

MALPRACTICE POLICY

Hayes School

MALPRACTICE POLICY

Centre name	Hayes School
Centre number	14245
Date policy first created	14/01/2026
Current policy approved by	Paula Harris-Pearce, Sarah Arney
Current policy reviewed by	Paula Harris-Pearce, Sarah Arney
Date of review	14/01/2026
Date of next review	30/09/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Rob Hitch
Senior leader(s)	Claire Thompson Senior Deputy Headteacher Michelle Toner Deputy Headteacher Sarah Arney Deputy Headteacher
Exams officer	Paula Harris-Pearce
Other staff (if applicable)	Heads of Department SLT Line Managers Subject teachers

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Hayes 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 documents **General Regulations for Approved Centres** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

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)

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 Hayes 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)

General principles

In accordance with the regulations Hayes 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 current JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures** and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11)

Preventing malpractice

Hayes School has in place:

- Robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ document **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
 - 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)

Additional information:

When malpractice, specifically "improper assistance" (like giving answers or helping with work beyond allowed support), occurs in assessments,

records must be updated to detail the incident, reported to the awarding body using appropriate JCQ reporting systems.

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

Copies of the JCQ information for candidate's documents are e-mailed by the Exams Officer to candidates and are published on the school website.

Assemblies have also taken place to advise candidates of what constitutes malpractice and the sanctions/penalties they may receive from awarding bodies, with reference to anonymised centre examples (from previous years).

AI use in assessments

AI use in assessments: Students complete the majority of their exams and a large number of other assessments under close staff supervision with limited access to authorised 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.

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.

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

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. (SMPP 4.3)

Escalating suspected malpractice issues

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

In the first instance all incidents of potential malpractice should be reported to the Exams Officer who will then escalate to the senior leader as appropriate.

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 document **Suspected**

Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (SMPP 4.1.3)

- The head of centre will ensure that, where a candidate 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 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)

Additional information:

N/A

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)

Additional information:

N/A

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Hayes School will:

- 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 document **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**

Additional information:

In accordance with the guidance, Hayes School will not submit an appeal to the awarding bodies on the grounds that:

- the individual did not intend to cheat;
- the individual has an unblemished academic record;
- the individual could lose a FEI/HEI place or employment;
- the individual regrets his/her actions

since these do not, by themselves, constitute grounds for an appeal.

The Use of AI in Coursework and Assessments

What is AI?

AI stands for artificial intelligence and using it is like having a computer that thinks. AI tools learn from data on the internet. It is important to note that there are a huge range of AI tools and they can now carry out a variety of tasks including writing text, making art and creating music. It is impossible to provide a comprehensive list of AI tools as new tools are emerging all the time, however, some of the most common tools are listed below:

AI chatbots currently available include:

• ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com/auth/login>)

• Jenni AI (<https://jenni.ai>)

• Jasper AI (<https://www.jasper.ai/>)

• Writesonic (<https://writesonic.com/chat/>)

Bloomai
(<https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom>)

- Gemini (<https://gemini.google.com/>)
- Claude (<https://claude.ai/>)

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate images, such as:

- Midjourney (<https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/>)
- Stable Diffusion (<https://stablediffusionweb.com/>)
- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (<https://openai.com/dall-e-2/>)

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate music. These include:

- Soundraw (<https://soundraw.io/>)
- wavtool (<https://wavtool.com/>)
- Musicfy (<https://create.musicfy.lol/>)

What is AI misuse?

Whilst AI is a new tool, the principles behind misuse do not change. Students must submit work for assessments which is their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words, is not copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work.

Students are also expected to demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding as required for the qualification in question and set out in the qualification specification. This includes demonstrating their performance in relation to the assessment objectives for

the subject relevant to the question/s or other tasks students have been set. While AI may become an established tool at the workplace in the future, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it is important for students' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI. Students should develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying.

To illustrate these principles, we have provided some examples below but, of necessity, the list of examples cannot be exhaustive.

