

Malpractice Policy (Exams)

The Hart School

Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Centre name	The Hart School
Centre number	30385
Date policy first created	20/09/2023
Current policy approved by	Jude Mahon - Vice Principal
Current policy reviewed by	Jude Mahon - Vice Principal
Date of review	30/09/2026
Date of next review	30/09/2027

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	**Name**
Head of centre	Rachael Sandham
Senior leader(s)	Anita Cleary, Ben Brennan, Heidi Goodall, Jude Mahon, Louisa Burnett, Nathan Lewis, Sandip Dosanjh, Shara Davies
Exams Officer	Fran Kinnstein
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at The Hart School is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations and reflects centre practice.

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 organisation 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 organisation or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding organisation 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

'Centre malpractice' normally involves malpractice where there is an element of systemic failure, a breach in policies or widespread malpractice such that a centre-level sanction is appropriate (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 1.9). (SMPP 2)

Purpose of the policy

To confirm The Hart School:

- has in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written malpractice policy which covers all qualifications delivered by the centre with reference to the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures*

  The policy **must** detail 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 The Hart School 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

The Hart School 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 current JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance:
    - *General Regulations for Approved Centres*
    - *Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE)*
    - *Instructions for conducting coursework*
    - *Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments*
    - *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments*
    - *A guide to the special consideration process*
    - *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*
    - *Plagiarism in Assessments*
    - *AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications*
    - *Post Results Services*
    - *A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes*
    - *Guidance for centres on cyber security* (SMPP 3.2)

Additional information:

AI - Use 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 format

What is AI Misuse

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.

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.

Acknowledging AI Use

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/), 25/01/2023.

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.

This must be submitted with the work 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.

The Head of Centre will be informed of the suspected malpractice and a decision will be made as to the need of reporting to the awarding body depending on if the student has signed an authentication form stating the work is all of their own. If no authentication form is signed then the internal malpractice investigation procedure is followed.

For internal malpractice investigation, where AI use has been considered by the teacher and particularly where this has had an impact upon the final marks/grades awarded by the assessor, clear records of this will 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.

See https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications/ for further information.

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

Students are made aware of The Hart School's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice during an assembly at the start of the new academic year for Year 10, Year 11, and Sixth Form.

This assembly is held by the Vice Principal of Achievement and the Head of Year. The Hart School ensures that students are also made 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.

This information is also communicated to parents / carers via a letter in order to make them aware of the risks and issues and ensure they support the school's approach.

During this assembly students are made aware of:

a) The importance of students submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and it is stressed to them the risks of malpractice.

b) What AI 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) Students are advised how they should reference appropriately in their work (including websites) and are given clear guidance on how they should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse.

d) Students are fully briefed on and signposted to the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents).

e) It is reinforced 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.

f) Students are reminded that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice.

AI use in assessments (and preventing AI misuse)

With reference to the JCQ guidance for Teachers & Assessors - *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*:

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.

The following JCQ support materials are also used to help teachers understand and prevent AI misuse and to help students to better understand the rules for use of AI in assessments: **Preventing AI Misue in Assessments - A summary for teachers; AI and Assessments - A quick guide (poster) for students, Senior leader presentation - Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments - A summary for teachers; Teacher presentation - AI and Assessments - A quick guide for students.**

Ofqual guidance designed to help teachers and school and college leaders develop an approach to the use of AI in assessed work, and to speak to students about it. (**Reference: AI in coursework: resources for schools www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-in-coursework-resources-for-schools)**

Prior to beginning their work, candidates are issued with the JCQ **Information for candidates** documents: **AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)**, (as applicable to any of their qualifications) **Coursework assessments**, **Non-examination assessments** and **Social media** (GR 5.8)

Relevant subject staff ensure that all candidates have read the **Notice to candidates** within the relevant awarding

body's **Candidate declaration form** (Authentication form) prior to beginning their work.

Candidates will not sign the declaration until they have completed their work and handed it in for final assessment.

