



## Malpractice Policy Exams & Assessment

Centre name	King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Boys
Centre number	20149
Date policy first created	May 2024
Current policy approved by	Melios Michael
Current policy reviewed by	Melios Michael
Date of review	January 2026
Date of next review	January 2027

### Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of Centre	Russell Bowen
Senior Leader(s)	Melios Michael
Exams Officer	Simla Nijran
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Boys 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

This policy outlines King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Boys' commitment to ensuring academic integrity and sets out procedures to prevent, detect, and deal with assessment malpractice, including the misuse of Artificial Intelligence (AI).

Applies to all qualifications with centre-assessed components, including coursework, non-examined assessments (NEAs), and internal assessments. It includes staff, students, and private candidates.

### 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 awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered, and/or
- a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification which:
  - o gives rise to prejudice to candidates, and/or
  - o compromises public confidence in qualifications, and/or
  - o 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
  - o 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)
  - o Misuses AI to deceive or misrepresent

### Examples include (but are not limited to):

- Plagiarism
- Collusion
- Fabrication of data
- False declarations of authenticity
- Failure to follow assessment rules
- AI misuse (see below)

### Definition of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

For the purposes of this policy, **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** refers to digital tools, systems, or software that can generate, analyse, or manipulate content autonomously or semi-autonomously. This includes (but is not limited to) tools that can:

- Generate written text, images, audio, data or code
- Paraphrase, rewrite, summarise or translate content
- Provide structured explanations, ideas or solutions
- Produce outputs based on patterns or algorithms

AI tools used by candidates may include large language models (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Copilot), paraphrasing tools, image-generation systems, and automated content generators.

Candidates must understand that **AI-generated content is not considered their own independent work** unless:

- its use is clearly acknowledged,
- prompts and outputs are retained in a non-editable format, and
- the candidate demonstrates independent understanding and analysis.

### **AI Use and Misuse in Assessments**

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in assessments carries risks which may compromise the integrity and validity of a candidate's work. These risks include the generation of inaccurate, misleading or fabricated information; the production of content that does not reflect the candidate's own knowledge, understanding or skills; the potential for hidden plagiarism; and over-reliance on AI which may prevent candidates from meeting the assessment objectives independently. There are also risks relating to bias within AI-generated outputs and uncertainty about how AI tools process and store data. Candidates must therefore exercise caution when using AI and ensure that any permitted use is fully transparent, appropriately referenced, and does not replace their own independent work.

Misuse of AI Includes:

- Submitting AI-generated content as one's own
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools
- Using AI to generate substantial content
- Paraphrasing AI content without attribution

#### **Acceptable Use:**

AI tools may only be used when:

- The AI tool is clearly identified (e.g., ChatGPT 3.5, used on 25/01/2025)
- A copy of the prompt and output is retained in non-editable format
- The AI is appropriately referenced
- Independent understanding and analysis are demonstrated

AI-generated content cannot replace the student's own fulfilment of assessment objectives.

#### **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
- 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 (regardless of how the incident might be categorised, as described in SMPP, section 19). (SMPP 2)

## Responsibilities

### Centre:

- Maintain and review this policy annually
- Ensure staff and students are trained on acceptable use of AI and the consequences of malpractice
- Display and distribute JCQ's "Information for Candidates" documents

### Teachers/Assessors:

- Confirm authenticity of student work
- Report concerns following internal procedures
- Avoid accepting unverified or inauthentic work
- Do not use AI as the sole marker of work

### Students:

- Submit only their own independent work
- Reference all sources, including AI tools, accurately
- Understand that misuse constitutes malpractice

## Purpose of the policy

To confirm King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Boys has in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a Malpractice Policy which covers the following:

- all qualifications delivered by the centre detailing how candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations and assessments
- the management of non-examination assessments including controlled assessments and coursework, which includes details on how candidates' work will be authenticated
- 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 King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Boys 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

King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Boys 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 for conducting these as specified in the following JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance:

- General Regulations for Approved Centres 2025-2026 (5.7)
- 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
- Information for candidates AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments) ([www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice](http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice))
- Post Results Services June 2025, November 2025 and June 2026
- A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2025-2026

(SMPP 3.3.1)

Additional information:

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

Candidates are given a briefing by the exams officer a few weeks before exams start and a booklet outlining all the relevant information to help them not to commit malpractice, including when the use of AI is or isn't permitted. They are also advised to read any information outside the exam room, which further outlines the rules within the exam room.

