

MALPRACTICE POLICY (EXAMS)

2025/26

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by
David Martin

Date of next review	Autumn 2026
---------------------------	-------------

Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Katherine Warrington School

Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Centre Name	Katherine Warrington School
Centre Number	17502
Date policy first created	October 2024
Current policy approved by	David Martin
Current policy reviewed by	David Martin
Date of next review	October 2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of Centre	David Martin
Senior leader(s)	Gareth Livesey-Jones
Exams officer	Michelle Phillips

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Katherine Warington School 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 publications **General Regulations for Approved Centres** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

Introduction

What are malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are 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

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 19). (SMPP 2)

Purpose of the policy

To confirm Katherine Warrington School:

- 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 Katherine Warrington School 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

Katherine Warrington School 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, through CPD and cascading of information, 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

Informing and advising candidates

Candidates are issued with a 'Candidate Exams Handbook', which identifies what malpractice is and advises candidates to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments. Candidates will also have these messages reinforced in pre-exam season assemblies and in briefings prior to each

examination. Delivery of such messages may be from members of SLT, the Exams Officer or the Pastoral staff.

AI use in assessments

AI stands for artificial intelligence and can be used to create text, images, videos, music and artwork based on instructions given to an AI tool.

AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications.

AI misuse is when you use an AI tool in an exam or assessment where you are not allowed to; and/or where you use an AI tool to create work and then say it's your own. Misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice.

Candidates complete the majority of their exams and a large number of other assessments under close staff supervision with limited access to authorised materials and no permitted access to the internet. The delivery of these assessments should be unaffected by developments in AI tools as candidates must not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments.

There are some assessments in which access to the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages. The majority of these assessments will be Non-Examined Assessments (NEAs), coursework and internal assessments for General Qualifications (GQs) and Vocational & Technical Qualifications (VTQs). JCQ's guidance which is designed to help candidates and teachers to complete NEAs, coursework and other internal assessments successfully is followed in relation to these assessments.

Candidates are informed by subject teachers about AI and where its use is appropriate. Candidates are also made aware of the risks of using AI. AI references must always be acknowledged. Any misuse of AI will be treated as malpractice.

If an AI tool has been used in an assessment, candidates must:

- reference the AI tool used
- give the date of when the AI tool generated the content
- give details of how it was used
- save screenshots of what they have asked or instructed the AI tool to do and what answer the AI gave them, and include this with the work submitted.

Identifying the misuse of AI by candidates requires the same skills and observation techniques teachers are already using to assure themselves candidate work is authentically their own. When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, staff will compare it against other work created by the candidate. Teachers will consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the candidate in the classroom, or under supervised conditions.

The Candidate Exams Handbook also includes a section outlining the use of AI e.g. what it is, the risks of using it, what AI misuse is, how this will be treated as malpractice, when it may be used and how it should be acknowledged by referencing the JCQ document 'Teachers & Assessors - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications'). Candidates are also directed to the JCQ document "AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications"

Identification and reporting of malpractice

Escalating suspected malpractice issues

All staff have a responsibility for reporting any potential malpractice in exams and assessments that they may identify. Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre can report it using the appropriate channels. (SMPP 4.3) All incidents of malpractice are reported to the Exams Officer in a full written report. The Exams Officer will report all instances of malpractice to the Head of Centre and the SLT link for exams.

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, including improper assistance, using the appropriate forms, and will conduct any investigation and gathering of information in accordance with the requirements of the JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (SMPP 4.1.3)
- If any improper assistance has been given, this will be reported to the awarding body, as per section SMPP 4.1.3, and a note will be made of this on the cover sheet of the candidate's work or other appropriate place.
- The head of centre will ensure that where a candidate who is a child/vulnerable adult 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)
- Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication need not be reported to the awarding body but will be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures. The only exception to this is where the awarding body's confidential assessment material has potentially been breached. The breach will be reported to the awarding body immediately (SMPP 4.5)
- All incidents of suspected staff and centre malpractice/maladministration and all incidents of suspected candidate malpractice identified after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication must be reported to the awarding organisation
- If, in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence to implicate an individual in malpractice, that individual (a candidate or a member of staff) will be informed of the rights of accused individuals (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 summarising the information obtained and actions taken to the relevant awarding body, 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)

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)

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Katherine Warrington School 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 publication **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**

If a candidate who is the subject of the decision disagrees with the decision:

- a written request, setting out as clearly and concisely as possible the grounds for the appeal including any further evidence relevant to supporting the appeal, should be submitted by the candidate
- an **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted within 5 calendar days of the decision being made known to the appellant

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 7 working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre.