of malpractice/maladministration sit within the curriculum in the first instance and the Curriculum Manager/Head of Curriculum is responsible for ensuring that assessment malpractice does not take place within the curriculum area or by the course team.
- It is the responsibility of line managers/internal verifiers.to ensure that any new staff are inducted to awarding body procedures regarding Malpractice/Maladministration promptly and prior to teaching and assessment
- The Exams Manager is responsible for ensuring that all records are maintained in accordance with Awarding Body regulations and exams are conducted in accordance with JCQ regulations for conducting examinations[10]

---

[9] *See: https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office*

[10] See: *https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office*

- Where a member of staff is accused of examination/assessment related malpractice/maladministration, the Exams/Curriculum department will forward all relevant information to the Principal who will then take responsibility (or nominate a suitable alternative) for the investigation in accordance with awarding body/organisation's regulations and subject to the College's Staff Disciplinary procedures.

### 7.2    Malpractice/Maladministration:

Instances of Malpractice/Maladministration arise for a variety of reasons:
- some incidents are intentional and aim to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment
- some incidents arise because of ignorance of regulations, carelessness or forgetfulness in applying the regulation
- some occur due to circumstances which are beyond the control of those involved

Individuals involved in Malpractice/Maladministration are varied, and could include:
- teachers, lecturers, tutors, trainers, assessors or others responsible for the conduct, administration or the quality assurance of examinations and assessments
- assessment personnel including examiners, assessors, moderators or internal and external verifiers
- an individual appointed in another capacity by the College such as an invigilator, a reader, a Sign Language Interpreter or a scribe to a candidate
- other third parties

- Examples of malpractice could include: a breach of security, deception, improper assistance to Learners, and maladministration for example: the failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of coursework/portfolios and examinations; malpractice in the conduct of the examinations or assessments and/or the handling of examination papers, Learner scripts, mark sheets, cumulative assessment records, and certificate claim forms, etc[11]

### 7.3    Investigations of Alleged Malpractice:

- On receiving a report of alleged malpractice, e.g. an incident of suspected malpractice is reported to the awarding body, or on receipt of a report from the awarding body, etc., the Principal will initiate an investigation. The investigation lead can be delegated to the Deputy Principal, the Assistant Principal, or other senior member of staff, although the Principal retains overall responsibility. In selecting a suitable senior member of centre staff to act as lead, the Principal must take all reasonable steps to avoid a conflict of interest.
- Investigations will normally be carried out by an Assistant Principal at the direction of the Deputy Principal Curriculum & Quality and on behalf of the awarding body to investigate the allegation.  However, the Assistant Principal may instruct a nominated Investigating Officer, e.g. an Assistant Principal or Head or Deputy Head of Curriculum outside of the area to gather the evidence.  This will ensure that the investigation is independent of the curriculum area involved in the suspected malpractice.
- Responsibility for informing the accused individual rests with the Investigating Officer.

---

[11] *See: Appendix 4: Examples of Staff Malpractice/Maladministration*

- Investigations into allegations of alleged malpractice or irregularities against the Principal may be carried out directly by the awarding body or the Chair of Corporation.
- Awarding bodies may on occasions nominate their own personnel to investigate cases. However, this would normally be in addition to, not an alternative to, the requirement on the College to provide full details of suspected, alleged or confirmed acts of malpractice.
- The investigation must be systematic and thorough and include all relevant staff and/or learners who may be involved or directly linked to the allegation.

### 7.3.1 The Assistant Principal (or alternative) will:

- ensure any appointed investigating officer is independent of the department/area involved in the suspected malpractice
- if delegating the investigation to an investigating officer, personally oversee investigations resulting from an allegation of malpractice
- report to the awarding body concerned, suspicions or actual incidents of malpractice
- respond speedily to requests for an investigation and ensure staff co-operate with any enquiry into the allegation
- ensure compliance with requests made by the awarding body as a result of alleged malpractice
- pass on to individuals concerned warnings, notifications of penalties, etc. issued by the awarding body arising from the malpractice investigation
- ensure staff members are clear on their rights and responsibilities
- ensure staff members are aware that College procedures on discipline, grievance and appeals may also apply in any subsequent disciplinary hearing

