

Examination policies and procedures



# **Candidate Malpractice Policy**

## **2025/26**

## Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Centre name	Bankside School
Centre number	24112
Date procedures first created	September 2024
Current procedures approved by	Kate Jasper
Current procedures reviewed by	Kate Jasper & Dawn Taylor
Date of next review	30/09/2026

### Key staff involved in the procedures

Role	Name
Head of centre	Kate Jasper
Senior leader(s)	Kate Jasper: Headteacher Tracey Hodgkins: Assistant Headteacher
Exams Officer	Dawn Taylor
Other staff (if applicable)	

These procedures are reviewed and updated annually to ensure compliance with current requirements and regulations.

## Introduction

This policy sets out 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.

All incidences of suspected malpractice in assessment must be reported by the centre to the relevant awarding body as per the JCQ publication: **JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

## Definition of Candidate Malpractice

Candidate Malpractice is essentially any deliberate activity or practice which contravenes regulations and compromises the integrity of the internal or external assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments, the presentation of any practical work, the completion of portfolios of assessment evidence and the writing of any examination paper. Some examples of malpractice are set out below. These are examples only and does not limit the scope of the definitions of malpractice set out in the relevant JCQ document.

## Examples of Candidate Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated.

### Coursework or non-examination assessments

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- **Plagiarism:** the copying and passing of as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another person's work
- **Collusion:** working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as the candidate's only
- **Failing to abide by the instructions of an assessor** – This may refer to the use of resources which the candidate has been specifically told not to use
- The alteration of any results document

### Examinations

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to examinations. This list is not exhaustive:

- Talking during an examination
- Taking a mobile phone into an examination
- Taking any item other than those accepted by the Awarding Body into the examination, such as a book or notes
- Leaving the examination room without permission

- Passing notes or papers or accepting notes to, or accepting notes or papers from another candidate

#### **Further examples of candidate malpractice:**

- 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 relation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations;
- the unauthorised use of alternative electronic devices or technology during remote assessment and remote invigilation;
- accessing the internet, online materials or AI tools during remote assessment and remote invigilation, where this is not permitted (See Appendix 1);
- failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments;
- collusion: working collaboratively with others, 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);
- failing to report to the centre or awarding body the candidate having unauthorised access to assessment related information or sharing unauthorised assessment related information online;
- 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 assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments, examination responses or assisting others in the production of controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments or examination responses;
- 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 offensive comments, obscenities or drawings; discriminatory language, remarks or drawings directed at an individual or group in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments or portfolios;
- personation: 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, third party sources or incomplete referencing (including the internet and artificial intelligence (AI) tools);

- theft of another candidate's work;
- being in possession (whether used or not) of unauthorised material during an examination or assessment, for example: notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators (when prohibited), dictionaries (when prohibited), watches, instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries (when prohibited), translators, wordlists, glossaries, iPods, mobile phones, AirPods, MP3/4 players, pagers, or other similar electronic devices;
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick or similar device where a candidate uses a word processor;
- facilitating malpractice on the part of other candidates;
- behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.

## Consequences of Malpractice – Internal and External Assessments

All suspected malpractice will be reported to the relevant awarding body (on completion of Form JCQ/M1) immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice.

Awarding bodies have a number of penalties and sanctions that they can apply if they uphold a report of malpractice:

