



# Malpractice Policy

## 2025/26

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at The Henslow and Evolution 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** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**, which should be referred to directly in relation to this policy.

Approved/reviewed by	
Julian Cattley	
Date of next review	Oct 2026

### Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	<b>Jacqui Brooks</b>
Exams officer / Quality Nominee	<b>Julian Cattley</b>



## The Henslow and Evolution School 25-26

### Contents

Key staff involved in the policy.....	1
<b>Introduction</b> .....	3
Purpose of the policy .....	4
General principles.....	5
Preventing malpractice.....	5
Identification and reporting of malpractice .....	12
Communicating malpractice decisions .....	14
Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice .....	14
Centre-specific changes.....	15



## 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 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)



The Henslow and Evolution School 25-26

### **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 Henslow and Evolution 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)



The Henslow and Evolution School 25-26

## General principles

In accordance with the regulations The Henslow and Evolution 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 JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures** and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11)

## Preventing malpractice

The Henslow and Evolution 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**. (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



#### The Henslow and Evolution School 25-26

- A guide to the special consideration process 2025-2026
- Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2025-2026 (this document)
- Plagiarism in Assessments
- AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications
- Post Results Services June 2025 and November 2025
- A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2025-2026
- Guidance for centres on cyber security

(SMPP 3.2)

### **Ensuring authenticity of work**

Teachers must be sufficiently familiar with a candidate's general standard to judge whether the piece of work submitted is within their capabilities. {NEA 4.6}

Candidates and teachers sign authentication forms as soon as the work is completed. The staff signature confirms that

- the work is solely that of the candidate concerned;
- the work was completed under the required conditions

If there are any doubts about the authenticity of the work:

- do not accept the candidate's work for assessment;
- record a mark of '0' (zero) for internally assessed work.

If teachers are concerned that malpractice may have occurred or cannot authenticate the work for any other reason, they must inform a member of the senior leadership team.



### **Candidate malpractice offences prior to candidate signing authentication statement:**

Where work is developed but not yet signed as authentic by the candidate the centre is responsible for managing any suspected or identified malpractice where this relates to the candidates work {if it is any other malpractice outside of the work, e.g. breaching controlled assessment conditions or having unauthorised materials then you must follow the section below: 'Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body'}

In this case the following should happen:

1. Any suspected or identified malpractice prior to authentication statement should be reported to the **Exams Officer/Deputy Head** and/or **Head Teacher**.
2. Any evidence / work should be provided with details of what kind of malpractice is suspected, observed or identified.
3. The situation will be considered and a decision about the next steps for the candidate will be made by the **Head Teacher** and communicated to the **candidate**. Decisions will relate to the indicative sanctions outlined in section 6 of the JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures guidance.
4. Where considered reasonable and appropriate for a candidate to continue they may be given a warning and advice about what they must avoid and the opportunity to complete their work, as long as this is in line with the guidance for the given task and that time allows for this.
5. Should there be any doubt about reasonable continuation of work then advice should still be sought from the awarding body, and this may in turn still trigger formal malpractice reporting.

*Important:*



## The Henslow and Evolution School 25-26

Where work is developed and already signed as authentic by the candidate, a report to the awarding body **must** be made if malpractice is suspected or identified.

Form JCQ M1 is used to report any malpractice to the awarding body.

### **Staff malpractice or maladministration**

Form JCQ M2 should be used to report any staff malpractice or maladministration.

### **Improper assistance**

‘Centres should not normally give credit for any work submitted which is not the candidate’s own work. If any improper assistance (see below) has been given, this must be reported to the awarding body, as per section 4.1.3, and a note must be made of this on the cover sheet of the candidate’s work or other appropriate place.’ {Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures section 4.5}

Improper assistance would be related to staff malpractice and **must** be reported to the awarding body. Appropriate note(s) must be added to the cover of the assessment as required in the JCQ guidance.

### **Rejection of work by a centre on the grounds of malpractice:**

*‘Note: Centres are advised that if coursework, controlled assessment, non-examination 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’* {Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures section 4.5}

Should there be the need for an internal appeal based on malpractice this should follow the internal appeals process {exams}, just as it were for an appeal against a marking decision.

### **Vocational work and suspected malpractice**





*'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' {Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures section 4.5}*

## AI Use

> What is AI?

***Artificial intelligence (AI) is technology that enables computers and machines to simulate human learning, comprehension, problem solving, decision making, creativity and autonomy.*** {www.ibm.com - [link](#)}

AI can be used in many different ways with the main focus of concern being generative AI that creates material based on questions, queries or prompts. This information is generally acquired from sources such as the web and the AI will produce anything from an outline or summary through to a fully completed and detailed report. If a learner chooses to present AI content as their own work, they will be considered to be committing malpractice, just like plagiarism or any other means of getting work done by someone else.