### 7.3.2 When conducting the investigation, the member of staff accused of malpractice must be:

- informed in writing of the allegation made against him/her
- informed what evidence there is to support that allegation
- informed the possible consequences should malpractice be proven
- given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations
- given an opportunity to submit a written statement
- given an opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required)
- given an opportunity to be accompanied by a friend or union representative.
- informed of the applicable disciplinary and appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him/her
- informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice may be shared with the relevant awarding body/organisation, the regulators (e.g. Ofqual/OfS, etc.), the police and/or professional bodies.
- The outcome of the investigation of an allegation of malpractice will be a written report submitted to the Principal, in the first instance, within 10 working days of the initiation of the investigation. The report will provide a clear review of what occurred, those involved, whether the allegations are correct and who it is judged was accountable for the malpractice. In addition, recommendations that may contribute to avoiding any re-occurrence should be included.
- Reports of malpractice will be forwarded to the relevant authorities, internally and externally which may include the Corporation, the Executive, and the regulatory

authority and awarding body in line with JCQ and any specific requirements by the individual awarding body.

- If the malpractice is judged to be the result of a serious management failure, the awarding body may apply sanctions against the curriculum area or the whole College. In these cases, the awarding body may make special arrangements to safeguard the interests of candidates who might otherwise be adversely affected.
- Actions required for lifting sanctions as directed by awarding bodies or regulatory bodies will be complied with fully by the College.
- Sanctions applied by awarding bodies following malpractice by an individual member of staff may also lead to the implementation of the College Disciplinary Procedures for Staff.
- Deputy Principal Curriculum & Quality or the Principal have the right to appeal against sanctions imposed on the College, or its staff, by Awarding Bodies/Organisations arising from malpractice decisions.

### 7.4 Whistleblowing Policy

Where a member of staff is not satisfied that a malpractice investigation has been undertaken with sufficient rigor, individuals may make a disclosure to the relevant awarding body by providing details of their concerns, the qualifications/subjects involved, key dates and any supporting documents and evidence they may possess. All disclosures will be treated with the strictest sensitivity and confidentiality.

## 8. Accountability

The Deputy Principal Curriculum & Quality ] is responsible for the drafting and implementation of this policy.

He or she is also responsible for ensuring that this document is regularly reviewed and updated – and is the first contact point for managers seeking advice and guidance about Assessment & Verification or making enquiries about its interpretation.

All managers are responsible for ensuring that they and their team members follow the requirements set out in this document.

All employees are responsible for adhering to the requirements set out in this document.

## 9. Equality, Diversity & Inclusion

The College has paid due regard to equality considerations during the preparation and implementation of this Policy.

These considerations included the potential for any differential negative effect on the grounds of age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race (including ethnic or national origins, colour or nationality), religion or belief (including lack of belief), sex, sexual orientation, marriage or civil partnership.

The College's judgement is that there is no such negative effect on those grounds and, consequently, no potential breach of the Equality Act 2010.

The operation of this Policy and Procedure will be monitored by the Executive Director of People and Organisational Development in order to establish that no unlawful discrimination is taking place and to identify opportunities for the College to enhance equality of opportunity and fair treatment.

## 10.    Review

This document will be reviewed by June 2024

The Deputy Principal Curriculum & Quality will undertake this review, taking into account the outcomes of the monitoring process, legislative changes and developments in good practice.

As part of the review, the Deputy Principal Curriculum & Quality will seek and consider the views of the College's employees and, where appropriate, of the recognised trade unions.

The outcome of the review will be reported to the Senior Leadership Team.

