EXAMS MALPRACTICE POLICY

This policy applies to all secondary schools within the Lionheart Educational Trust

Approved by the Trust

October 2024 – October 2025

Contents

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 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

- 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

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

Suspected malpractice

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

2.   General Principles

In accordance with the regulations each centre will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place

- 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.

- 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

- As required by an awarding body, each centre will ensure that JCQ's guidance designed to help students and teachers to complete NEAs, coursework and other internal assessments is closely followed, especially in relation to the risk of AI use.

  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, 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 evolving quickly but there are still 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

- The guidance emphasises the following requirements:

  - 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;

  - Students and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice;

  - Students must make sure that 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 that this will not allow them to demonstrate that 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.

- The head of centre must also ensure teaching staff do not use artificial intelligence (AI) as the sole means of marking candidates work.

3.   Preventing malpractice

Each Lionheart centre 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 understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the following JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance:

  o *General Regulations for Approved Centres 2024-2025*;

  o *Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2024-2025*;

  o *Instructions for conducting coursework 2024-2025*;

  o *Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2024-2025*;

  o *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2024-2025*;

  o *A guide to the special consideration process 2024-2025*;

  o *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2024-2025*;

  o *Plagiarism in Assessments*;

  o *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*; Guidance for teachers and assessors

  o *A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes*

- Informing and advising candidates: Each centre will provide candidates with an examination booklet ahead of exams giving them examples of potential malpractice incidents, this will also be included in assemblies and presentations with candidates. Candidates will also be directed to information provided by JCQ for further guidance.

4.   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

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

- 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

- 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.

- 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 centre'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

- If, in the view of the 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 individuals

- 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

- Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used

- 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

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.

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

- 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**

5. Staff with responsibility for exam procedures

Beauchamp City Sixth Form

Position in School	Staff
Head of Centre	Catherine Bartholomew
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Dan Burke
Exam Officer	Aziza Raidhan
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Catherine Bartholomew
SEND Coordinator	Ismahane Messahel
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Kathryn Judge

Beauchamp College

Position in School	Staff
Head of Centre	Kath Kelly
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Gary Mellor
Exam Officer	Sal Lail
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Jim Ardley
SEND Coordinator	Belinda Howell
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Shelley Bass, Alice King

Castle Rock School

Role	Staff
Head of Centre	Roma Dhameja
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Phil Cooling
Exam Officer	Emma Knaggs
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Roma Dhameja
SEND Coordinator	Amy Bowles
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Roma Dhameja

Cedars Academy

Role	Staff
Head of Centre	Laura Sanchez
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Hayley Pugh
Exam Officer	Susan Panczak
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Luke Marvell
SEND Coordinator	Emma Brewster
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	James Rolfe, Dave Allard, Dan Thomas,

Humphrey Perkins School

Position in School	Staff
Head of Centre	Jenny Piper-Gale
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Rikki Khakhar
Exam Officer	Allison Poulton
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Matthew Rofe
SEND Coordinator	Karen Bradley
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Della Bartram

Judgemeadow Community College

Role	Staff
Head of Centre	Alex Grainge
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Sally Howgate
Exam Officer	Rafia Mastoor
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Sally Howgate
SEND Coordinator	Jasdeep Singh
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Emma Andrews

Newbridge School

Position in School	Staff
Head of Centre	Michael Gamble
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Michael Gamble
Exam Officer	Leila Tillotson-Roberts
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Sophie Maine
SEND Coordinator	Sophie Marlow
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Thomas Barr, Mick Rowbottom, Rebecca Knaggs

Martin High School

Role	Staff
Head of Centre	Laura Sanchez
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Timothy Hackett
Exam Officer	Chloe Hollis
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Kevin Seaward
SEND Coordinator	Emma Rudkin
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	

Mercia Academy

Role	Staff
Head of Centre	Jackie Cooper
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Jackie Cooper
Exam Officer	Nick Holmes
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Kelly Lundman
SEND Coordinator	Katie Westwood
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	

Sir Jonathan North College

Position in School	Staff
Head of Centre	James McKenna
SLT Line Manager for Exam Officer	Carl Hartley
Exam Officer	Amrita Ali
SLT Line Manager for SEND Coordinator	Claire Greaves
SEND Coordinator	Nic Coton
Other SLT member with contingency exam responsibility	Steve Reynard

Lionheart Educational Trust

Role	Staff
Chief Operating Officer	Ben Jackson
Director of Data & Exams	Richard Heppell