# MALPRACTICE POLICY

## 2026/27

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

| Approved/reviewed by | |
|---|---|
| Natasha Bramwell | |
| Date of next review | Oct 2027 |

Key staff involved in the policy

| Role | Name(s) |
|---|---|
| ALS lead/SENCo | Connie Knight<br>Maxine Page |
| ALS lead/SENCo line manager (Senior leader) | Lee Davidson<br>Nicola Brooks<br>Claire Ludlow<br>Darren Mullings<br>Iian Conley |
| Head of centre | Sam Cottrell |
| Assessor(s) | David Wiley<br>Olivia Cole<br>Helen Tarrant<br>Glenn Hillary<br>Howard Cole<br>Lauren Cooper<br>Matthew Tither |
| Access arrangement facilitator(s) | Natasha Bramwell |

## Purpose of the policy

This policy details the procedures of The Springfields Academy for dealing with suspected malpractice and breaches of security in the examinationsprocess in accordance with the requirements of JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures.

This policy deals with suspected candidate malpractice and suspected centre staff malpractice.

## Malpractice

JCQ define malpractice as:

"any act, default or practice which is a breach of the Regulations or 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 integr ity 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, e mployee or agent of any awarding body or centre"

Malpractice can occur in a range of circumstances:

- Intentional – incidents are carried out purposefully with the aim to give unfair advantage in an ex amination or assessment;
- Unintentional – incidents arise due to a lack of awareness, carelessness, or forgetfulness in applyi ng regulations;
- Environmental – incidents occur as a result of circumstances which are beyond the control of the people involved (e.g. supervision of candidates is disrupted by an emergency alarm).

## 1. Candidate Malpractice

**1.1 Examples of candidate malpractice** (this list is not exhaustive):

- the alteration or falsification of any results document, including certificates;
- a breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding body in rel ation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations;
- failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the exam inations or assessments;
- collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates, beyond what is permitted;
- copying from another candidate (including the use of technology to aid the copying);
- allowing work to be copied, e.g. posting work on social networking sites prior to an
- examination/assessment; • the deliberate destruction of another candidate's work;
- disruptive behaviour in the examination room or during an assessment session (including the use of offensive language); 4 Marple Hall School – Malpractice Policy 2021/22
- failing to report to the centre or awarding body the candidate having unauthorised access to assessment related information or sharing unauthorised assessment related information on- line;
- exchanging, obtaining, receiving, passing on information (or the attempt to) which could be assessment related by means of talking, electronic, written or non-verbal
- communication;
- making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of controlled
- assessment, coursework, non-examination assessment or the contents of a portfolio;
- allowing others to assist in the production of controlled assessment, coursework, non- examination assessment or assisting others in the production of controlled assessment, course work or non-examination assessment;
- the misuse, or the attempted misuse, of examination and assessment materials and

- resources (e.g. exemplar materials);
- being in possession of unauthorised confidential information about an examination or assessment;
- bringing into the examination room notes in the wrong format (where notes are permitted in examinations) or inappropriately annotated texts (in open book examinations);
- the inclusion of inappropriate, offensive, obscene, homophobic, transphobic, racist or sexist material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination
- assessments or portfolios;
- impersonation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one's place in an examination or an assessment;
- plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from, or reproduction of, the work of others or published sources or incomplete referencing;
- theft of another candidate's work;
- bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material, for example: notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators (when prohibited), dictionaries (when prohibited), instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries (when prohibited), translators, wordlists, glossaries, iPods, mobile phones, MP3/4 players, pagers, watches or other similar electronic devices;
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick or similar device where a candidate uses a word prosessor;
- facilitating malpractice on the part of other candidates;
- behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.

**Artificial intelligence (AI)**

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools are now widespread and easy to access. Staff, pupils and parents/carers may be familiar with generative chatbots such as ChatGPT etc The Springfields Academy recognises that AI has many uses to help pupils learn, but may also lend itself to cheating and plagiarism.

Pupils 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 Pupils 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
- Where a pupil uses an AI tool, the pupil should retain a copy of the question(s) asked and the AI-generated responses. Pupils must submit this along with the assessment. Staff should:
- Be aware that AI tools are still being developed and should use such tools with caution as they may provide inaccurate, inappropriate or biassed content
- Make students aware of the risks of using AI tools and that they need to appropriately reference AI as a source of information to maintain the integrity of assessments

For more information on AI misuse, see JCQ's 'AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications'. Any misuse of AI tools may be treated as malpractice.

**Informing and advising candidates**

A candidate briefing is held at the start of each academic year and, again, before the start of the summer exam season.