## 11.    Policy Category

| Category [select ONE only] | ☐ Business Development, Marketing and Subcontracting<br>☐ Corporation<br>☐ Data Protection<br>☐ Equality & Diversity<br>☐ Estates / Facilities<br>☐ Executive Support, Administration and Reception<br>☐ Finance<br>☐ Health and Safety<br>☐ International<br>☐ IT Services<br>☐ Management Information Systems<br>☐ People and Organisational Development<br>☒ Quality<br>☐ Learner Services & Safeguarding |
|---|---|
| Audience [select ALL that apply] | ☒ Employees<br>☐ Governors<br>☒ Learners<br>☐ Partners<br>☐ Suppliers |

# Appendix 1: Formative and Summative Assessment

## A1.1 Formative Assessment

- Formative assessment is carried out as part of the teaching and learning process.
- When setting formative assessment activities, assessors must:
  - identify areas for learner progression, including stretch and challenge;
  - explain clearly the assessment process;
  - set "dry run" or "mock" tasks and scenarios to help learners understand what level they have reached and how to prepare for formal assessment;
- provide feedback on how to improve knowledge, skills, understanding, behaviour, approach, spelling, grammar, vocabulary, terminology, etc.
- At the formative assessment stage, the assessor (teacher) must not confirm achievement of specific assessment criteria; however, feedback should support learners, guiding them on what to do to improve achievement. Written feedback must be given to the learner within 10 working days of the activity.
- Formal internal verification is not required for formative assessment, however as part of the wider Internal Verifier role it is useful to provide guidance and assistance to the assessor on a regular basis.
- Where more than one assessor is assessing a unit, standardisation should take place and the Internal Verifier will have a role in this.

## A1.2 Summative Assessment

- Summative assessment is a final assessment decision on assignment tasks in relation to the assessment criteria for each unit, in accordance with awarding body (or College) requirements.
- It is the definitive assessment and recording of learner's achievement.
- Internal Verification must take place at this point.

# Appendix 2: Roles & Responsibilities

1. Role of the Assessor
2. Role of the Internal Quality Assurer (IV/IM/IQA
3. Role of the Lead Internal Quality Assurer (LIV/LIM/LIQA)
4. Roles & responsibilities of the Curriculum Manager (CM) / Head of Curriculum (HoC)

## 1. Roles & Responsibilities of the Assessor

The Assessor will:
- Read and understand the programme specification, and understand the construction of the units.
- Design assessment activities which guide learners to produce evidence that meets the targeted assessment criteria and unit content, and any associated guidance.
- Create and agree an annual plan of assessment activities and timescales with their Lead Internal Verifier (LIV) / Programme Lead (PL) / Head of Curriculum (HoC) or Deputy Head of Curriculum (DHoC) at the beginning of the academic year.
- Deliver inspiring, high-quality teaching to facilitate learning and allow learners to develop their knowledge and skills to succeed in their assessments.
- Recognise the learning needs of individual learners, including Education, Health and Care Plans (EHCP), and plan resources to meet those needs (in collaboration with Learning Support Assistants (LSA) where applicable).
- Seek to promote diversity as an asset to learning.
- Assess the work submitted by learners, checking authenticity and sufficiency of evidence produced against the relevant awarding body (or College) criteria.
- Provide feedback to learners within 10 working days on how to improve (in accordance with awarding body regulations).
- Provide feedback on all written work for standards of literacy, such as spelling, grammar, vocabulary and terminology.
- Ensure the Assessment & Verification policy is adhered to.
- Ensure all learners are aware of the Assessment & Verification policy in particular the section on appeals and misconduct.
- Ensure that they do not invigilate their own learners' exams; in the case of offsite delivery this includes functional skills examinations.
- Take an active part in internal verification, according to a planned schedule as devised by their LIV/PL/DHoC/HoC.

## 2. Roles & Responsibilities of the Internal Quality Assurer (IQA)

The principles of Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) / Internal Verification (IV) / Internal Moderation (IM) are broadly similar for all qualifications.

The IQA is required to:

- Check assignments before they are issued to ensure that they meet awarding body criteria and are appropriate for learners.
- Sample and verify assessment decisions
- Give constructive feedback to assessors.

Where there is a team of assessors, it is good practice for all assessors to be involved in internally validating each other.  If there is one main person responsible for delivery and assessment, then another person will need to be identified to undertake Internal Quality Assurance.  You cannot internally quality assure your own assessment.

IQAs for BTEC delivery do not always need a formal qualification depending on the awarding board's assessment strategy and the competence of the delivery team.  However, Certificate/Diploma NVQ Assessors and IV's require a formal assessor/verifier/TAQA qualification.