### **Informing and training staff on AI use and malpractice**

All staff involved in the delivery, supervision, assessment and administration of examinations and assessments, including teachers, assessors, invigilators and relevant support staff, are informed of the appropriate use of AI and the risks of AI misuse through annual training and updates. This includes whole-staff briefings at the start of each academic year, targeted CPD for staff involved in non-examined assessments and coursework, and updates from the exams officer where JCQ or awarding body guidance changes. New staff receive guidance as part of their induction. Staff are reminded of their responsibilities to authenticate student work, monitor for indicators of AI misuse, and follow internal reporting procedures where concerns arise.

### **AI use in assessments**

Students complete most exams without access to the internet or electronic devices, these exams should be unaffected by AI as the students will have no way of accessing AI tools in these circumstances.

Where students require access to the internet, such as the research stages of NEAs (Non-Examined

Assessments) and coursework, the use of AI can be recognised by methods highlighted in the JCQ document 'AI Use in Assessments'. The use of AI in these assessments can also be prevented by methods highlighted in this document.

## Identification and reporting of malpractice

### 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)

Any malpractice is reported to the exams officer and if they deem it necessary the senior leadership team will be informed.

### 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 document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (SMPP 4.1.3)
- 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 (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 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 (SMPP 4.5)
- 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 (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)

Additional information:

#### **Internal Review of Centre Decisions (Prior to Awarding Body Referral)**

Where a teacher or assessor identifies concerns about the authenticity of a candidate's work **prior to authentication**, the matter will be reviewed internally in line with the centre's malpractice procedures. If a candidate believes that their work has been incorrectly identified as malpractice at this stage, they may request an **internal review of the decision**.

- The internal review will be conducted by a senior member of staff not previously involved in the assessment decision, to ensure impartiality. The review will consider the evidence available at the time, including the candidate's explanation where appropriate.
- This internal review process does **not** constitute a formal appeal and does **not** override the centre's obligation to report suspected malpractice to the awarding body where required. Once a case has been referred to an awarding body, any right of appeal will be in accordance with the JCQ document *A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes*.

## Updating Assessment Records in Cases of Improper Assistance

Where a teacher, assessor, or other member of staff identifies that a candidate has received **improper assistance** during the preparation, completion, or submission of assessed work (including coursework, controlled assessments, NEAs, or any centre-assessed component), the centre will ensure that **all relevant assessment records are updated accordingly**. This will include:

### 1. Recording the Details of the Improper Assistance

The following information will be added to the candidate's assessment record for the component concerned:

- the nature of the improper assistance identified
- when and how it was discovered
- the member of staff who detected or reported it
- any statements provided by the candidate or staff
- supporting evidence (e.g., drafts, emails, annotated work, similarity reports, AI output logs)

### 2. Annotating the Candidate's Work and Associated Documentation

Where permitted, the candidate's work will be:

- annotated to highlight the section(s) affected
- cross-referenced to the malpractice record
- marked as "Subject to Malpractice Review" until the case is resolved

### 3. Updating Centre Tracking and Authentication Records

The following records will also be updated:

- internal assessment tracking sheets
- teacher authentication logs
- candidate authentication declarations
- internal NEA/coursework submission records

If improper assistance was identified **before authentication**, this will be explicitly recorded and the work will be treated in line with internal review procedures.

#### **4. Updating Records After the Outcome of the Investigation**

Once the investigation has concluded (internally or via the awarding body), the assessment record will be updated to include:

- the final decision
- any penalties or adjustments applied
- revised marks or grade outcomes (if applicable)
- the date of resolution
- whether the incident was reported to the awarding body
- any required follow-up actions

All updates will be completed by the Exams Officer or designated senior leader and retained in accordance with JCQ's retention requirements.

#### **5. Retention of Records**

All documentation relating to improper assistance and corresponding updates to assessment records will be:

- securely stored
- retained for the period specified by JCQ and the awarding body
- accessible only to authorised staff involved in exams administration, quality assurance, and oversight

#### **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)  
Additional information:

#### **Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice**

King Edward VI Camp Hill School for Boys 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**

#### **Procedures for Suspected Malpractice**

- **Before authentication:** Address internally. Students must revise and resubmit.
- **After authentication:** Report to the awarding body as per JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures.
- Retain all supporting evidence (e.g., AI detection reports, teacher notes, student statements).

#### **Detection Measures**

- Comparisons with known student work
- Use of AI detection tools (e.g., Turnitin, GPTZero)
- Monitoring language style, content coherence, and referencing
- Verbal questioning or draft reviews when appropriate

#### **Penalties**

Following JCQ guidelines, penalties may include:

- Loss of marks for component/qualification
- Disqualification
- Barred entry for future exams
- Internal sanctions where appropriate

#### **Review and Publication**

This policy is available on the school website under "Examination Policies." It is reviewed annually or in response to changes in JCQ regulations.