

St Richard's Catholic College

MANAGING BEHAVIOUR POLICY(EXAMS)



The Policy was approved by the Governing Body: November 2025

Chair of Governors:_____

The Governing Body will review the policy in: November 2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of Centre	The Principal
Senior leader(s)	SLT
Exams officer	Mrs Daniela Fletcher

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that candidate behaviour in the examination room at St Richard's Catholic College is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

References in this policy to GR, ICE and SMPP refer to the JCQ publications **General Regulations for Approved Centres, Instructions for conducting examinations** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm that candidate behaviour in the examination room at St Richard's Catholic College is managed in line with JCQ regulations.

1. Briefing Candidates

To ensure candidates are aware of the standard of behaviour that is required in the examination room,

- ensure the JCQ **Information for Candidates** documents (coursework, non-examination assessments, on-screen tests, social media and written examinations) and Awarding Body privacy notices are distributed to all candidates whether electronically or in hard copy format **prior** to assessments and/or examinations taking place. (GR 5.8)
- ensure candidates are also made aware of the content of the JCQ **Unauthorised items** and **Warning to candidates** posters (GR 5.8)
- prior to assessments and/or examinations taking place, ensure candidates are briefed to reinforce what they must and must not do when sitting written examinations and/or on-screen tests, and when producing coursework and/or non-examination assessments (GR 5.8)

At St Richard's Catholic College candidates are made aware of JCQ information/briefed by:

- Centre Specific Handbook
- Directed to JCQ Documents on St Richard's Catholic College Website, (by Pastoral Leader and EO), reminders and links within the newsletter, email communication from EO,
- Assembly by the EO

2. Candidate Malpractice

- 'Malpractice', means any act, default or practice which is a breach of the Regulations (SMPP 1.2)
- Suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice (SMPP 2)

- Candidate malpractice' normally involves malpractice by a candidate in connection with any examination or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the completion of any examination (SMPP 2)
- Inappropriate behaviour by a candidate in the examination room is deemed 'candidate malpractice'
- Failure by a centre to notify, investigate and report to an Awarding Body all allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself (SMPP 1.7)

Examples of inappropriate behaviour/actions that constitute 'candidate malpractice' are provided in the final section of this policy.

3. Instructions for Conducting Examinations - Malpractice in the examination room

The following requirements are applied at St Richards Catholic College:

- Candidates are under formal examination conditions from the moment they enter the room in which they will be taking their examination(s) until the point at which they are permitted to leave
- Candidates must not talk to, attempt to communicate with or disturb other candidates once they have entered the examination room. If they do, this must be reported to the relevant Awarding Body
- Candidates must not open the question paper until the examination begins. If they do, this must be reported to the relevant Awarding Body (ICE 19.1)
- Where a candidate is being disruptive, the invigilator must warn the candidate that they may be removed from the examination room. The candidate must also be warned that the Awarding Body will be informed and may decide to penalise them, which could include disqualification (ICE 24.1)
- The head of centre, or authorised members of staff, have the authority to remove a candidate from the examination room but should only do so if the candidate would disrupt others by remaining in the room (ICE 24.1)
- The head of centre must report to the Awarding Body immediately all cases of suspected or actual malpractice in connection with the examination, including candidates, invigilators and centre staff, using the relevant JCQ forms (ICE 24.3)
- Where candidates commit malpractice, the Awarding Body may decide to penalise them, which could include disqualification. Candidates should be warned of the possible penalties an Awarding Body may apply as detailed in the JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (ICE 24.4)
- In cases of suspected malpractice, examination scripts must be packed as normal with Form JCQ/M1 being submitted separately to the relevant Awarding Body (ICE 24.6)

4. Roles and Responsibilities

The Role of the Invigilator

- Be vigilant and remain aware of incidents or emerging situations, looking out for malpractice (ICE 20.2)
- Warn a disruptive candidate that he/she may be removed from the examination room (ICE24.1)
- Record what has happened and actions taken on the exam room incident log (ICE 24.1)