**As an IQA, you will:**
Check the quality of assessment instruments to ensure they are fit for purpose.

- Ensure an effective system of recording learner achievement is in place.
- Keep accurate and up-to-date records of the Internal Quality Assurance process.
- Advise on the appropriateness of assessment evidence with regard to level, sufficiency, authenticity, validity and consistency.
- Use your subject specialism to sample assessments to quality assure assessors' judgements, ensuring that they are consistent, fair and reliable.
- Ensure your own assessment decisions are sampled when teaching on the programme.
- Ensure that appropriate corrective action is taken where necessary.
- Take part in the formal stages of any academic appeal.

3. **Roles & Responsibilities of the Lead Internal Quality Assurer (LIV/LIM/LIQA)**

The Lead IQA has a much wider role than just verifying assessment decisions. The responsibility of the Lead Internal Quality Assurer is to oversee the processes of standardisation and verification/moderation.

It is part of their duty to be acquainted with guidelines and handbooks issued by awarding bodies for specific qualifications and to ensure that these are correctly implemented by assessors/verifiers.

The Lead IQA has to support and develop their team of assessors/verifiers, to ensure that they are well-informed, up to date and fully competent to assess the qualification.

Their work involves, but is not limited to:

- Acting in an advisory capacity, providing feedback to assessors at all stages of the verification process
- Monitoring assessment tasks and the way they are carried out
- Ensuring the validity of internal assessments, checking that they conform to awarding body requirements

- Sampling assessed work in accordance with awarding body requirements to ensure the quality of feedback and consistency of grading decisions
- Assuring national standards are met
- Amending the outcome of grades/marks awarded, as necessary
- Cascading information to relevant parties
- Confirming records are accurate and authentic
- Ensuring quality assurance systems and associated procedures are in place
- Facilitating the process of successfully meeting external verification/moderation requirements.

The Lead Internal Quality Assurer's role will usually include the following:

- Ensure all programmes have current assessment and internal verification schedules.
- Ensure assignments are internally verified before distribution to learners and assessment decisions of all groups are verified.
- Monitor the standard of assessment and internal verification.
- Monitor and support the work of Assessors and Internal Verifiers.
- Maintain accurate and up-to-date auditable records of internal verification and sampling activity and ensure that these are fit for purpose and available for external scrutiny by maintaining a Course Quality File
- Make available copies of all standardisation and IV plans promptly in the Curriculum & Quality shared drive for cross-College monitoring.
- Provide advice and assistance to Assessors for learners with special assessment needs.
- Provide feedback to the Teaching & Learning Improvement Managers on the effectiveness of the assessment and verification process.
- Ensure that any corrective action required by the Teaching & Learning Improvement Managers is carried out within agreed timescales.
- Undertake some internal verification for individual units within at least one of the programmes.
- Ensure that records of assessment and samples of learner work are being retained for use with Standards Verification if necessary. Plan to set aside examples of work that have been verified at different levels and grades to meet the requirement of a completed unit for each level within a subject area.
- Collate all learner records of unit achievement and internal verification from all internal verifiers and submit to the Examination Department when all IV is complete and claims are appropriate.
- Markbook entries must be checked and verified or paper-based systems countersigned.
- Liaise with the Standards/External Verifier and provide a high standard of evidence as requested.
- Arrange Standards/External Verifier visits, grade reviews or postal samples in conjunction with the Assistant Principal for the curriculum area.
- Make arrangements for handover to a deputy or replacement if unable to carry out the Lead Internal Verifier/Internal Quality Assurer role.
- Ensuring the IQA and Assessment Policies are understood and accepted by the assessment team.
- Ensuring Assessors/IQAs are occupationally competent and appropriately qualified (especially for NVQ programmes).
- Inducting new members of the assessment team.

- Identifying training needs for assessors, particularly where they are new to the course or scheme.
- Ensuring that assessors and learners are aware of the Appeals Procedure and that disputes are dealt with fairly.
- Sharing the External Quality Assurance (EQA) i.e. SV/EV/EM findings with the assessment team.
- Agreeing and implementing action plans to meet issues raised by the EQA.
- Ensuring regular standardisation meetings with all assessment team members present; with standardisation of assessment decisions and standardisation activities included in the agenda, and that these meetings are minuted, with the minutes kept in the Course Quality File.

