



Malpractice Policy - Exams

Malpractice Policy - Exams

Centre name	Chauncy
Centre number	17263
Current policy approved by	Board of Governors
Current policy reviewed by	Head of Centre

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Steve Walton
Senior leader(s)	Sonali Lariko
Exams officer	Jaqui Meli
Other staff (if applicable)	James Steventon SENCO

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Chauncy 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 is 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 the 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 against 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

- 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.
- 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 the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures - section 19).

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

Chauncy 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, Chauncy School will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after assessments 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 current JCQ document
- Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures, and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require.

Preventing malpractice

Chauncy 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. 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 2024-2-25
 - Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2024-2025
 - Instructions for conducting coursework 2024-2025
 - Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2024-2025
 - Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2024-2025
 - A guide to the special consideration process 2024-2025
 - Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2024-2025 (this document)
 - Plagiarism in Assessments
 - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications
 - Post Results Services June 2026 and November 2026
 - A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2025-2026

The School's Responsibility

It is important that staff involved in the management, assessment and quality assurance of Examinations, and our students are fully aware of the contents of this policy and that the centre has arrangements in place to prevent and investigate instances of suspected malpractice and maladministration.

A failure to report suspected or actual malpractice/maladministration cases, including plagiarism, cheating and collusion or having in place effective arrangements to prevent such cases, may lead to sanctions being imposed on the school by the Awarding body.

Chauncy School's compliance with this policy and how it takes reasonable steps to prevent and/or investigate instances of malpractice and maladministration will be reviewed by JCQ annually.

What is Plagiarism?

Plagiarism is the presentation of someone else's work, words, images, ideas, opinions or discoveries, whether published or not, as one's own, or alternatively taking for one's own use, the artwork, images or computer-generated work of others without properly acknowledging the source, with or without the owner's permission.

Plagiarism by students can occur in examinations, but is most likely to occur outside sat, unseen exams, i.e. in coursework, assignments, portfolios, and essays.

Examples of plagiarism may include:

- Directly copying from written, physical, pictorial or written material without crediting the source
- Paraphrasing someone else's work without crediting the source
- Using AI, for example, ChatGPT to generate or modify content to evade plagiarism detection is deemed as malpractice

Work submitted for assessment must be the student's own efforts and must be their own work. Students are bound by their student code of conduct and are required to ensure that all submitted work is their own and valid for assessment purposes.

Brief quotations from the published or unpublished works of another person, suitably attributed, are acceptable. Details on how to reference the material used can be obtained from your subject teachers.

The Use of AI in Coursework and Assessments

What is AI?

AI stands for artificial intelligence, and using it is like having a computer that thinks. AI tools learn from data on the internet. It is important to note that there is a huge range of AI tools and they can now carry out a variety of tasks, including writing text, making art and creating music. It is impossible to provide a comprehensive list of AI tools as new tools are emerging all the time; however, some of the most common tools are listed below:

AI chatbots currently available include:

- ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com/auth/login>)
- Jenni AI (<https://jenni.ai>)
- Jasper AI (<https://www.jasper.ai/>)
- Writesonic (<https://writesonic.com/chat/>)
- Bloomai (<https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom>)
- Gemini (<https://gemini.google.com/>)
- Claude (<https://claude.ai/>)
- There are also AI tools which can be used to generate images, such as:
- Midjourney (<https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/>)
- Stable Diffusion (<https://stablediffusionweb.com/>)
- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (<https://openai.com/dall-e-2/>)

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate music. These include:

- Soundraw (<https://soundraw.io/>)
- wavtool (<https://wavtool.com/>)
- Musicfy (<https://create.musicfy.lol/>)

What is AI misuse?

Whilst AI is a new tool, the principles behind misuse do not change. Students must submit work for assessments which is their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is, in their own words, and isn't copied or paraphrased from another source, such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work.

Students are also expected to demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding as required for the qualification in question and set out in the qualification specification. This includes demonstrating their performance in relation to the assessment objectives for the subject relevant to the question/s or other tasks students have been set. While AI may become an established tool at the workplace in the future, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it's important for students' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI. Students should develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of

the subjects they are studying. To illustrate these principles, we have provided some examples below, but, of necessity, the list of examples cannot be exhaustive.

Examples of AI misuse include:

- 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 an assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation, or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge and reference the use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies

Work submitted for assessment must be the student's own efforts and must be their own work. Students are bound by their student code of conduct and are required to ensure that all submitted work is their own and valid for assessment purposes.

If any sections of a student's work are reproduced directly from AI-generated responses, those elements must be identified by the student, and they must understand that this does not allow them to demonstrate that they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded.

Risks of using AI

There are many risks associated with using AI. A clear risk is that students may rely on incorrect information, and so they reach incorrect conclusions. AI creates responses based upon the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response, and so the responses cannot be relied upon. In addition, AI chatbots often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. AI may also present a safeguarding risk, as some AI chatbots have been identified as providing dangerous and harmful answers to questions, and some can also produce fake references to books/articles by real or fake people.