The Role of the Exams Officer

- Ensure that the JCQ **Information for candidates documents** (coursework, non-examination assessments, on-screen tests, privacy notice, social media and written examinations) are distributed to all candidates prior to assessments and/or examinations taking place and that candidates are also made aware of the content of the JCQ **Unauthorised Items** and **Warning to Candidates** posters (GR 5.8)
- Ensure the JCQ **Unauthorised items** and **Warning to Candidates** posters are displayed in a prominent place for all candidates to see prior to entering the examination room (GR 5.8)
- Where a candidate is being/has been disruptive in the examination room, warn the candidate that the Awarding Body will be informed and may decide to penalise them, which could include disqualification (ICE 24.1)

The Role of the Head of Centre

- Where a candidate is seriously disrupting others, makes the decision to remove the candidate from the examination room (ICE 24.1)
- Report to the Awarding Body immediately all cases of suspected or actual malpractice in connection with the examination by completing form JCQ/M1 (ICE 24.3)

The Role of the Senior Leader

- Ensure support is provided for the Exams Officer and invigilators when dealing with disruptive candidates in examination rooms
- Ensure that internal disciplinary procedures relating to candidate behaviour are instigated, when appropriate

Examples of 'candidate malpractice'

These include (but are not limited to):

Introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room

Own blank paper

- used for rough work
- used for final answers

Calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited)

- not used
- used or attempted to use

Bringing into the examination room notes in the wrong format or prohibited annotations

- notes/annotations go beyond what is permitted but do not give an advantage; content irrelevant to subject
- notes/annotations are relevant and give an unfair advantage
- notes/annotations introduced in a deliberate attempt to gain an advantage

Unauthorised notes, study guides and personal organisers

- content irrelevant to subject
- content relevant to subject
- relevant to subject and evidence of use

Mobile phone or similar electronic devices (including iPod, MP3/4 player, memory sticks, smartphone, smartwatch, AirPods, earphones and headphones)

- not in the candidate's possession but make a noise in the examination room
- in the candidate's possession but no evidence of being used by the candidate
- in the candidate's possession and evidence of being used by the candidate

Watches (not smartwatches)

- in candidate's possession

Breaches of examination conditions

A breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the Awarding Body in relation to the examination rules and regulations

- minor non-compliance: e.g. sitting in a non-designated seat; continuing to write for a short period after being told to stop
- major non-compliance: e.g. refusing to move to a designated seat; significant amount of writing after being told to stop
- related non-compliance

Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security and integrity of the examinations

- leaving examination early (no loss of integrity); removing script from the examination room, but evidence of the integrity was maintained
 - removing script from examination room but with no proof that the script is safe; taking home materials
- deliberately breaking a timetable clash supervision arrangement; removing script from the examination room and with proof that the script has been tampered with; leaving examination room early so integrity is impaired

Disruptive behaviour in the examination room or assessment session (including use of offensive language)

- minor disruption lasting a short time; calling out, causing noise, turning around
- repeated or prolonged disruption; unacceptably rude remarks; being removed from the examination room; taking another's possessions
- warnings ignored; provocative or aggravated behaviour; repeated or loud offensive comments; physical assault on staff or property

Exchange, obtaining, receiving, or passing on information which could be examination related (or the attempt to)

Verbal communication

- isolated incidents of talking before the start of the examination or after papers have been collected
- talking during the examination about matters not related to the exam; accepting examination related information
- talking about examination related matters during the exam; whispering answers to questions

Communication

- passing/receiving written communications which clearly have no bearing on the assessment
- accepting assessment related information
- passing assessment related information to other candidates; helping one another; swapping scripts

Offences relating to the content of candidates' work

The inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework, non- examination assessments or portfolios

- isolated offensive words or drawings
- frequent offensive words or drawings; isolated obscenity or offensive comments directed at an individual or group
- frequent obscenities; discriminatory language, remarks or drawings directed at an individual or group

Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from or reproduction of third party sources (including the internet and AI tools); incomplete referencing

- minor amount of plagiarism/poor referencing in places
- plagiarism from work listed in the bibliography or referenced/acknowledged; or minor amount of plagiarism from a source not listed in the bibliography or referenced / acknowledged
- plagiarism from work not listed in the bibliography or referenced/acknowledged; or plagiarised text consists of the substance of the work submitted and the source is listed in the bibliography or referenced / acknowledged