1. **Warning:** The candidate is issued with a warning that if he/she commits malpractice within a set period of time, further specified sanctions may be applied.
2. **Loss of all 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 non-examination assessment if this consists of several items.
3. **Loss of all marks for a component:** The candidate loses all the marks gained for a component. A component is more often a feature of a linear qualification than a unitised qualification, and so this sanction can be regarded as an alternative to sanction 4. Some units also have components, in which case a level of sanction between numbers 2 and 4 is possible.
4. **Loss of all marks for a unit:** The candidate loses all the marks gained for a unit. This sanction can only be applied to qualifications which are unitised. For linear qualifications, the option is sanction 3. This sanction usually allows the candidate to aggregate or request certification in that series, albeit with a reduced mark or grade.
5. **Disqualification from a unit:** The candidate is disqualified from the unit. This sanction is only available if the qualification is unitised. For linear qualifications the option is sanction 7. The effect of this sanction is to prevent the candidate aggregating or requesting certification in that series, if the candidate has applied for it. For qualifications with assessments taken throughout the academic year, the candidate will be disqualified from the unit and will not be able to use the unit to aggregate/certificate. The candidate will need to redo the unit in order to be eligible for aggregation/certification, subject to the awarding body's qualification requirements.
6. **Disqualification from all units in one or more qualifications taken in that series or academic year:** If circumstances justify, sanction 5 may be applied to other units taken during the same examination or assessment series. (Units which have been banked in previous examination series are retained.) This sanction is only available if the qualification is unitised. For linear qualifications the option is sanction 8. For qualifications with assessments taken throughout the academic year, the candidate will be disqualified from the unit(s) and will not be able to use

the unit(s) to aggregate/certificate. The candidate will need to redo the unit in order to be eligible for aggregation/certification, subject to the awarding body's qualification requirements.

7. **Disqualification from a whole qualification:** The candidate is disqualified from the whole qualification taken in that series or academic year. This sanction can be applied to unitised qualifications only if the candidate has requested aggregation. Any units banked in a previous examination series are retained, but the units taken in the present series and the aggregation opportunity are lost. If a candidate has not requested aggregation, the option is sanction 6. It may also be used with linear qualifications.
8. **Disqualification from all qualifications taken in that series or academic year:** If circumstances justify, sanction 7 may be applied to other qualifications. This sanction can be applied to unitised qualifications only if the candidate has requested aggregation. Any units banked in a previous examination series are retained, but the units taken in the present series and the aggregation opportunity are lost. If a candidate has not requested aggregation, the option is sanction 6. It may also be used with linear qualifications. This sanction is only applied by the affected awarding body.
9. **Candidate debarral:** The candidate is barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time. This sanction is applied in conjunction with any of the other sanctions above, if the circumstances warrant it.

Awarding bodies will communicate decisions to the head of centre who will then cascade the outcome to the candidate and parent /carer/ appropriate adult.

## **Appeals**

In the event that a malpractice decision is made, which the candidate feels is unfair, the candidate has the right to appeal in line the Appeals Policy.

Appeals granted by the head of centre must be submitted to the awarding body within 14 days of receiving the malpractice outcome decision.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Artificial Intelligence (AI)**

#### **What is and how can it be used?**

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.

### **How AI usage should be acknowledged**

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 (For example - ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>, 25/01/2025)). The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used).

They must understand this will not allow them to demonstrate they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded the unit or learning outcome.

### **What constitutes AI misuse?**

Students are made aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and staff will regularly check for identification of potential malpractice. It must be in their own words and not copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool and must reflect their own independent work demonstrating their understanding of the task/subject. For those students using a laptop, relevant centre staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access where this is prohibited

Clarification and an explanation of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice is outlined to both students and parents, raising awareness of the risks and issues and ensure they support the centre's approach. Access to the policy via ClassDojo and website.

### **Misuse of AI could be in the form of:**

Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment 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.

### **How such cases will be treated as malpractice**

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. We will ensure that the student is aware of the severity of plagiarism and using AI and given the opportunity to resubmit the work correctly. How to avoid malpractice by ensuring sources are referenced properly and acknowledge AI tools, etc.

### **Useful strategies to support:**

#### **Comparison with previous work**

When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the student. Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work

completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions. Where the work is made up of writing, it is possible to make note of the following characteristics: • Spelling and punctuation • Grammatical usage • Writing style and tone • Vocabulary • Complexity and coherency • General understanding and working level • The mode of production (i.e. whether handwritten or word-processed)

### **Reporting AI misuse.**

If a student has not signed the declaration of authentication, centres do not have to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation. Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own. If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed by the student, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation.