

The Meadows School



Staff and Candidate Malpractice Policy

Updated: June 2026
Date to be reviewed: June 2027
Ratified by Governors: July 2026

Table of Contents

Serial	Description	Page No.
1	Rationale	3
2	Staff Malpractice Policy Introduction	3
3	Examples of Staff Malpractice	3
4	Staff Malpractice Procedure	3
5	Staff Malpractice Sanctions	4
6	Appeals	4
7	Candidate Malpractice Policy Introduction	5
8	Examples of Candidate Malpractice	5
9	The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Assessments	6
10	Appeals	8

1. Rationale

This policy has been adopted and written in relation to The Staff and Candidate Malpractice Policy at the Meadows School and should be read in conjunction with the LA's policies and procedures and any DFE Policy, statements and guidelines.

2. Introduction

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding staff malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications (such as ASDAN) and also regarding examinations invigilated by staff at the school and marked externally.

3. Examples of Malpractice

3.1. Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- Tampering with candidates work prior to external moderation/verification
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance
- Fabricating assessments and/or internal verification records or authentication statements

3.2. The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regard to examinations

- Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone or go to the toilet unsupervised
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place

4. Staff Malpractice Procedure

4.1. Investigations into allegations will be coordinated by the Head Teacher, who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out within ten working days. The investigation will involve establishing the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true. Where appropriate, the staff member concerned and any potential witnesses will be interviewed and their version of events recorded on paper

4.2. The member of staff will be:

- informed in writing of the allegation made against him or her
- informed what evidence there is to support the allegation

- informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven
- given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations
- given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- given the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required)
- informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him/her
- informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice will be shared with the relevant awarding body and may be shared with other awarding bodies including the General Teaching Council.

4.3. If work is submitted for moderation/verification or for marking which is not the candidate's own work, the awarding body may not be able to give that candidate a result

5. Staff Malpractice Sanctions

Where a member of staff is found guilty of malpractice, The Meadows School may impose the following sanctions:

- Written warning:** Issue the member of staff with a written warning stating that if the offence is repeated within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied
- Training:** Require the member of staff, as a condition of future involvement in both internal and external assessments to undertake specific training or mentoring, within a particular period of time, including a review process at the end of training
- Special conditions:** Impose special conditions on the future involvement in assessments by the member of staff
- Suspension:** Bar the member of staff in all involvement in the administration of assessments for a set period of time
- Dismissal:** Should the degree of malpractice be deemed gross professional misconduct, the member of staff could face dismissal from his/her post

6. Appeals

The member of staff may appeal against sanctions imposed on them.

Candidate Malpractice Policy

7. Introduction

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding candidate malpractice in the assessment of internally marked qualifications (such as ASDAN) and also regarding examinations marked externally.

8. Examples of Malpractice

8.1. Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- Plagiarism: the copying and passing of as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another person's work
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as the candidate's only
- Failing to abide by the instructions of an assessor- this may refer to the use of resources which the candidate has been specifically told not to use
- The alteration of any results document

8.2. If a teacher suspects a candidate of malpractice, the candidate will be informed and the allegations will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their side of the story before any final decision is made. If the candidate accepts that malpractice has occurred, he/she will be given the opportunity to repeat the assignment. If found guilty of malpractice following an investigation, the teacher may decide to re-mark previous assignments and these could also be rejected if similar concerns are identified.

8.3. Students must not use or submit another person's work in any form to support their accreditation or coursework, as doing so constitutes malpractice and undermines the authenticity of their attainment and/or grade. If they have completed a group task, the teacher will have to clearly identify the students contribution to the task.

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to examinations. This list is not exhaustive:

- Talking during an examination
- Taking mobile phone into an examination
- Taking any item other than those accepted by the Awarding Body into the examination, such as books or notes
- Leaving the examination room without permission
- Passing notes or papers or accepting notes to, or accepting notes from another candidate
- Submitting work that includes **content copied from other students**, past candidates, or online sources without acknowledgement.

- Presenting **group-produced work** as individual work where this is not allowed.

8.4. If a teacher suspects a candidate of malpractice during an examination, the candidate will be informed and the allegations will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give their side of the story before any final decision is made. If the candidate is found guilty of malpractice, the Awarding Body will be informed and the candidate's examination paper will be withdrawn. It is unlikely that the candidate will have the opportunity to repeat the examination.

9. The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Assessments

9.1 The use of the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages of work but AI is not to be used to write answers for the candidate

- Students who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice.
- Students and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice.
- Students must make sure that work submitted for assessment is demonstrably their own. If any sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified by the pupil, and they must understand that this will not allow them to demonstrate that they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded.
- Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the pupil's own.
- Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for ple, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI, but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate and take appropriate action.

9.2 What is AI Misuse?

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the students 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 students own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations.
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information.

9.3 Detection and Identifying AI Use.

Potential indicators of AI use

If you see the following in students work, it may be an indication that they have misused AI:

- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms, and other localisations*
- A default use of language or vocabulary which might not be appropriate to the qualification level*
- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected. Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
- 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.
- Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.
- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work.
- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work.
- A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- 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.
- The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability.
- The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten. (this can vary by learner, some students will type rather than write)
- The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content.
- Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the student's usual style.

*Please be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages and levels of proficiency when generating content. However, some AI tools will produce quotations and references.

9.4 Reporting and Investigation

If AI misuse is suspected by a teacher or reported by another student or member of the public, it must be reported immediately. The subject department will confirm if the student in question has signed a declaration of

authentication, if at this initial stage the student has not signed the stated form, the centre is not required to report this matter to the relevant awarding body and will deal with the case internally.

If a suspected pupil has signed a declaration of authentication document, then the relevant awarding body will be notified and liaise with the Head Teacher to conduct a full investigation.

10. Appeals

In the event that a malpractice decision is made, which the candidate feels is unfair, the candidate has the right to appeal in line with the Appeals Policy.