

Malpractice Policy (Exams/Assessment)

St Bartholomew's School

Malpractice Policy (Exams/Assessments)

Centre name	St Bartholomew's School
Centre number	51221
Date policy first created	21/06/2024
Current policy approved by	David Fitter
Current policy reviewed by	Adam Robbins
Date of review	13/01/2026
Date of next review	13/01/2027

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	David Fitter
Senior leader(s)	Adam Robbins
Exams officer	Gaele Jenner
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at St Bartholomew's 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 documents **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 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)

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 19). (SMPP 2)

Purpose of the policy

To confirm St Bartholomew's 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 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 Bartholomew's 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

St Bartholomew's 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 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
 - Plagiarism in Assessments
 - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications
 - Post Results Services November 2025, January 2026 and June 2026
 - A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2025-2026

(SMPP 3.3.1)

Additional information:

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

Formal assemblies before Y11 and Y13 exams and before the final public exams are delivered by the Deputy Headteacher with responsibility for exams, Adam Robbins and/or by the Exams Officer, Gaele Jenner. The assemblies explain all aspects of the JCQ Guidance for Candidates. Presentations are to be updated each year to reflect changes to the guidance. A particular emphasis is placed on malpractice both for examinations and for the delivery of NEA components. These messages are reinforced in meetings with Heads of Faculty/Department to ensure that staff are aware of the regulations and vigilant and able to follow correct procedures if issues emerge. An increasingly important part of this information-sharing relates to AI use. There has been whole school training for all staff to help them understand AI and the contingent risks. In anticipation of final submission of NEAs, staff are reminded of the risks and our school approach in line with the JCQ guidance 'AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications'

AI use in assessments

Definition: AI is the ability of computer systems to perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, like learning, problem-solving, perception, and decision-making, by processing data and recognizing patterns and has potential for misuse in assessments.

In line with the JCQ guidance, we inform students and staff of acceptable forms of AI use and appropriate approaches for referencing these within student work.

Our [Use of artificial intelligence \(AI\) policy](#) includes the following:

Use of AI by students

We recognise that AI has many uses to help students learn. Students may use AI tools:

- As a research tool to help them find out about new topics and ideas
- When specifically studying and discussing AI in schoolwork, for example in IT lessons or art homework about AI-generated images
- All AI-generated content must be properly attributed and appropriate for the students' age and educational needs.

AI may also lend itself to cheating and plagiarism. To mitigate this, students may not use AI tools:

- During assessments, including internal and external assessments, and coursework
- To write their homework or class assignments, where AI-generated text is presented as their own work
- To complete their homework, where AI is used to answer questions set and is presented as their own work (for example, maths calculations)

This list of AI misuse is not exhaustive.

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, students should reference their use of AI. The reference must show the name of the AI source and the date the content was generated. They should also retain meticulous records of material that was generated by the AI source.

We consider any unattributed use of AI-generated text or imagery to be plagiarism.

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)

Any forms of suspected malpractice are to be referred without delay to the Deputy Headteacher, Adam Robbins and the Exams Officer, Gael Jenner. Formal statements and evidence will be secured as appropriate.

Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body

- The Exams Officer, on behalf of 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 EO will also notify the head of centre and Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum)
- The Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum) 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)
- Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non- examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication does not need to 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 (the candidate or the member of staff) will be informed of the rights of accused individuals (SMPP 5.33)
- Once the information gathering has concluded, the Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum) (or other appointed information gatherer) will submit a written report summarising the information obtained and actions taken to the relevant awarding body, 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)

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 Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum) will communicate the decision to the individuals concerned and pass on details of any sanctions and action in cases where this is indicated. The Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum) will also inform the individuals if they have the right to appeal. (SMPP 11.1)

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

St Bartholomew's 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 bodies' appeals processes**

Changes 2025/2026

- AI use in assessment: AI Definition added as per GR 5.3, policies available for inspection.
- Reporting suspected malpractice: added "on behalf of the head of centre" to reflect SMPP 4.1.3