Students also run the risk of falsely presenting the knowledge, skills and understanding which they have acquired, which would constitute malpractice leading to disqualification, debarment or penalty.

Referencing the use of AI

If AI is allowed, students must reference AI in line with JCQ guidance (reproduced below).

- Name the AI tool you used
- Add the date you generated the content
- Explain how you used it
- Save a screenshot of the questions you asked and the answers you got

Informing and advising teachers

The school will provide advice and tools to support teachers who are marking and assessing work. We will share with teachers the JCQ guidance on Artificial Intelligence in Assessments (updated for this year). In addition, we have regularly included reminders and updates in staff briefings and staff training.

We will make our teachers aware that identifying the misuse of AI by students requires a variety of assessment methods and is part of ongoing practice rather than a single action. Teachers must rely on their own knowledge of students' usual writing and ways of working to make informed judgements about the authenticity of work. Our teachers will also directly interact with students, e.g. through student check-ins, verbal questioning, so that they are familiar with students' work and their conceptual development. In addition, curriculum planning will ensure that students are given some time in supervised conditions so the teacher can authenticate each student's whole work with confidence. The school will also train teachers in the use of AI detection tools (see below), but will make staff aware that they cannot solely rely on this tool to detect malpractice.

Informing and Advising Candidates

Students will be reminded about accidental or intentional AI misuse via pre-season assemblies and during the coursework window, before signing the candidate declaration forms. Candidates will also discuss AI within their PIE lessons and in tutorials. Students will be given time in supervised conditions so the teacher can authenticate each student's whole work with confidence.

AI and Plagiarism Checker

Chauncy School uses a variety of plagiarism detection software such as Quilbolt, Google Classroom Plagiarism Checker and Zerogpt that scans student work for matched text by comparing the work to a large database of student work, publications, and materials on the internet.

All Teachers must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the students' own and where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it has been generated by AI, but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate and use plagiarism detection software to highlight where the student has plagiarised work or made use of AI in the completion of their work.

Reporting malpractice (use of AI)

If a student has signed the declaration of authentication, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation as detailed in JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures.

If a student has not signed the declaration of authentication, the case does not need to be reported to the awarding organisation. The teacher and, if necessary, other key leaders (Department Lead / Year Lead / SLT) will ensure that the student is aware of the possible significance of their actions. This should include not only the possible consequences for them if they were to submit this work, but also that they fully understand their error. This should therefore include the teacher outlining: what malpractice is, how to avoid malpractice and how to reference sources / acknowledge AI tools. The teacher will also ensure that the final version submitted to the awarding organisation represents only work that is their own. The school is aware that the support of parents is critical in this area, and so has set up a notification for parents which highlights the misuse of AI to parents. This notification will also allow us to monitor students who are misusing AI for further focused teaching.

Definition of Cheating

The term cheating includes, without limitation:

- Being in possession of notes, 'crib notes', or textbooks during an examination other than an examination where the rules of the examination permit such usage
- Communicating during the examination with another candidate
- Having prior access to the examination questions, unless permitted to do so by the rules of the examination
- Substitution of examination materials
- Unfair or unauthorised use of an electronic calculator/device during an exam where usage is not permitted.
- Impersonation
- Use of a communication device during the examination
- Any deliberate attempt to deceive

Definition of Collusion

Collusion is an example of unfair means because, like plagiarism, it is an attempt to deceive the examiners by disguising the true authorship of an assignment or part of an assignment. Its most common version is that student A copies, or imitates in close detail, student B's work with student B's consent. But it also includes cases in which two or more students divide the elements of an assignment among themselves, and copy, or imitate in close detail, one another's answers.

It is an offence to copy, or imitate in close detail, another student's work, even with their consent (in which case it becomes an offence of collusion). It is also an offence of collusion to consent to having one's work copied or imitated in close detail. Students are expected to take reasonable steps to safeguard their work from improper use by others.

Collusion should not be confused with the normal situation in which students learn from one another, sharing ideas, as they generate the knowledge and understanding necessary for each of them to successfully and independently undertake an assignment. Nor should it be confused with group work on an assignment where this is specifically authorised in the assignment brief.

Identification and Reporting of Malpractice

Escalating Suspected Malpractice Issues

Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre MUST report it to the Head of Centre, the Senior Leader i/c of Exams and the Exams Officer.

Reporting Suspected Malpractice within an Exam to the Awarding Body

The Head of Centre/ Exams Officer 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](#)

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.

The following forms will be used to notify the awarding body of the incident of Malpractice:

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

Reporting Suspected Malpractice with a Controlled Assessment, NEA and Coursework to the Awarding Body

Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non- examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication does not need to 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 (the candidate or the 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. The following forms will be used to notify the awarding body of the incident of Malpractice:

- **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

The awarding body will decide based on 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.

Communicating Malpractice Decisions

Once a decision has been made, it will be communicated in writing to the Head of Centre/ Exams Officer as soon as possible. The Head of Centre Exams Officer 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.

Appeals Against Decisions Made in Cases of Malpractice

Chauncy 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 document A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes