



Woodhey High School

Malpractice Policy (Exams)

2024/25

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Reviewed by: Exams Officer	
Approved by: Gary Holden (Assistant Headteacher)	
Date of next review	September 2025

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of Centre	Dean Watson
Senior Leader(s)	Mel Ward (Deputy Head Teacher), Gary Holden (Assistant Head Teacher)
Directors of Faculties	S Wood (Director of Innovation) L Aldred & F Grattrick (Asst Dir Of Performance), M Barlow (Dir of Communication), M Malone (Dir of Calculation), L Kern (Dir of Global Learning) A Harper (Dir of Performance)
Exams Officer	Claire Baker
Data and Exams Officer	Alison Abbott

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Woodhey High 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)

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion:

- Misuse of examination material.
- Behaving in such a way as to undermine the integrity of the examination.
- Failing to abide by the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor or the awarding body in relation to the examination rules and regulations.
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations.
- Disruptive behaviour in the examination room (including the use of offensive language).
- Introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room e.g. notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited), Airpods, earphones/earbuds mobile phones, smart watches and other wrist watches, headphones or other similar devices, such as smart glasses.

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) This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion:
- Moving the time or date of a fixed examination (beyond that permitted) without notifying the relevant awarding body.

- Failing to keep examination papers secure prior to the examination.
- Obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination.
- Assisting candidates in the production of coursework, beyond that permitted by the regulations.
- Allowing candidates unsupervised access to coursework exemplar material, whether this is the work of former students or that provided by the awarding body.
- Failing to keep student computer files secure.
- Assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers.
- Improper assistance to candidates.

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 Woodhey High 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)

General Principles

In accordance with the regulations Woodhey High 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)
- 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) including:
 - the JCQ M1 form in a case of suspected candidate malpractice
 - the JCQ M2 form in a case of suspected malpractice/maladministration involving a member of centre staff;
- as required by an awarding body, investigate 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).

Where reference is made to candidates, this includes any private candidates accepted by the centre.

Aims

- To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or learners;
 - To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively;
 - To standardise and record any investigation of malpractice to ensure openness and fairness
 - To impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on learners or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven;
 - To protect the integrity of this centre and qualifications.
-
- Introducing into the examination room notes in the wrong format (when notes are permitted) or incorrectly annotated texts (in open book examinations).
-
- Taking prohibited items into an exam such as (but not restricted to) wrist watches, phones, labels on drinks bottles, non-clear pencil cases, tissues, note paper.
 - Obtaining, receiving, exchanging or passing on information which could be examination related (or the attempt to) by means of talking or written paper/notes.
 - The inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts or coursework.
 - Copying from another candidate (including the misuse of ICT to do so).
 - Plagiarism: the failure to acknowledge sources properly and/or the submission of another person's work as if it were the candidate's own, including the use of AI programs and tools, such as Chat GPT
 - Theft of another's work.
 - The deliberate destruction of another's work.
 - Collusion by working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work.
 - Fabrication of results or evidence.
 - False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework.
 - Impersonation, by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test.
 - The alteration of any results documents, including certificates.
-
- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made.

- Failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure.
- Fraudulent claims for certificates.
- Inappropriate retention of certificates.
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated.
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the learner's own, to be included in a learner's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework.
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as an amanuensis, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment.
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.

Preventing malpractice

Woodhey High 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 2023-2024; Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2023-2024;
- Instructions for conducting coursework 2023-2024; Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2023-2024;
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2023-2024;
- A guide to the special consideration process 2023-2024;
- Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2023-2024;
- Plagiarism in Assessments;
- AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualification
- s; A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2023-2024 (SMPP 3.

Informing and advising Candidates

- All candidates receive a copy of the awarding bodies' regulations regarding coursework and examinations. During the course of the examination period, notices are displayed both in the area immediately outside the examination room and on display in the examination area.
- Verbal announcements before the beginning of every exam, candidates are given a verbal reinforcement of the awarding body's regulations.
- Candidates are given the opportunity to hand in mobile phones, notes, watches etc prior to the exam commencing.

- Candidates each have their own secure ICT login.
- Asst Head Teacher/SLT will hold an assembly with candidates prior to the exams commencing to inform them of the expectations within the exam room.
- Staff are emailed a link to the exams policies and the process of conducting coursework and NEAs, which are accessible in the 'Communal Staff Documents' folder and have to submit a read receipt to confirm that they have read the policies.
- Although written examinations will be unaffected by developments in AI tools as students will 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) for General Qualifications, coursework and internal assessments.
- Teaching staff are not allowed to invigilate external exams.
- Teaching staff are not allowed in the rooms where external exams are taking place.

