



MALPRACTICE IN EXAMINATIONS OR ASSESSMENTS

This policy describes the procedures to be followed in cases where there is reason to suspect malpractice. In this policy, the term malpractice also covers the maladministration of examinations or assessments.

Malpractice means any act 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 the school, or any employee of any awarding body or the school.

Reference should be made to the following JCQ documents:

- *Suspected Malpractice Policies & Procedures*
- *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*
- *Plagiarism in Assessments*
- *Public Interest Disclosure Act (Whistleblowing)*

All these documents are available on the JCQ website:

<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>

This policy is applicable to all examinations and assessments that contribute to qualifications with awarding bodies. It also describes the procedures to be followed where there is reason to suspect malpractice in internal examinations or key internal assessments.

This policy also covers forms of malpractice that do not relate directly to sitting an examination, for example handling of examination question papers, candidate scripts, mark sheets, cumulative assessment records, results and certificates. Please note, this list is not exhaustive. The term maladministration may also be used for these forms of malpractice.

In all cases Parmiter's is committed to act in a fair, thorough, impartial and timely manner and to notify the appropriate bodies/authorities as required.

Instances of malpractice arise for a variety of reasons:

- Some incidents are intentional and give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment;
- Some incidents arise due to lack of awareness of the regulations, carelessness or forgetfulness in applying the regulations;
- Some occur as a result of the force of circumstances which are beyond the control of those involved (e.g. a fire alarm sounds in an examination).

Malpractice may involve:

- candidates;
- teachers, assessors or others responsible for the conduct, administration or quality assurance of examinations and assessments, including examination officers, invigilators and those facilitating access arrangements;
- assessment personnel, such as examiners, assessors, moderators or internal and external verifiers;
- other parties, for examples parents/carers, siblings or friends of the candidate.

Irrespective of the underlying cause or the people involved (students, teachers or other third parties, e.g. parents/carers, siblings) all allegations of malpractice need to be investigated. This is to protect the integrity of the qualification or assessment and to be fair to all students.

Types of malpractice

JCQ and the awarding bodies divide malpractice into the following types:

- breach of security;
- deception;
- improper assistance to candidates;
- failure to cooperate with an investigation;
- maladministration;
- candidate malpractice.

Artificial Intelligence (AI)

It is acknowledged that the increased availability of generative artificial intelligence (AI) poses an increased risk to the integrity of some assessments, notably NEA. The school is committed to ensuring staff and students are clear about:

- how students can use AI;
- the misuse of AI;
- the risks of using AI; and
- how the use of AI must be acknowledged by students in their work.

AI tools must only be used when the conditions of the assessment permit the use of the internet. Students must be able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking. It is noted that students do have access to generative AI platforms in school.

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.

The misuse of AI tools in relation to assessments constitutes malpractice.

Acknowledging AI use must be done through appropriate referencing and a clear explanation of how AI generated content has been used. It is noted that appropriate referencing extends beyond the use of AI.

If the AI tool 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.

Guidance on referencing is given in Appendix A of the [NEA policy](#). This includes guidance on referencing the use of AI generated content. This guidance on referencing is taken from JCQ^{CIC} *Guidance for Teachers/Assessors: Plagiarism in Assessments*.

Staff should be aware of potential indicators of AI misuse in student work. Appendix A identifies potential indicators that all staff should be alert to. If misuse of AI, and therefore malpractice, is suspected, staff should follow the procedures outlined in this policy.

For further information about AI and assessments, reference should be made to the JCQ document *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*.

Minimising the risk of malpractice

The school is committed to minimising the risk of malpractice through a range of approaches which includes, but is not limited to:

- Providing clear processes for the administration of qualifications which reduce, as far as reasonably possible, the opportunity for malpractice to occur.
- Where relevant to their role, ensuring staff understand the requirements for conducting assessments as specified in the JCQ documents listed below, 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 Qualifications*
 - *A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2023-2024.*
- Ensure staff have access to relevant training, as required.
- Ensure staff understand the key dates and deadlines relevant to assessment and examinations and that adherence to these deadlines is monitored.
- Issuing clear and robust guidance to teaching staff on the delivery of all assessments that contribute to qualifications with awarding bodies, e.g. NEA.
- Ensuring that staff delivering and/or assessing NEA have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting suspected malpractice.
- Issuing clear and robust guidance to students, and their parents/carers, on examination and assessment regulations, including all appropriate JCQ *Information for Candidates* documents.
- Making students aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment.

- Ensuring that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools.
- Ensuring that candidates are aware of actions that constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed if malpractice is committed.