Examples of AI misuse include:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the student's own
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
- Using AI to complete parts of an assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation, or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge and reference the use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies

Work submitted for assessment must be the student's own efforts and must be their own work. Students are bound by their student code of conduct and are required to ensure that all submitted work is their own and valid for assessment purposes.

If any sections of a student's work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified by the student and they must understand that this does not allow them to demonstrate that they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded.

Risks of using AI

There are many risks associated with using AI. A clear risk is that students' risk relying on incorrect information and so they reach

incorrect conclusions. AI creates responses based upon the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response and so the responses cannot be relied upon. In addition, AI chatbots often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. AI may also present a safeguarding risk as some AI chatbots have been identified as providing dangerous and harmful answers to questions and some can also produce fake references to books/articles by real or fake people.

Students also run the risk of falsely presenting the knowledge, skills and understanding which they have acquired which would constitute malpractice leading to disqualification, debarment or penalty.

Referencing use of AI

If AI is allowed, students must reference AI in line with JCQ guidance (reproduced below).

- Name the AI tool you used
- Add the date you generated the content
- Explain how you used it
- Save a screenshot of the questions you asked and the answers you got

Informing and advising teachers

The school will provide advice and tools to support teachers who are marking and assessing work. We have shared with teachers the JCQ guidance on Artificial Intelligence in Assessments (updated for this year). In addition, we have regularly included reminders and updates in the staff bulletin. All staff have a responsibility for reporting any potential malpractice that they may identify.

We will make our teachers aware that identifying the misuse of AI by students requires a variety of assessment methods and is part of ongoing practice rather than a single action. Teachers must rely on their own knowledge of students' usual writing and ways of working to make informed judgements about the authenticity of work. Our teachers will also directly interact with students e.g. through student check-ins; verbal questioning so that they are familiar with students' work and their conceptual development. In addition,

curriculum planning will ensure that students are given some time in supervised conditions so the teacher can authenticate each students' whole work with confidence

Informing and Advising Candidates

Students have been sent electronically the JCQ Information for Candidates on AI in assessments. They will be reminded about accidental or intentional AI misuse via assemblies and during the coursework window, before signing candidate declaration forms. Students will be given time in supervised conditions so the teacher can authenticate each student's whole work with confidence

All Teachers must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the students' own and where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it has been generated by AI, but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate where the student has plagiarised work or made use of AI in the completion of their work. This could be through an oral assessment of the student's understanding of the content or through raising their concerns or queries with them. If an investigation is inconclusive the work in question could be removed and replaced by alternative work whose authenticity is not in doubt. Alternatively the candidate could be given another piece of work to complete under controlled conditions in the centre which must be completed by the awarding body's deadline. Any appeals against staff decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice are set out in the centre's Internal Appeal's Policy.

Reporting malpractice (use of AI)

If a student has signed the declaration of authentication, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation as detailed in JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures.

If a student has not signed the declaration of authentication, the case does not need to be reported to the awarding organisation. The teacher and, if necessary, other key leaders (Department Lead / Year Lead / SLT) will ensure that the student is aware of the possible significance of their actions. This should include not only the possible consequences for them if they were to submit this work but also that they fully understand their error. This should therefore include the teacher outlining: what malpractice is, how to avoid malpractice and how to reference sources / acknowledge AI tools. The teacher will also ensure that the final version submitted to the awarding organisation represents only work that is their own.

Changes 2025/2026

(Added) New heading **Centre malpractice** added.

(Added) Under heading **Preventing malpractice** added to the list of JCQ documents.

(Added/amended) Under heading **AI use in assessments**:

- additional/amended text added in bullet points to reflect slight changes in SMPP
- optional insert field added referencing the JCQ document **Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)** or similar centre document.

(Amended) Under heading **Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body** text amended to reflect wording changes/additions in SMPP.

Centre-specific changes

N/A