What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments

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 still being developed and there are often 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
- AI chatbots currently available include:
- ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com>)
 - Jenni AI (<https://jenni.ai>)
 - Jasper AI (<https://www.jasper.ai/>)

- Writesonic (<https://writesonic.com/chat/>)
- Bloomai (<https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom>)
- Google Bard

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/>)

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?

As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres*

(<https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/general-regulations/>), 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 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. Any use of AI which means students have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice. 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.

AI tools must only be used when the conditions of the assessment permit the use of the internet and where the student is able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 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 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.

Woodhey has made 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. Students are aware of the our approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.

The following steps have been taken:

- a) Explaining 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) Updating our malpractice 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)
- c) Ensuring our malpractice policy includes clear guidance on how students should reference appropriately (including websites);
- d) Ensuring our malpractice policy includes clear guidance on how students should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse
- e) Ensuring that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools
- f) Considering 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;
- g) Ensuring 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);
- h) Reinforcing 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; and

- i) Reminding students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice

Identification and reporting of malpractice

Reporting malpractice for Candidates

The Exams Officer along with the Assistant Head Teacher will conduct a full enquiry into the malpractice, in conjunction with the Head of Centre. 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 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)

If malpractice is deemed to have taken place then a full written report (using Form JCGQ/M/01 where appropriate) will be submitted to the awarding body with supporting evidence.

Candidates accused of malpractice:

- will be made fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice. The parents/guardians of the candidates are also notified in writing of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences;
- will be advised that a copy of the JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures** can be found on the JCQ website;
- will be informed of what evidence there is to support the allegation;
- will be informed of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven;
- will have the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations;
- will have the opportunity to submit a written statement;
- will have the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required);
- will be informed of the applicable appeals procedure should a decision be made against him or her;
- will be informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators and other appropriate authorities.

- 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)

A report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form JCQ M1 Report of suspected candidate malpractice.

- This form must be used by the head of the centre to notify the appropriate awarding body of an instance of suspected candidate malpractice in the conduct of examinations or assessments.
- It can also be used to provide a report on investigations into instances of suspected malpractice.
- In order to prevent the issue of erroneous results and certificates, it is essential that the awarding body concerned is notified immediately of instances of suspected candidate malpractice.
- At all times will comply with the data protection law
- 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)

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)

• 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

Woodhey High 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 publication **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**

Reporting Malpractice for Staff

Investigations into any case of malpractice or irregularities against a member of staff must normally be carried out in the first instance by the Head of Centre in conjunction with the Awarding Body. Investigations into alleged malpractice or irregularities against the Head of Centre must be carried out by the Chair of the School's Governing Body, or the responsible employer, and reported to the awarding body when completed.

Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities:

- will be made fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice, and the possible consequences should malpractice be proven;
- will be made aware of the avenues for appealing should a judgement go against him or her;
- may be accompanied by a friend or union representative when a member of the awarding body's staff is present at an interview with the staff member concerned.

A report on cases where members of staff are found to have committed malpractice, together with details of the action taken by the Head of Centre, the Governing Body or the responsible employer must be forwarded to the regulatory authorities and may be made available to other Awarding Bodies if the Awarding Body decides that the circumstances of the case are sufficiently serious to warrant such reports being made.

A report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form JCQ M2 Notification of suspected malpractice/maladministration involving centre staff.

- This form must be completed by the head of centre before an investigation commences to notify an awarding body of an instance of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice or maladministration.
- The form must be completed and submitted to the appropriate awarding body immediately a suspicion is raised or an allegation received.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is using others' ideas and words without clearly acknowledging the source of that information.

Students can avoid plagiarism by:

- giving credit whenever they use another person's idea, opinion or theory; any facts, statistics, graphs, drawings; any pieces of information that are not common knowledge; or quotations of another person's actual spoken;
- by giving credit when paraphrasing another person's spoken or written words;
- informing their teacher if they have received help and guidance from someone other than their teacher, their teacher will then record the nature of the assistance given.
- putting in quotations everything that comes directly from the text, especially when taking notes.
- Misuse of AI