> When may it be used?

The use of specific AI resources is carefully controlled on school systems. As per the Data Protection Officers {DPO} AI policy, any resource that is required for use on the school system must go through testing and risk assessment prior to use being allowed on the system.

If and where an AI resource is permitted to be used, any material created using the resource must be clearly acknowledged as laid out in the JCQ document: AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications.

> How should AI be acknowledged?

*'Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, student acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated.*

*For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2025.'*



### > The risks of using AI

Using AI to generate work and not declaring this is malpractice. Even where AI content is declared the content would not attract any credit/marks. There are also other risks associated with generative AI including plausible but inaccurate content and bias. AI responses or information may even prompt inappropriate actions or contain fake references or fabricated information.

### > AI misuse

AI misuse is when a candidate has used one or more AI tools without proper acknowledgement. Copying, paraphrasing, using AI to complete parts of a task, failing to reference AI or doing this in a poor or misleading way are all forms of misuse. {further detail: JCQ – AI use in assessment section 3}

### > Authenticity of work – in relation to AI misuse

Authenticity of work should be considered carefully, especially when considering if AI misuse may have taken place. Indicators of AI content are given in JCQ's AI use in assessment section 8 {AIUIA}.

Staff should consider:

- Comparison with previous work
  - Consideration of indicators {See JCQ AIUIA section 8}
  - Use of automated detection tools
- {where assistance is required staff should refer to the IT specialist}

## **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



#### The Henslow and Evolution School 25-26

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, although care must be taken when a student is allowed to use a laptop or similar device for exams, to ensure that they have no access to AI tools. 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:

- AI Information sheet for teachers
- AI poster for students
- AI senior leader presentation for teachers
- AI teachers presentation for students
- JCQ - AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications

Candidates will be issued with a copy of the JCQ **Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)** prior to completing their work and prior to signing the declaration of authentication.

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



## The Henslow and Evolution School 25-26

Candidates are informed and advised to avoid malpractice as part of their **Student Examination Guide** and **Exams Assembly** {where required this may also take the form of a one-to-one briefing}. The guide includes advice and information, including appropriate use and acknowledgement of AI and what constitutes malpractice. Guidance is provided by the Exams Officer, Julian Cattley and/or Head of Centre, Jacqui Brooks; normally during the Autumn term exams assembly.

Candidates will be advised:

- What malpractice is and the various types including misuse of AI
- To avoid any form of malpractice
- Processes followed if malpractice is suspected and/or identified
- How to avoid malpractice, including appropriate referencing of source material {including AI resources}
- That using AI – Artificial Intelligence will not be appropriate in many exam and assessment situations and if it is it must be clearly referenced, and any AI generated material clearly identified
- Misuse of AI technology will be considered malpractice

The exams assembly will take place during the Autumn term and will normally be delivered by the Exams Officer and/or the Head of Centre.

The Exams Officer will:

- Update and provide copies of the Student Examination Guide, including key information, policy outlines, guidance about malpractice and details about centre procedures
- Lead the exams assembly exploring the contents of the guide
- Record the date of the exams assembly and who took part {staff and examination candidates}
- Further to the above, if any learner is absent or requires briefing on an individual basis, this will be arranged for them {with date, candidate and staff details recorded as above}

### **Identification and reporting of malpractice**

### **Escalating suspected malpractice issues**



#### The Henslow and Evolution School 25-26

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

Any cases of suspected or actual malpractice should be reported to the exams officer Julian Cattley or head of centre Jacqui Brooks.

### Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body

- 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 publication **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (SMPP 4.1.3)
- The head of centre will ensure that where a candidate who 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)
- 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 body. 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



#### The Henslow and Evolution School 25-26

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. (SMPP 4.5)

- If, in the view of the investigator, 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 the accused individual informed of their rights and responsibilities (SMPP 5.33-3.4)
- Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed information-gatherer) will submit a written report to the relevant awarding body summarising the information obtained and actions taken, 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 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)

### **Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice**

The Henslow and Evolution School will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal, where relevant



The Henslow and Evolution School 25-26

- Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ publication **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**

## Centre-specific changes

Centre procedures for suspected malpractice in work prior to authentication being signed: updated.

Various elements added in relation to preventing malpractice with signposts to JCQ documentation and centre procedures and information where appropriate.

The use of AI as a form of malpractice has been further updated this year and will continue to be clearly presented to learners, both in the updated mandatory documentation as well as in the wider advice, discussion and examples given in, for example, the **student exam guide** and **exams guidance assembly**.

Staff will be informed about AI use and risk of malpractice and integrity of work using the JCQ resources, presentation and linking to this policy.