




Name of Policy	Malpractice Policy – Exams and Assessments
School Lead	Jon Stevenson
Governor Lead	Curriculum and Standards Chair
Date of last Review	April 2024
Date of Approval	29 April 2024
Date of next Review	October 2024
Links to other policies	Examinations Policy Complaints and Appeals Policy Non-Examination Assessment Policy
Head teacher sign off signature and date	 08/05/2024

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
SENCo	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. 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 (SMPP 1)

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. (SMPP 2)

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 (SMPP 2)

2.5 Suspected malpractice

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice. (SMPP 2)

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 (GR 5.3)

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 (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 JCQ publication [Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures](#) and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11)

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*. (SMPP 4.3)

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 2023-2024](#)
- [Instructions for conducting examinations \(ICE\) 2023-2024](#)
- [Instructions for conducting coursework 2023-2024](#)
- [Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2023-2024](#)
- [Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2023-2024](#)
- [A guide to the special consideration process 2023-2024](#)
- [Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2023- 2024](#)
- [Plagiarism in Assessments](#)
- [AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications](#)
- [A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2023-2024 \(SMPP 3.3.1\)](#)

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

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 can't get marks for content just produced by AI – their marks come from showing their own understanding and producing their own work.

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

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.

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 remind students that any content produced using AI must be referenced and cannot be given marks – and a failure to reference use of AI is malpractice.

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.

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 (SMPP 4.3)

Suspected malpractice should be reported to the Head of Centre and will be investigated by the HOC and SBM.

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 \(SMPP 4.1.3\)*](#)

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 (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)

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)

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)

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. (SMPP 11.1)

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*](#)