Authenticating candidates' work With reference to relevant sections of the JCQ documents, e.g. Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments / Instructions for conducting coursework, AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications, Plagiarism in Assessments insert how teachers/assessors in the centre assure the work they accept for assessment is authentically the candidates' own work (including for example, naming any online plagiarism and AI detection tools used, etc).

Rejecting a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice (reference to SMPP 4.5)

Where a candidate's work may be rejected on the grounds of malpractice there is an internal process in place so that candidates can request an internal appeal against this decision. This process can be found in The Hart School's Internal Appeals Procedure relating to internal assessment decisions found on The Hart School website.

Identification and reporting of malpractice

All staff at The Hart School have a responsibility for reporting any potential malpractice that they may identify.

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)

Student Malpractice:

a) For written examinations initially all student malpractice concerns should be reported immediately to the Exams Officer who will then escalate to the Head of Centre where appropriate.

b) For coursework, controlled assessments and non examination assessments all student malpractice concerns should be reported to the Director of Faculty initially who will then escalate to the Head of Centre where appropriate.

Centre Staff Malpractice:

All concerns regarding centre staff malpractice should be reported to the Head of Centre immediately.

Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding organisation

- The head of centre will notify the appropriate awarding organisation immediately of all* alleged, suspected or actual incidents of (staff, centre and candidate) 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)

  (*The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments where the offence relates to the content of candidate work (e.g. copying/collusion, plagiarism and/or AI misuse and the authentication forms have not been signed by the candidate)

- 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)

- Form JCQ/M1 will be used to notify an awarding organisation of an incident of suspected candidate malpractice. Form JCQ/M2 will be used (**before** an investigation commences) to notify an awarding organisation 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 organisation. 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 organisation. 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 information gatherer, there is sufficient evidence that an individual may have committed malpractice, that individual (the candidate or the member of staff) will be informed of all the required information and informed of their rights and responsibilities as the accused individual, prior to the submission of the report to the awarding organisation (SMPP 5.35-36, 40)
- Where it is identified that there is a need to exercise discretion in the light of the circumstances of the case in terms of how the evidence is presented to the accused individual (for example, if there are concerns about revealing the identity of a third party mentioned in the documentation), this will be discussed with the awarding organisation.

  If the accused individual is provided with a reduced or redacted set of case documentation by the information gatherer, then the awarding organisation will be provided with the same information as provided to the individual. Where there are multiple individuals involved in the same incident, copies of the redacted documents for each individual will be provided to the awarding organisation. (SMPP 5.36)
- Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed information gatherer) will submit a written report to the relevant awarding organisation summarising the information obtained and actions taken, accompanied by the information obtained during the course of their enquiries (SMPP 5.37)
- Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used (SMPP 5.39)
- The awarding organisation 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 5.42)

Additional information:

Not applicable

Communicating malpractice decisions

Once a decision has been made by the awarding organisation, 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:

Not applicable

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

The Hart 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 document **A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes**

Additional information:

Students are made aware of The Hart School's Internal Appeals Procedure (Internal Assessment Decisions) at the start of Year 10, Year 11 and Sixth Form. They are regularly signposted to the procedure with emphasis on and around coursework deadlines throughout the academic year, so all students are aware of expectations and regulations.

Changes effective from September 2026

(Updated)

- Wording updated under heading **Purpose of the policy**
- JCQ documents updated under heading **Preventing malpractice**
- Wording in certain bullet points updated under various headings
- Insert prompts updated in various *Additional information* sections
- Updated various SMPP section references
- References to awarding 'body' in the SMPP document updated to 'organisation'

(Amended)

- Heading **AI use in assessments** amended to **AI use in assessments (and preventing AI misuse)**
- Bullet point referring to *Information for candidates* documents amended

(Added)

- New insert sections added under various headings
- New bullet point added under heading **AI use in**... referring to the *Candidate declaration form*
- Under heading **Identification and reporting of**... added a sentence with reference to all staff responsibility

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in September 2026, no additional centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.