4.    **Roles & responsibilities of the Curriculum Manager (CM) / Head of Curriculum (HoC):**

Overall responsibility for fair, accurate and timely assessment and quality assurance for their curriculum area is the responsibility of the Curriculum Manager (CM) / Head of Curriculum (HoC).

This will usually include the following:

- Ensure Lead Internal Quality Assurers (LIQA/LIM/LIV) are appointed in each subject area.
- Ensure Lead IQAs are suitably qualified to meeting Awarding Body requirements.
- Ensure staffing levels are appropriate to meet the Quality Assurance requirements of Awarding Bodies.
- Ensure staff are suitably qualified, use relevant schemes of learning and have been trained in assessing, standardising and verifying learners' work.
- Ensure these procedures are implemented and monitored effectively and reported through Performance and Quality Review Meetings.
- Ensuring learners are registered with the awarding body in a timely manner and checking registrations to avoid error
- Ensuring assessors meet continuing professional development requirements
- Ensure all Lead IQAs, IQAs and assessors use Markbook (or similar) to continuously monitor learner attainment and take corrective action when required.
- Organise any assessment appeals.
- Ensure all Lead IQAs, IQAs and Assessors fully understand and adhere to the Internal Quality Assurance, Assessment, Appeals and Assessment Malpractice policies.
- Make teaching staff available to participate in any standardisation or verification meeting.
- Make Lead IQAs available to attend training, development and standardisation meetings with the Quality Team.
- Ensure agreed documentation is used to record all assessment, standardisation and verification decisions.
- Plan for handover to a deputy or replacement if the Lead IQA is unable to carry out their role.
- Ensure that all awarding body on-line or paper-based assessment, examination and resits are administered, conducted and marked using Awarding Body guidelines on the given dates, conditions and timings.

- Ensure that the Examination Department is informed at least 2 weeks in advance of any planned on-line or externally set examinations of the: date and time, title of the examination, list of learners taking the exam, room number, invigilator and the teacher / assessor.

# Appendix 3: Examples of Candidate/Learner Academic Misconduct

The following are examples of Academic Misconduct.  This is not an exhaustive list and other instances of Academic Misconduct may be identified and considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion. For example:

- the alteration or falsification of any results document, including certificates
- a breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding body in relation to examination or assessment rules and regulations
- failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of examinations or assessments
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates, beyond what is permitted
- copying from another candidate (including the use of ICT to aid the copying)
- allowing work to be copied e.g. posting written coursework on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment
- the deliberate destruction of another candidate's/learner's work
- disruptive behaviour in an examination room or during an assessment session (including the use of offensive language)
- exchanging, obtaining, receiving, passing on information (or the attempt to) which could be examination related by means of talking, electronic, written or non- verbal communication
- making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of controlled assessments, coursework or the contents of a portfolio
- allowing others to assist in the production of controlled assessments, coursework or assisting others in the production of controlled assessments or coursework
- the misuse, or the attempted misuse, of examination and assessment materials and resources (e.g. exemplar materials)
- being in possession of confidential material in advance of an examination
- bringing into the examination room notes in an unauthorised format (where notes are permitted in examinations) or inappropriately annotated texts (in open book examinations)
- the inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or portfolios
- Impersonation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one's place in an examination or an assessment
- Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from published sources or incomplete referencing
- theft of another learner's work, bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material, for example: notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators (when prohibited), dictionaries (when prohibited), instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries (when prohibited), reading pens, translators, wordlists, glossaries, iPods, mobile phones, MP3/4 players, pagers or other similar electronic devices
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick where a candidate uses a word processor
- behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.
- fabrication of results or evidence relating to an assessment
- offering a bribe or other inducement to any person connected with the assessment process.

# Appendix 4: Examples of Staff Malpractice/Maladministration

The following are examples of malpractice. This is not an exhaustive list and other instances of malpractice may be identified and considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion.

