

Malpractice Policy

2025/26

Malpractice Policy 2025

Centre name	St. Mark's Church of England School
Centre number	awaited
Date policy first created	05/09/2025
Current policy approved by	Governing Body (September 2026)
Current policy reviewed by	Governing Body
Date of next review	September 2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Mr Ben Godber
Senior leader(s)	Assistant Head Teacher (Outcome)
Exams officer	Jiani Guo
Other staff (if applicable)	Stehpanie Bryant

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at St. Mark's Church of England 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 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. 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)

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)

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)

Suspected malpractice

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

Purpose of the policy

To confirm St. Mark's Church of England 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)

- provides clear processes for the administration of qualifications which reduce, as far as reasonably possible, the opportunity for malpractice to occur.
- give clear and robust guidance on all aspects of the delivery and administration of all qualifications, including the following JCQ documents
 - 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

General principles

In accordance with the regulations St. Mark's Church of England 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)
- In the unlikely event of a malpractice being committed it is the responsibility of all staff to report any potential concerns directly to the Exams Officer or The head of Centre in the Exams Officer absence.
- 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)

Preventing malpractice

St. Mark's Church of England 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 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*; *Plagiarism in Assessments*; *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*; *A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2025-2026* (SMPP 3.3.1)

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

Candidates and parents are emailed Student Guidelines a few months before the examinations commence. The tutors have a powerpoint presentation of the same document, which they go through in detail with their tutees and obtain signatures from each of them. This is so we are confident that each student is aware of what is expected and what is against the regulations. Also, our senior leader (AHT-outcome) informs the student in a dedicated exam assembly, of all rules and regulations.

AI Use in Assessments

What is AI?

AI systems are designed to analyze data, recognize patterns, make predictions, and perform tasks that typically require human intervention. The goal is to create intelligent machines that can learn, reason, and make decisions in a manner similar to humans.

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.

While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice.

Teachers and students should also be aware that AI tools are evolving quickly but there are still limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

AI chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. Users can ask follow-up questions or ask the chatbot to revise the responses already provided. AI chatbots respond to prompts based upon patterns in the data sets (large language model) upon which they have been trained. They generate responses which are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate. AI chatbots can complete tasks such as the following:

Answering questions

- Analysing, improving, and summarising text
- Authoring essays, articles, fiction, and non-fiction
- Writing computer code
- Translating text from one language to another
- Generating new ideas, prompts, or suggestions for a given topic or theme
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or formality

When can AI be used?

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).

How should it be acknowledged?

It remains essential that students are clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and that they know how to do this. Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments. If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way.

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2024. The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.

What are the Risks of using AI?

The use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments. As noted above, they have been developed to produce responses based upon the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response and so the responses cannot be relied upon. AI chatbots often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. 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.

What is AI Misuse and how will this be treated as malpractice?

Students must be able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

- AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment 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.

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of 'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism' include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Please note that Incidents of suspected candidate malpractice identified before the candidate has signed any declaration of authentication do not need to be reported to the awarding body.

Identification and reporting of malpractice

Potential indicators of AI misuse of the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication that the student has misused AI:

- a) A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations*
- b) A default use of language or vocabulary which might not accord with the qualification level*
- c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected~
- d) Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
- e) A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects
- f) Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered
- g) A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work 10
- h) A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
- i) A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
- j) A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- k) Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
- l) The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output
- m) The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
- n) The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth and variety or to overcome its output limit
- o) The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
- p) Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.

*Please be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content.

However, some AI tools will produce quotations and references.

Automated detection

AI chatbots, as large language models, produce content by 'guessing' the most likely next word in a sequence. This means that AI-generated content uses the most common combinations of words, unlike humans who tend to use a variety of words in their normal writing. Several programs and services use this difference to statistically analyse written content and determine the likelihood that it was produced by AI, for example:

- Turnitin AI writing detection (<https://www.turnitin.com/solutions/topics/aiwriting/ai-detector/>)
- Copyleaks (<https://copyleaks.com/ai-content-detector>)
- GPTZero (<https://gptzero.me/>)
- Sapling (<https://sapling.ai/ai-content-detector>)

These can be used as a check on student work and/or to verify concerns about the authenticity of student work. However, it should be noted that the above tools, as they base their scores on the predictability of words, will give lower scores for AI-generated content which has been subsequently amended by students. The quality of these detection tools can vary and AI and detection tools will continue to evolve. Spending time getting to know how the detection tools work will help teachers and assessors understand what they are and aren't capable of.

AI detection tools, including those listed above, employ a range of detection models which can vary in accuracy depending on the AI tool and version used, the proportion of AI to human content, prompt types and other factors (such as an individual's English language competency). In instances where misuse of AI is suspected it can be helpful to use more than one detection tool to provide an additional source of evidence about the authenticity of student work.

The use of detection tools, where used, should form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of students' work; all available information should be considered when reviewing any malpractice concerns. Teachers will know their students best and so are best placed to assess the authenticity of work submitted to them for assessment – AI detection tools can be a useful part of the evidence they can consider.

Escalating suspected malpractice issues

Once suspected malpractice has been identified, the Exams Officer (Jiani Guo) can report it to the Head of Centre then;

- collect detailed statements from the invigilators, the accused and any other students that could be involved or witnessed the incident.
- complete the JCQ M1/M2 form

- obtained a signature from the Head of Centre

Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body

- The exam officer or 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 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)
- 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/M2 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)

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

St. Mark's Church of England School will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal, where relevant by ensuring that all staff and students have access to this information prior to any assessments.
- Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ publication **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes.**