



CHILTERN
LEARNING
TRUST



Lea Manor High School

Malpractice Policy (Exams) 2026/27

Date Reviewed	Body
October 2026	Jess Pather Headteacher
Next review date: October 2027	To be reviewed: Annually

Together we succeed

What is malpractice and maladministration?

This is for the attention of Heads of Centre, as well as teachers and assessors

All those involved in the public qualifications system have a role to play in supporting the appropriate delivery of assessments and upholding the integrity of qualifications. Whilst the vast majority of centres, centre staff and candidates do not normally experience any form of malpractice, it is important that all are aware of the risks of malpractice and take steps to prevent it occurring. Where malpractice does occur, it is vitally important that prompt action is taken to safeguard the integrity of qualifications. '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 use the word 'malpractice' to cover both 'malpractice' and 'maladministration' and it means any act, default or practice which is:

- a breach of the Regulation; and/or 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
- 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.

Preventing Malpractice

Lea Manor High School must:

- take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice or maladministration in the development, delivery, and award of qualifications which it makes available or proposes to make available.
- ensure that the design of qualifications reduces, as far as reasonably possible, the opportunity for malpractice to occur.
- provide clear processes for the administration of qualifications which reduce, as far as reasonably possible, the opportunity for malpractice to occur.
- Issue clear and robust guidance documents on all aspects of the delivery and administration of all qualifications, including the following JCQ documents:
 - Use all appropriate communication channels to provide updated information, guidance, and training for all stakeholders, including learners, in relation to the prevention of malpractice and maladministration.

- fully utilising the JCQ Centre Inspection Service (CIS) who act on behalf of the awarding bodies ensuring that centre checks are undertaken with appropriate regularity and rigour.

- respond efficiently and with clarity to a request from a centre to provide it with guidance on how best to prevent malpractice and maladministration.

- monitor social media, where appropriate, for any indication of malpractice and maladministration.

- monitor data, including entry data,

- review proven cases of malpractice to analyse what, if anything, the awarding organisation(s) should learn from the occurrence.

Centres must take all reasonable steps to prevent malpractice. These can include but are not limited to: Centre staff malpractice and maladministration.

- ensure that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the JCQ documents above and any further awarding body guidance and that members of staff follow appropriate security procedures to ensure confidential information relating to examinations and assessment materials is not breached.

- In accordance with 5.3(k) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres, teachers and assessors must only accept work for qualification assessments which is the students' own;

- ensure that examination officers are appropriately trained, resourced and supported.

- ensure that exams at alternative sites are conducted in accordance with JCQ ICE requirements.

- ensure that all staff who manage and implement special consideration and access arrangements are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced.

- ensure that members of staff do not communicate any confidential information about examinations and assessment materials, including via social media.

- ensure that examination clash arrangements are planned and managed effectively.
- Ensure that staff delivering/assessing coursework or non-examination assessments have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting plagiarism or other potential candidate malpractice.

- ensure that the centre has a culture of honesty and openness so that any concerns of potential malpractice can be escalated appropriately without fear of repercussion

For Candidate malpractice Lea Manor High School must:

- ensure that all JCQ notices, e.g. Information for candidates, non-examination assessments, coursework, on-screen tests, written examinations, social media,

plagiarism are distributed to candidates prior to assessments/examinations taking place.

- Students who misuse AI to the extent that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice in accordance with JCQ regulations and could attract severe sanctions;
- Students and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice;
- Students must ensure work submitted for assessment is demonstrably their own. If any sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI-generated responses, those elements must be identified by the student and they must understand this will not allow them to demonstrate they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded (please see the **Acknowledging AI use** and **AI use and marking** sections below and **Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work** at the end of this document); and
- Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI but this has not been acknowledged) they must investigate and take appropriate action
 - AI use in this context refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments, which contributes to the award of qualifications.
 - When properly referenced, this can be acceptable, although students cannot be credited for any work they produce for assessment which is not their own so the benefit to them of using AI is likely to be limited and they risk committing malpractice if AI is misused.
- This means that centres must have agreed policies and procedures relating to assessment in place which effectively monitor and check that the work a student submits for assessment is their own. Centres must ensure these also address the risks associated with AI misuse.
 - ensure candidates are informed verbally and in writing about the required conditions under which the assessments are conducted, including warnings about the introduction of prohibited materials and devices into the assessments, and access to restricted resources.
 - ensure that candidates are aware of actions that constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice.
 - ensure that candidates are aware of the sanctions of passing on or receiving (even if the information was not requested) confidential assessment materials. If a candidate receives confidential information, they must report it to a member of centre staff immediately.
 - ensure that candidates involved in examination clash arrangements are aware of appropriate behaviour during supervision, i.e. ensuring that candidates cannot pass on or receive information about the content of assessments, thereby, committing candidate malpractice.
 - ensure that candidates completing coursework or non-examination assessments are aware of the need for the work to be their own and are provided with clear

instructions on how to avoid plagiarism and that **AI technology** (technology that enables computers and machine to simulate human learning i.e. problem solving, decision making and creativity) may not be used, and the use of **AI technology** will be treated as malpractice which would lead to examinations bodies being notified and students subject to disqualification.

Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment where a candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, must be reported using a JCQ M1 to the relevant awarding body. 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.

Centres should not normally give credit for any work submitted which is not the candidate's own work. If any improper assistance has been given, this must be reported to the awarding body, and a note must be made of this on the cover sheet of the candidate's work or other appropriate place.

Where malpractice by a candidate in a vocational qualification is discovered prior to the work being submitted for certification, centres should refer to the guidance provided by the awarding body.

Note: Centres are advised that if coursework, controlled assessment, nonexamination assessment or portfolio work which is submitted for internal assessment is rejected by the centre on grounds of malpractice, there should be an internal process in place at the centre so that candidates can request an internal appeal against this decision

The Head of Centre must:

- notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice. The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments (not including timed assessment for Art & Design qualifications) before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidates. If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the head of centre must inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate(s)

Completing and submitting the report

- The following evidence must be provided alongside the report (as appropriate):
 - any written statements from/transcriptions of interviews with the teacher(s), invigilator(s), assessor, internal verifier(s) or other staff who are involved in, or provided information relevant to, the alleged malpractice. All such documents must be signed and dated by the individuals concerned;
 - transcriptions of interviews with/written statements from any candidates involved in, or affected by, the alleged malpractice. All such documents must be signed and dated by the candidates, and any statements must be in the candidates' own words. When reporting candidate malpractice, if statement(s)

from the candidate(s) is/are not enclosed, centres should put a cross in the box on the JCQ M1 form to indicate that the candidate(s) has/have been given the opportunity to make a statement, but has/have chosen not to do so.

- Head of Centre must inform candidates of sanctions applied against candidates and appeals against sanctions arising from malpractice decisions
- be accountable for ensuring that the centre and centre staff comply at all times with the awarding body's instructions regarding an investigation;

All Centre staff should be aware of JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures as it is the head of centre duty to also report any suspected malpractice/maladministration involving centre staff