




Name of Policy	Malpractice Policy – Exams and Assessments
School Lead	Jon Stevenson
Governor Lead	Full Governing Body
Date of last Review	October 2024
Date of Approval	October 2024
Date of next Review	October 2025
Links to other policies	Examinations Policy Complaints and Appeals Policy Non-Examination Assessment Policy
Head teacher sign off signature and date	 October 2024

Key staff involved in the malpractice procedure

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Steve Barnes
Exams officer	Liz Hallissey
SLT members	Jon Stevenson, Helen Garrett
SENDCo	Elena Wilson
Chair of Governors	Barbara Temple

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at The Pilgrim 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.](#)

Contents

1. Key staff involved in the policy	1
2. Introduction	3
3. Purpose of the policy	
4. 4 4. Preventing malpractice	5
5. Identification and reporting of malpractice	7
6. Communicating malpractice decisions	8
7. Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice	8

2. Introduction

2.1 What is malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are related concepts, the common theme of which is that they involve a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment.

2.2 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
- a breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered
- a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification which:
- gives rise to prejudice to candidates
- compromises public confidence in qualifications
- compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate
- damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre.

2.3 Candidate malpractice

'Candidate malpractice' means 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 writing of any examination paper.

2.4 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.

2.5 Suspected malpractice

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice.

[3. Purpose of the Policy](#)

3.1 To confirm The Pilgrim School has in place a written malpractice policy which covers all qualifications delivered by the centre and details 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 in accordance with [JCQ Instructions for Conducting Examinations](#) (JCQ ICE) (Section 4) and [General Regulations for Approved Centres and Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures](#).

3.2 General principles

In accordance with the regulations The Pilgrim School will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place.
- 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.
- As required by an awarding body, gather evidence of any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the JCQ publication [Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures](#) and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require.

[4. Preventing Malpractice](#)

4.1 The Pilgrim School has in place robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ publication [Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures](#).

This includes ensuring that all 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 2024-25](#)
- [JCQ Instructions for Conducting Examinations](#)
- [Instructions for conducting coursework 2024-25](#)

- [Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2024-25](#)
- [Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2024-2025](#)
- [A guide to the special consideration process 2024-2025](#)
- [Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures](#)
- [Plagiarism in Assessments](#)
- [AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications](#)
- [A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2024-25](#)

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

Candidates are advised that the work they submit for assessments should be their own. This is the case for both formal assessments and NEA / Coursework elements.

Candidates are advised of the circumstances under which AI may be allowed in NEA / Coursework.

4.3 AI Use in Assessments

AI can be used to generate answers that are not the pupils own answers. This can be accessed on any device that supports the use of AI through the internet or through other means. Therefore, there is a balance with using AI to learn but also being clear that under coursework situations they must submit authentically generated answers independently which they have created.

Candidates are advised that where they are allowed to use AI tools, they must:

- Reference them clearly
- Name the AI tool used
- Add the date they generated the content
- Explain how it was used
- Save a screenshot of the questions they asked and the answers they got

Candidates are advised that where the use of AI tools is allowed, they cannot get marks for content just produced by AI – their marks come from showing their own understanding and producing their own work and any use of AI must be referenced and a failure to do so is malpractice.

Therefore:

Candidates are advised that use of AI is not allowed in formal assessments / exams and their use would constitute malpractice.

Any staff decision to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice, because AI is used, and means that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations, and may attract severe sanctions.

Students and staff should not copy from any source, including generative AI, without prior approval and adequate documentation.

Students should not submit AI-generated work as their original work. Staff and students will be taught how to properly cite or acknowledge the use of AI where applicable. Teachers will be clear about when and how AI tools may be used to complete assignments and restructure assignments to reduce opportunities for plagiarism by requiring personal context, original arguments, or original data collection.

4.4 Teaching staff

Are advised to consider putting safeguards against use of AI in NEA / coursework in place by, wherever possible, finding time for students to complete work under exam-like conditions/in class to help staff understand the standard candidates are currently working at.

Teaching staff are also advised to talk to students about their work to check their understanding on an ongoing basis, before commencing marking of work.

All teaching staff have a responsibility to report any potential malpractice that they can identify.

