Bishop Douglass Catholic School

In Pursuit of Excellence

To lead those in our care to grow in their faith
and to benefit from an enriching education

MALPRACTICE POLICY (EXAMINATIONS)

This policy confirms that Bishop Douglass 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*)

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Bishop Douglass 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 (GR), Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (SMPP), Instructions for Conducting Coursework (ICC)* and *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications (AI)*.

1. 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 related procedures use 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

Suspected malpractice

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice.

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.

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*)

2. General principles

In accordance with the regulations Bishop Douglass 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*)
- As required by an awarding body, gather evidence of 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*)

3. Preventing malpractice

Bishop Douglass 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*.

This includes ensuring that all staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations must read and 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: Guidance for Teachers / Assessors*
- *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications;*
- *A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2025-2026 (SMPP 3.3.1)*

These processes to consider the content of the candidate's work include, but are not limited to, checking for varying quality of work, the use of specialised vocabulary or American vocabulary or spellings and inconsistencies in presentation, style and tone.

4. Informing and advising candidates

Bishop Douglass School ensures that all candidates are well informed about malpractice, so that they are able to avoid committing malpractice in examinations / assessments.

The JCQ *Information for Candidates* documents and *Warnings to Candidates* signs are included in the Examination section of the school's website, and information relating to these documents and their location is included in the centre's Examination Guide for Candidates. This is also explained to all candidates during an Examination Assembly, carried out by the Senior Member of Staff responsible for

exams and reinforced by Heads of Year, Form Tutors and other centre staff.

Bishop Douglass School has the same procedures for internal mock examinations as external examinations, so all candidates are well versed in examination protocol and procedures.

The JCQ *Warnings to Candidates* are clearly displayed outside every examination room, clearly stating that candidates should not bring any electronic devices or other unauthorised items into the examination room.

Additionally, at the start of every examination, candidates are reminded about examination regulations, and this is re-iterated during the 'Start of examination' wording that is read at the start of every examination in every room, where they have one final opportunity to alert the invigilator if they have any unauthorised items in their possession and are at risk of committing malpractice.

Teaching staff ensure candidates completing a controlled assessment, coursework or non- examination assessment component are aware of JCQ and awarding body *Information for Candidates* documents on producing work that is internally assessed (coursework, non- examination assessments, social media) prior to assessments taking place, and that candidates understand the consequences of plagiarism and committing malpractice.

ICC also states that 'In order to prevent plagiarism centres must ensure that each candidate is issued with an individual copy of the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates (www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/information-for-candidates-documents)' section 9a. The Exams Office ensures that all GCSE, GCE and BTEC candidates receive a copy of this information. It is the responsibility of teaching staff to remind candidates of the requirement to follow this guidance, and where necessary, signpost candidates to the Exams section of the school website, where this information can also be found.

5. Identification and reporting of malpractice

Suspected malpractice can be identified and reported by any of the following:

- centres (including by students, parents or centre staff);
- awarding bodies (including by examiners, moderators and awarding body staff);
- other individuals (including anonymous sources or members of the public) (*SMPP 4.2*)

If a candidate receives confidential assessment or examination information, even if the information was not requested, they must report it to a member of centre staff immediately. (SMPP 3.3.2)

Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre can report it using the appropriate channels (*SMPP 4.3*)

A written statement detailing the incident of suspected malpractice may also be required. Therefore, staff should record what has happened as soon as possible after the event, and pass this to the Exams Officer or the Head of Centre at the earliest opportunity. As much information should be included as possible – including time and date, when was observed, what action was taken and the seat numbers of any candidates involved (where appropriate). All statements must be signed and dated by the individual concerned.

All those interviewed or making a statement should be made aware that awarding bodies reserve the right to share their statements with others involved in the case or other appropriate third parties. (*SMPP 5.29*)

At Bishop Douglass School, the Deputy Head is responsible for investigating suspected student malpractice in external examinations. The Head of Centre is responsible for investigating suspected staff malpractice.

All incidents of suspected malpractice should be reported immediately to the Examination Officer or

the Head of Centre, or in their absence the SLT Link for Examinations (Mr. Bent) or other Senior Leader.

The Head of Centre will notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice, using the appropriate forms. 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 before any investigation has taken place.

The Head of Centre will conduct any investigation and gathering of information in accordance with the requirements of the JCQ publication *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*

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.

Once the information gathering has concluded, the Head of Centre (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. Once an investigation is complete, form JCQ/ M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ / M3 will be used.

If, in the view of the relevant awarding body's 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.

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.

7. 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, or another Senior Leader nominated by 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.

8. Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Where appropriate, Bishop Douglass 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.*

Appendix One – Malpractice during assessments

Candidates must not:

- submit work which is not their own
- make available their work to other candidates through any medium
- allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material
- assist other candidates to produce work
- use AI, books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution
- misuse AI
- submit work that has been word processed by a third person without acknowledgement
- include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material

These prohibitions mean that candidates must not publicise their work by posting it on social media or by any other electronic means. (*ICC 6.1*)

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 St Thomas More Catholic School'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 (*ICC 6.2*)

Details of any work which is not the candidate's own must be recorded on the authentication form supplied by the awarding body or other appropriate place. (*ICC 6.2*)

Where irregularities in a controlled assessment, coursework or non- examination assessment component are identified after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, the Head of Centre must submit full details of the case to the relevant awarding body immediately, completing Form JCQ / M1. (ICC 6.3)

Appendix Two – Artificial Intelligence and its use in assessments

As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ *General Regulations for Approved Centres,* all work submitted for qualification assessments must be the students' own. Students who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations, and may attract severe sanctions (*AI Executive Summary*)

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

Acknowledging AI Use

Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments. 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.

Misuse of AI and Malpractice

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in JCQ *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*. 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 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.

Centres must make 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. They should also make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice. All students are given access to the JCQ AI poster for Students, this is included in their Exam Candidate Handbook and it is discussed in their exam assembly.