Reporting allegations of malpractice

Invigilators, those facilitating access arrangements or any other staff member present who suspects malpractice during public examinations, internal examinations or assessments must report this immediately to the Examination Officer. The Examination Officer will then liaise with Mrs Berks, Deputy Headteacher.

Teachers who suspect malpractice during the marking of examinations, assessments or non-examination assessment must report this immediately to their Head of Department. If the Head of Department agrees there are grounds to suspect malpractice it should be reported immediately to Mrs Berks, Deputy Headteacher.

If a student suspects malpractice by another student or a member of staff they should report it immediately to an appropriate member of staff (e.g. Head of Year, Head of Department, Examination Officer) who will liaise with Mrs Berks, Deputy Headteacher.

If a member of staff suspects malpractice by a colleague they should report it immediately in accordance with the school's *Whistleblowing Policy & Procedure*.

The school is aware that the reporting of malpractice by a member of staff or a student can create a difficult environment for that staff member or student. Accordingly, in line with JCQ guidelines, the school will try to protect the identity of an informant if this is asked for at the time the informant gives information.

Procedures for dealing with allegations of malpractice

For examinations and assessments that contribute to qualifications with awarding bodies (ie public examinations and associated assessments)

The handling of malpractice complaints and allegations related to any aspect of the examinations and assessments will be dealt with according to the JCQ procedures given in '*Suspected Malpractice Policies & Procedures*' document.

The centre's internal procedures will be used to deal with allegations of malpractice if:

- it is discovered in non-examination assessment(s) before the authentication form(s) have been signed by the candidate; and/or

- at the time of the incident, the candidate has not been entered with an awarding body for the component, unit or qualification.

In other situations, suspicions or actual incidents of malpractice will be reported immediately to the awarding body. The awarding body may ask the school to undertake an investigation, or may investigate themselves.

Any investigation undertaken by the school into an allegation of malpractice will be carried out in a timely manner by the Head of Centre or a senior member of staff nominated by the Head of Centre.

The member of staff responsible for conducting the investigation will aim to establish the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It will not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true.

The individual will be informed of the allegation made against them. The parents/carers of a student will also be informed. The individual and their parents/carers (if appropriate) will have an opportunity to respond to the allegations.

Once the investigation has concluded a written report will be submitted to the Head of Centre, or the awarding body where appropriate, along with the information obtained during the investigation. The report will contain a statement of the facts of the case, including an account of the circumstances of the alleged malpractice and an objective description of the information gathered during the course of the investigation. Details of any mitigating factors found during the investigation process will be included.

In cases where the centre must decide if malpractice has occurred, the report will clearly state whether each allegation of malpractice has been upheld or not proven. Details of relevant sanctions and/or penalties will be included.

For internal examinations and assessments

To ensure a fair and thorough process, all allegations of malpractice will be managed according to the procedures for public examinations and assessments (but without the need to notify any awarding body).

Sanctions, penalties and appeals

For all cases reported to the awarding body it is for the awarding body to decide on the appropriate sanction and penalty.

For all internal cases guidance on appropriate sanctions and penalties will be taken from the JCQ document '*Suspected Malpractice Policies & Practice*' appendices 4, 5 & 6.

Standard penalties issued by the school may include: warning, loss of marks for a section, loss of all marks for a component/unit or removal of a candidate from future examinations. Candidates may also be required to rewrite / resit an assessment or examination; normally this will be done in a Saturday detention.

In all cases, details of the allegation, the investigation, the conclusion of the investigator and the penalty applied will be kept on the student's file.

In all cases where the school applies a sanction and/or penalty the student and/or their parents/carers have the right to appeal against the decision of the investigator and the sanction and/or penalty. Please refer to the school's internal appeals procedures.

In cases where the awarding body applies a sanction and/or penalty, the awarding body's appeal procedures must be followed.

Appendix A: Potential indicators of AI use

- a. If teachers see the following in student work, it may be an indication of the misuse of AI.
- b. A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations
- c. A default use of language or vocabulary which might not appropriate to the qualification level
- d. A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected (please note, some AI tools will produce quotations and references)
- e. Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
- f. 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
- g. Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered
- h. A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
- i. A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
- j. A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
- k. A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- l. 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
- m. The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output
- n. The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
- o. The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth, variety or to overcome its output limit
- p. The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
- q. Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style

Teachers who suspect malpractice during the marking of examinations, assessments or non-examination assessment must report this immediately to their Head of Department. If the Head of Department agrees there are grounds to suspect malpractice it should be reported immediately to Mrs Berks, Deputy Headteacher.