This briefing will highlight best practice and also covers examples of learner malpractice

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
- Suspected malpractice should be reported to the Exams Officer and/or Head of Centre
- Concerns regarding the Exams Officer should be reported to the Head of Centre
- Concerns about the Head of Centre should be reported to the Chair of Governors.

## 1.2 Dealing with Suspected Candidate Malpractice

a) Internally Marked NEA, Controlled Assessment or Portfolio Assignment

If a member of staff suspects a candidate of malpractice, the candidate will be informed and the allegations will be explained. The candidate will have the opportunity to give a statement before any final decision is made. If the candidate accepts that malpractice has occurred and has not yet signed a candidate declaration, they will be given the opportunity to repeat assignment. If the malpractice is proven following the investigation, centre staff may decide to remark previous assignments and these could also be rejected if similar concerns are identified. If malpractice is discovered after a candidate has signed a declaration this will be reported to the Awarding Body in accordance with The Springfields Academy (as for externally marked examinations below).

b) Externally Marked Examinations

If a member of staff suspects a candidate of malpractice during an externally marked examination, the candidate will be informed and an investigation will be undertaken by the Exams Officer. All cases of suspected candidate malpractice will be reported to the Awarding Body in accordance with JCQ regulations and requirements.

As part of the investigation the candidate will be:

- informed of the allegation made against them
- informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- informed of the possible consequences should the malpractice be proven
- given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegation
- given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- informed of the Awarding Body outcome
- informed of the applicable appeals procedure should a decision be made against them

## 1.3 Sanctions for Candidate Malpractice

Where a candidate has been reported to an Awarding Body for suspected malpractice which is subsequently proven, the following sanctions may be imposed:

- **Warning:** the candidate will be issued with a warning that if the offence is repeated within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied
- **Loss of marks for a section:** the candidate loses all the marks gained for a discrete section of the work. A section may be part of a component or a single piece of controlled assess ment if this consists of several items.
- **Loss of marks for a component:** the candidate loses all the marks gained for a component
- **Disqualification from a whole qualification:** The candidate is disqualified from the whole qualification taken in the exam series or academic year
- **Disqualification from all qualifications taken in the exam series:** If circumstances suggest, the above penalty may be applied to other qualifications
- **Candidate debarred:** The candidate is barred from entering one or more examinations for a set period of time. This penalty may be applied in conjunction with any of the other penalties above if the circumstances warrant it.

## 1.4 Right to Appeal – Candidate Malpractice

A candidate may appeal against sanctions imposed on them. Appeals will be made by the centre on behalf of a candidate and conducted in accordance with the JCQ Suspected Malpractice in Examinationsand Assessments Policies and Procedures and Awarding Body Procedures.

## 2. Centre Staff Malpractice

### 2.1 Examples of centre staff malpractice (this list is not exhaustive):

- Breach of security
- Deception
- Improper assistance to candidates
- Failure to cooperate with an investigation
- Maladministration

### 2.2 Dealing with Suspected Candidate Malpractice

Investigations into allegations will be coordinated by the Head of Centre, who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out within ten working days and in accordance with the JCQ regulations a nd requirements. The investigation will involve establishing the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true. Where appropriate, the staff member concerned and any potential witnesses will be interviewed and t heir version of events recorded.

The member of staff will be:

- informed in writing of the allegation made against them
- informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven
- given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations
- given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- given the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required)
- informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against them
- informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice will be shar ed with the relevant awarding body and may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regula tors Ofqual, the police and/or relevant professional bodies

If work is submitted for moderation/verification or for marking which is not the candidate's own, the awarding body may not be able to issue a result for that candidate.

### 2.3 Sanctions for Centre Staff Malpractice

Where a member of staff has been reported to an Awarding Body for suspected malpractice which is s ubsequently proven, the following sanctions may be imposed: The Springfields Academy – Malpractice Policy 2022/23

- Written warning: the member of staff will be issued with a written warning stating that if the offence is repeated within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied
- Training: the member of staff will be required, as a condition of future involvement in both internal and external assessments, to undertake specific training or mentoring, within a particular period of time, including a review process at the end of the training
- Special conditions: Impose special conditions on the future involvement in assessments by the member of staff
- Suspension: Bar the member of staff in all involvement in the administration of assessments for a set period of time

- Dismissal: Should the degree of malpractice be deemed gross professional misconduct; the memb er of staff could face dismissal from their post

### 2.3 Right to Appeal – Centre Staff Malpractice

The member of staff may appeal against sanctions imposed on them. Appeals will be conducted in acc ordance with JCQ regulations and requirements.