

JCQ Centre Staff Sanctions Tariff Grid January 2019

This document has been agreed by representatives of the JCQ awarding bodies, and is intended to provide a principles-based guide to applying sanctions in teacher malpractice cases. It is for guidance only, is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive and is intended to provide an indicative frame work for considering sanctions in all cases of teacher malpractice and will be used alongside any mitigating and aggravating factors which are present in a particular case, which will be taken into account.

The document accompanies the JCQ Suspected Malpractice booklet and supplements the information about available sanctions contained there, as well as the exemplars contained at the end of the JCQ booklet.

The aim is to ensure that sanctions applied across awarding bodies are as consistent as possible, whilst allowing for the inevitable variations in the detail of different malpractice cases. At all times, the focus of sanctioning is to ensure that sanctions are proportionate, and achieve the aim of securing the integrity of the public examination system as set out in Section 9.1 of the JCQ Suspected Malpractice document.”

Version 1.3 26 February 2019 Staff Offences and Penalties: *For guidance only* - Mitigating and aggravating factors should also be considered. Empty boxes may still be used if justified.

Type of Offence	Warning	Training	Special Conditions	Suspension (MalCom only)
Improper Assistance	Minor assistance, no significant impact, e.g. where not allowed, headings or a basic table template, small amounts of simple / generic feedback, sharing exemplars without careful control (where individual is untrained/inexperienced).	Limited help, minimal impact, misunderstanding rules or lack of experience, e.g. new reader clarifies questions, non-specialist gives 'how to' guide in NEA against regulations.	Limited help and impact, e.g.-staff member gives general 'how to' guide, giving exemplars with no control, and/or feedback beyond regulations in presence of mitigating factors, e.g. in NEA following recent spec change where allowed in previous spec.	Significant impact; impairment to validity of assessments; e.g. feedback beyond regulations, giving exemplars for copying, provision of answers.
Maladministration	Repeated use of out of date or wrong tasks / texts, minor errors in following assessment regulations with minimal impact on candidates, e.g. granting legitimate access arrangements when approval not given.	Errors in following assessment regulations, by inexperienced/insufficiently-trained staff, e.g. new invigilator failing to manage timings correctly; scribe reading questions.	Errors in following assessment regulations by experienced members of staff, but with limited impact affecting a limited number of candidates, e.g. granting access arrangements to ineligible candidates to limited effect which is not systematic in scope; failure to invigilate clash candidates adequately to limited impact.	Errors in following assessment regulations that compromises integrity of assessment or submissions; or breach of regs that impacts results; or systemic, repeated or continuing non-compliance with JCQ regulations; failure to provide training for invigilators, and/or those facilitating Access Arrangements.
Deception	This box is intended to be blank.	This box is intended to be blank.	This box is intended to be blank.	Falsifying candidates' work or submissions, systemic non-compliance with JCQ regulations; falsifying marks, entering fictitious and/or ineligible candidates for exams; fabricating evidence for access arrangements.

<p>Security Breach</p>	<p>Failure to give due care and attention to security of assessment materials not resulting in a security breach, e.g. materials left outside of secure store but no breach to seals on question paper packets. Risk presented to integrity of exam, but no evidence of breach; failure to store papers appropriately but with no impact beyond increased risk.</p>	<p>Risk presented to integrity of exam with evidence of failure to understand regulations designed to protect exam integrity, e.g. incorrect papers removed from secure store, no second pair of eyes check, but content of papers not divulged to any unauthorised third party</p>	<p>Inadvertent/accidental failure to follow security regulations or action that has the potential to breach examination security e.g. giving candidates the wrong paper but breach contained to candidates within centre.</p>	<p>Abuse of legitimate access to confidential material, e.g. sharing live exam questions with candidates in advance of the scheduled exam time. Failure to act promptly to contain impact of security breach to centre. Failure to arrange exam clash supervision leading to significant impact.</p>
<p>Failure to Cooperate / Reporting issues</p>	<p>Minor non-compliance, e.g. delay in meeting investigation timescales without agreement, delay in reporting.</p>	<p>Failure to investigate in accordance with JCQ guidance.</p>	<p>Failure to report a low-impact incident of malpractice. Failure to take action as required by an awarding body.</p>	<p>Failure to report significant case of malpractice; failure to cooperate with investigation, failure to respond to awarding body communications. Submission of investigation reports that are misleading or contain false information that may lead an AO to an incorrect conclusion.</p>