

Policy 9 - Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Upton Hall School FCJ

Policy 9 - Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Centre name	Upton Hall School FCJ
Centre number	34763
Date policy first created	02/10/2023
Current policy approved by	A Gaunt
Current policy reviewed by	A Gaunt
Date of review	01/05/2026
Date of next review	01/05/2027

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	A Gaunt
Senior leader(s)	A Murphy
Exams officer	H Whitehurst
Other staff (if applicable)	P Etheridge

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Upton Hall School FCJ is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

Reference in the policy to **GR** and **SMPP** relate to relevant sections of the current JCQ documents **General Regulations for Approved Centres** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

Introduction

What are malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are distinct but related concepts, the common theme being that they involve a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This policy and procedure uses the word 'malpractice' to cover both 'malpractice' and 'maladministration' and it means any act, default or practice which is:

- a breach of the Regulations, and/or
- a breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered, and/or
- a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification

which:

- gives rise to prejudice to candidates, and/or
- compromises public confidence in qualifications, and/or
- 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 centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre (SMPP 1)

Candidate malpractice

'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)

Centre staff malpractice

'Centre staff malpractice' means malpractice committed by:

- a member of staff, contractor (whether employed under a contract of employment or a contract for services) or a volunteer at a centre, or
- an individual appointed in another capacity by a centre, such as an invigilator, a Communication Professional, a Language Modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader or a scribe (SMPP 2)

Centre malpractice

'Centre malpractice' normally involves malpractice where there is an element of systemic failure, a breach in policies or widespread malpractice such that a centre-level sanction is appropriate (SMPP 2)

Suspected malpractice

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice (regardless of how the incident might be categorised, as described in SMPP, section 1.9). (SMPP 2)

Purpose of the policy

To confirm Upton Hall School FCJ:

- has in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written malpractice policy which covers all qualifications delivered by the centre detailing how candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments, how suspected malpractice issues should be escalated within the centre and reported to the relevant awarding body; it must also acknowledge the use

of AI (e.g. what AI is, when it may be used and how it should be acknowledged, the risks of using AI, what AI misuse is and how this will be treated as malpractice) (GR 5.3)

General principles

In accordance with the regulations Upton Hall School FCJ will:

- take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after assessments have taken place (GR 5.11)
- inform the awarding body **immediately** of any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice or maladministration, involving a candidate or a member of staff, by completing the appropriate documentation (GR 5.11)
- as required by an awarding body, gather evidence of any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the current JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures** and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11)

Preventing malpractice

Upton Hall School FCJ has in place:

- Robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**. (SMPP 4.3)
- This includes ensuring that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the following JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance:
 - General Regulations for Approved Centres 2025-2026
 - Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2025-2026
 - Instructions for conducting coursework 2025-2026
 - Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2025-2026
 - Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2025-2026
 - A guide to the special consideration process 2025-2026
 - Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2025-2026 (this document)
 - Plagiarism in Assessments
 - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications
 - Post Results Services June 2025 and November 2025
 - A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2025-2026
 - Guidance for centres on cyber security

(SMPP 3.2)

Additional information:

NA

Informing and advising candidates how to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments

In Year 11, candidates are advised in PSHE lessons prior to mock exams about the importance of avoiding malpractice. Tutors go through the details using a powerpoint.

The JCQ information for candidates is shared with the Year group via the Pastoral Classroom.

This information is repeated in an exams assembly prior to public exams for both Year 11 and 13, led by ECH

AI use in assessments

The JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications guidance is used to provide teachers/assessors involved in delivering JCQ qualifications with the information they need to manage use of AI in assessments.

Appendix 1

The use of Artificial Intelligence(AI) in assessed work for awarding bodies

a) Key principles

The Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) has published clear guidance on the use of AI which can be found here. The school will comply with this guidance.

JCQ's guidance states that any use of AI which means students have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the student's own
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

b) Measures to inform candidates

To guard against malpractice linked to AI, the centre will:

- i) Explain to students, before they begin working on any work which forms part of an exam assessment and in which access to the internet is permitted, the importance of completing their own independent work.
- ii) Explain to students the JCQ guidance about malpractice linked to AI, found in section (a) above.
- iii) Reinforce to students the significance of their declaration where they confirm the work they are submitting is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and that they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject
- iv) Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice
- v) Explain to students the conventions for referencing acceptable AI use.

To ensure that all students receive this information in a consistent manner, all students beginning on relevant work will be asked to read a copy of the school's 'Guidance on the use of AI' (appendix one here) and sign the declaration sheet, which will be retained by the school.

c) Measures to reduce the likelihood of AI misuse during the completion of assessed work

JCQ have suggested a number of actions which teachers can take as assessed work is being prepared, which will make it harder for candidates to misuse AI whilst completing their work. Not all of these will be appropriate or permissible in every subject, but each department completing relevant work should consider which of these approaches are valid for them, and have a written record of which of these approaches they will use as a matter of routine.

