Malpractice Policy

St Martins School Derby

Malpractice Policy

Centre name	St Martins School Derby
Centre number	23355
Date policy first created	03/06/2024
Current policy approved by	Toni Beardmore
Current policy reviewed by	Ziad Amjad
Date of review	10/10/2025
Date of next review	10/10/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Toni Beardmore
Senior leader(s)	Rachal Cooper
Exams officer	Ziad Amjad
Other staff (if applicable)	-

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at St Martins School Derby 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 are malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are distinct but 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:

- gives rise to prejudice to 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

'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)

Centre malpractice

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 1.9). (SMPP 2)

Purpose of the policy

To confirm St Martins School Derby:

- 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 St Martins School Derby 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

St Martins School Derby 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

  - 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

  - Guidance for centres on cyber security

  (SMPP 3.2)

Additional information:

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

Staff to ensure students are aware what Malpractice is and how to avoid this. Students will be informed of AI use, plagiarism and any other form of malpractice which could have an impact on the outcome of their exams and assessments.

AI use in assessments

What is AI?

Artificial intelligence is a field of science concerned with building computers and machines that can reason, learn, and act in such a way that would normally require human intelligence or that involves data whose scale exceeds what humans can analyze.

When and how AI can be used in exams and assessments

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 an AI tool does not provide such details, students should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.

In addition to the above, where students use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. This allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether that use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

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 noneditable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used. This must be submitted with the work the student submits for assessment, so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own.

What is AI misuse?

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.

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.

Teachers and assessors made aware of AI use?

When marking student work in which AI use has been acknowledged, and there are no concerns of AI misuse, the assessor must still ensure that if the student has used AI tools such that they have not independently met the marking criteria, they are not rewarded. Depending upon the marking criteria or grade descriptors being applied, the assessor may need to take into account the failure to independently demonstrate their understanding of certain aspects when determining the appropriate mark/ grade to be awarded. Where such AI use has been considered, and particularly where this has had an impact upon the final marks/grades awarded by the assessor, clear records should be kept – this provides feedback to the student and provides clarity in the event of an internal appeal or the work being selected for moderation/ standards verification.

The approaches used within the centre to ensure that teachers can be assured the work they accept for assessment is authentically the students own work:

Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques that teachers are probably already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own. There are also some tools that can be used. We explore these different methods below. Comparison with previous work When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the student. Where the work is made up of writing, one can make note of the following characteristics:

• Spelling and punctuation

• Grammatical usage

• Writing style and tone

• Vocabulary

• Complexity and coherency

• General understanding and working level

• The mode of production (i.e. whether handwritten or word-processed)

Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions.

Students complete the majority of their exams and a large number of other assessments under close staff supervision with limited access to authorised materials and no permitted access to the internet. The delivery of these assessments should be unaffected by developments in AI tools as students must not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments.

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). JCQ's guidance which is designed to help students and teachers to complete NEAs, coursework and other internal assessments successfully is followed in relation to these assessments.

When and how students are made aware of appropriate use of AI and AI misus

Teachers, assessors and other staff must discuss the use of AI in qualification assessments and agree their approach to managing students' use of AI at St Martins School. Centres must make students aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment.

We will also make students aware of the the schools approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice. St Martins will consider communicating with parents to make them aware of the risks and issues and ensure they support the centre's approach. Centres should do the following:

a) Explain the importance of students submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice;

b) Update the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy to acknowledge the use of AI (e.g. what it is, the risks of using it, what AI misuse is, how this will be treated as malpractice, when it may be used and how it should be acknowledged) – most simply by referencing this document;

c) Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students should reference appropriately (including websites);

d) Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse (see the below section on Acknowledging AI use);

e) Ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools (see the What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments? and What is AI misuse? sections);

f) Ensure that, where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, teachers and relevant centre staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access where this is prohibited;

g) Consider whether students should be required to sign a declaration that they have understood what AI misuse is, and that it is forbidden in the learning agreement that is signed at enrolment in some centres;

h) Ensure that each student is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/ information-for-candidates-documents);

i) Reinforce to students the significance of their (electronic) declaration where they confirm the work they're submitting is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and that they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject;

j) Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice (see the Awarding Organisation actions section below and the examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations can be found in Appendix A: AI misuse examples at the end of this document); and

k) Ensure that teachers are aware they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work (see AI use and marking section below).

Candidates will be issued with of the JCQ **Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)** or similar centre document prior to completing their work/prior to signing the declaration of authentication.

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)

Refer to the whistleblowing policy

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)

- Candidate malpractice offences relating to the content of work (i.e. inappropriate/offensive content,

copying/collusion, plagiarism (including AI misuse) and/or false declaration of authentication) which are discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication, do not need to be reported to the awarding body. Instead, they will be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures.

Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment where the offence does not relate to the content of candidates' work (e.g. possession of unauthorised materials, breach of assessment conditions) or where a candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, must be reported using a JCQ M1 to the relevant awarding body. If, at the time of the malpractice, there is no entry for that candidate (who the centre intended to enter), the centre is required to submit an entry by the required entry deadline. (SMPP 4.5)

- If, in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence that an individual may have committedmalpractice, that individual (the candidate or the member of staff) will be informed of all the required information and the accused individual informed of their rights and responsibilities (SMPP 5.33-3.4)

- Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed information-gatherer) will submit a written report to the relevant awarding body summarising the information obtained and actions taken, 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:

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

St Martins School Derby 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**

Additional information:

Changes 2025/2026

(Added) New heading **Centre malpractice** added.

(Added) Under heading **Preventing malpractice** added to the list of JCQ documents.

(Added/amended) Under heading **AI use in assessments**:

- additional/amended text added in bullet points to reflect slight changes in SMPP

- optional insert field added referencing the JCQ document I**nformation for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)** or similar centre document.

(Amended) Under heading **Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body** text amended to reflect wording changes/additions in SMPP.

Centre-specific changes

Changes under heading:

AI use in assessments