## Breach of security

Breaking the confidentiality of question papers or materials, and their electronic equivalents, or the confidentiality of candidates' scripts or their electronic equivalents. It could involve:

- failing to keep examination material secure prior to an examination
- discussing or otherwise revealing secure information in public, e.g. internet forums
- moving the time or date of a fixed examination (beyond the arrangements permitted by the regulations within the JCQ publication: Instructions for conducting examinations without notifying the relevant awarding body; (Conducting an examination before the published date is centre staff malpractice and a clear breach of security)
- failing to supervise adequately candidates who have been affected by a timetable variation. (This would apply to candidates subject to overnight supervision by centre personnel or where an examination is to be sat in an earlier or later session on the scheduled day)
- permitting, facilitating or obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination
- failing to retain and secure examination papers after an exam in cases where the life of the paper extends beyond the particular session (such papers are always clearly marked). For example, where an examination is to be sat in a later session by one or more candidates due to a timetable variation
- tampering with candidate scripts or controlled assessments or coursework after collection and before dispatch to the awarding body/examiner/moderator.  (This would additionally include reading candidates' scripts or photocopying candidates' scripts prior to dispatch to the awarding body/examiner. The only instance where photocopying a candidate's script is permissible is where he/she has been granted the use of a transcript)
- failing to keep Learner computer files which contain controlled assessments or coursework secure.
- failing to keep Learner portfolio evidence towards assessment secure

## Deception

Any act of dishonesty in relation to any examination or assessment, but not limited to:
- inventing or changing marks for internally assessed components (e.g. coursework) where there is no actual evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks being given
- 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).
- giving assistance beyond that permitted by the specification to a candidate or group of candidates, which results in a potential or actual advantage in an examination or assessment.
- For example:
- assisting candidates in the production of controlled assessments or coursework, or evidence of achievement, beyond that permitted by the regulations

- sharing or lending candidates' controlled assessments or coursework with other candidates in a way which allows malpractice to take place
- assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers
- permitting candidates in an examination to access prohibited materials (dictionaries, calculators etc.)
- prompting candidates in an examination/assessment by means of signs, or verbal or written prompts
- assisting candidates granted the use of an oral language modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader, a scribe or a Sign Language Interpreter beyond that permitted by the regulations.
- alteration of assessment and grading criteria
- assisting learners in the production of work for assessment, where support unduly influences the outcomes of assessment
- producing falsified entries statements
- allowing evidence which is known not to be the learner's own, to be included in a learner's assignment / portfolio
- falsifying records / certificates
- fraudulent certificate claims, i.e. claiming prior to completion

**Maladministration**

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

For example:
- failing to ensure that candidates' coursework or work to be completed under controlled conditions is adequately monitored and supervised
- failure to use current awarding body/organisation assignments and specifications for assessment purposes
- failing to issue to candidates the appropriate notices and warnings when conducting examinations/controlled assessments
- inappropriate members of staff assessing Learners for access arrangements who do not meet the criteria as detailed by the JCQ regulations[12]
- failure to train invigilators adequately, leading to non-compliance of JCQ regulations
- failure to inform the JCQ Centre Inspection Service of alternative sites for examinations
- not ensuring that the examination venue conforms to JCQ regulations / awarding body requirements
- 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 awarding body requirements
- the introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room, either during or prior to the examination (N.B this precludes the use of the examination room to coach candidates or give subject-specific presentations, including power- point 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

---

[12] See: *https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office*

- failure to keep accurate records in relation to very late arrivals and overnight supervision arrangements for examination candidates
- failure to keep accurate and up to date records in respect of access arrangements which have been processed electronically using the Access arrangements online system
- 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 supervise effectively the printing of computer-based assignments when this is required
- failing to retain candidates' controlled assessments or coursework in secure conditions 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 candidate scripts / controlled assessments / coursework to the awarding bodies or examiners or moderators in a timely way
- failing to notify the appropriate awarding body of an instance of suspected malpractice in examinations or assessments as soon as possible after such an instance occurs or is discovered
- failing to conduct a thorough investigation into suspected examination or assessment malpractice when asked to do so by an awarding body
- the inappropriate retention or destruction of certificates