Possible approaches include:

- Allocating time for sufficient portions of work to be done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each student's whole work with confidence.
- Examining intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages.
- Introducing classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident that the student understands the material.
- Considering whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their

work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work.

If, in the course of assessed work being completed, a teacher suspects that a student is misusing AI, they will alert their Head of Department and the Exams Officer, who will consider appropriate next steps.

d) Marking of assessed work

Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques that teachers are probably already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own.

JCQ suggest a range of questions which teachers may usefully consider as they are marking which could help identify AI misuse. These can be found in the 'Identifying Misuse' section of the JCQ guidance on AI.

If a member of staff has concerns about the authenticity of work submitted by a student, they will alert their Head of Department and the Exams Officer, who will consider appropriate next steps.

Appendix 2

Guidance on the use of AI

Key principles:

There are strict rules about the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in work which forms part of an exam course. You must make sure that you comply with these rules. Failure to do so may result in a severe penalty, which could include disqualification from the qualification.

The Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) states that any use of AI which means students have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the student's own
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

You will be required to sign an authentication sheet when you complete your assessed work. This states that the work is your own, independent work.

Teachers have been provided with guidance about how to identify AI misuse. They may also use electronic tools to help identify AI misuse.

Referencing AI use:

If you make any use of AI, you must reference it, as you would any other source.

i) To reference the use of an AI tool, you must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2023.

j) You must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a noneditable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used. This must be submitted with the work so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used

If you use an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified and referenced in your work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, you should ensure that you independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources you have used to do this.

I have read and understood this guidance. I understand that any misuse of AI may lead to severe consequences.

Candidate name: Date:

Identification and reporting of malpractice

Escalating suspected malpractice issues

Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre can report it using the

appropriate channels. (SMPP 4.3)

Staff should make a careful note of the grounds for concern and pass it to the Exams Officer, Mrs Whitehurst. This should be done as soon as possible. Mrs Whitehurst will bring it to the attention of Ms Murphy for discussion

Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body

- The head of centre will notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice, using the appropriate forms, and will conduct any investigation and gathering of information in accordance with the requirements of the JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (SMPP 4.1.3)
- The head of centre will ensure that, where a candidate is a child or an adult at risk and is the subject of a malpractice investigation, the candidate's parent/carer/ appropriate adult is kept informed of the progress of the investigation (SMPP 4.1.3)
- Form JCQ/M1 will be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of candidate malpractice. Form JCQ/M2 will be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of suspected staff malpractice/maladministration (SMPP 4.4, 4.6)
- Candidate malpractice offences relating to the content of work (i.e. inappropriate/offensive content, copying/collusion, plagiarism (including AI misuse) and/or false declaration of authentication) which are discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication, do not need to be reported to the awarding body. Instead, they will be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures.

Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment where the offence does not relate to the content of candidates' work (e.g. possession of unauthorised materials, breach of assessment conditions) or where a candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, must be reported using a JCQ M1 to the relevant awarding body. If, at the time of the malpractice, there is no entry for that candidate (who the centre intended to enter), the centre is required to submit an entry by the required entry deadline. (SMPP 4.5)

- If, in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence that an individual may have committed malpractice, that individual (the candidate or the member of staff) will be informed of all the required information and the accused individual informed of their rights and responsibilities (SMPP 5.33-3.4)
- Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed information-gatherer) will submit a written report to the relevant awarding body summarising the information obtained and actions taken, accompanied by the information obtained during the course of their enquiries (5.35)
- Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used (SMPP 5.37)
- The awarding body will decide on the basis of the report, and any supporting documentation, whether there is evidence of malpractice and if any further investigation is required. The head of centre will be informed accordingly (SMPP 5.40)

Additional information:

Communicating malpractice decisions

Once a decision has been made, it will be communicated in writing to the head of centre as soon as possible. The head of centre will communicate the decision to the individuals concerned and pass on details of any sanctions and action in cases where this is indicated. The head of centre will also inform the individuals if they have the right to appeal. (SMPP 11.1)

Additional information:

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Upton Hall School FCJ will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal, where relevant
- Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ document **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**

Additional information:

Changes 2025/2026

(Added) New heading **Centre malpractice** added.

(Added) Under heading **Preventing malpractice** added to the list of JCQ documents.

(Added/amended) Under heading **AI use in assessments**:

- additional/amended text added in bullet points to reflect slight changes in SMPP
- optional insert field added referencing the JCQ document **Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)** or similar centre document.

(Amended) Under heading **Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body** text amended to reflect wording changes/additions in SMPP.

Centre-specific changes