Teaching staff are advised to be clear about when and if students can use AI tools and if the qualification rules allow the use of AI tools, to make sure students know how to reference clearly.

Teaching staff should advise students that misusing AI is cheating and a form of malpractice and inform them that the consequences are severe – they could lose the marks for the assessment or even be disqualified from the subject.

Teaching staff should ensure candidates are aware of the importance of the candidate declaration (which references AI use) when they submit their work for assessment.

In line with teaching standards, equality and diversity, and wellbeing policies Teaching staff should ensure that pupils do not 1) Use AI tools to manipulate media to impersonate others for bullying, harassment, or any form of intimidation which is strictly prohibited. All users are expected to employ these tools solely for educational purposes, upholding values of respect,

inclusivity, and academic integrity at all times.2) Develop a dependence on AI tools which can decrease human discretion and oversight and affect a pupils ability to work independently and submit coursework of integrity. 3) Create Unequal access: If an assignment permits the use of AI tools, the tools will be made available to all students, considering that some may already have access to such resources outside of school.

If AI misuse is suspected by a teacher or reported by another pupil or member of the public, it must be reported immediately. The subject department will confirm if the pupil in question has signed a declaration of authentication, if at this initial stage the pupil has not signed the stated form, the centre is not required to report this matter to the relevant awarding body and will deal with the case internally. If a suspected pupil has signed a declaration of authentication document, then the relevant awarding body will be notified and liaise with the Head of Centre to conduct a full investigation. The procedure is detailed in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures document (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>).

Sanctions and Consequences

The sanctions applied to a pupil committing plagiarism and making a false declaration of authenticity include but are not limited to: Disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for several years. The Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment. Awarding bodies will also take action against the centre, which can include the imposition of sanctions, where centre staff are knowingly accepting or failing to check, inauthentic work for qualification assessments.

For further information please follow the below links:

<https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/JCQ-AI-poster-for-students-2.pdf>

<https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/JCQ-AI-information-sheet-for-teachers-1.pdf>

The approaches used within the exam centre and teacher training will ensure that the work they accept is authentically the pupils own. Staff will be trained to spot potential indicators of AI use which may include, but is not an exhaustive list, the following- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms, and other localisations, a default use of language or vocabulary which might not appropriate to the qualification level, a lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected. Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified, a lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date , Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered, a difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a pupil in the classroom or in other previously submitted work, a lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected. • A lack of specific local or topical knowledge

5. Misusing AI tools Preventing misuse The school acknowledges that misuse of AI tools can happen both accidentally and intentionally. In mitigation, the school will consider taking the following actions to prevent the misuse of AI tools:

- Restricting access to online AI tools on school devices and networks, especially on devices used for exams and assessments
- Setting reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing pupils with regular reminders
- Allocating time for sufficient portions of pupils' work to be completed in class under direct supervision, where appropriate
- Examining intermediate stages in the production of pupils' work to ensure that work is being completed 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 and understanding achieved during lessons to ensure the teacher is confident that pupils understand the material
- Engaging pupils in verbal discussions about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work
- Refusing to accept work that is suspected to have been generated through misuse of AI tools without further investigation
- Issuing tasks which are, wherever possible, topical, current and specific, and require the creation of content which is less likely to be accessible to AI models
- Investing in educating and training staff, pupils and parents on the use of AI tools and raising awareness of the risks and issues that come with its use

5. Identification and reporting of malpractice

5.1 Escalating suspected malpractice issues

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

Suspected malpractice should be reported to the Head of Centre and will be investigated by the Head of Centre and Exams Officer.

5.2 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 publication [Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures](#)

The Head of Centre will ensure that where a candidate is the subject of a malpractice investigation, the candidate's parent/carer/ appropriate adult is kept informed of the progress of the investigation.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Form [JCQ/M1](#) will be used when reporting candidate cases. For centre staff, form [JCQ/M3](#) will be used.

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.

6. 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 the relevant parent / guardian and pass on details of any sanctions and action in cases where this is indicated.

The head of centre will also inform the individuals and their relevant parent / guardian if they have the right to appeal.

7. Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

The Pilgrim School will:

- Provide the individual and the relevant parent / guardian 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 2024-25](#)