Great Marlow School

Excellence • Compassion • Integrity

Malpractice Policy

Approved by Leadership Team	April 2025
Review due by:	Summer Term 2027

Indicate as appropriate:

☑ There has been a change to the previous policy

or

☐ There has not been a change to the previous policy.

Key staff involved:

Role	Name(s)
Head of Centre	**MR K FORD**
Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum)	**MR G PENDLEBURY**
Assistant Headteacher (SENCo)	**MRS V TODD**
Assistant Headteacher (Exams Line Manager)	**MRS L FLETCHER**
Examinations Officer	**MRS A SMITH**
IT Manager	**MR F AHMED**

Purpose

Our assessment system must be robust and fair. This ensures that the grades students work so hard to achieve are respected by everybody, including employers and higher education providers. Everyone either sitting an assessment or involved in the administration of it has a role to play in following the rules and regulations that are in place to protect the integrity of the qualifications awarded.

Scope

The policy covers all qualifications delivered by the centre.

Remit

This policy confirms GMS compliance with the JCQ[1] General Regulations for Approved Centres 2026-27; namely, that the centre will:

- take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (including maladministration) before, during and after assessments 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. Failure to do so constitutes malpractice in itself. The only exception to this reporting requirement is if the suspected malpractice relates to coursework, a controlled assessment or a non-examination assessment (NEA) (except a timed assessment in Art) before the candidate has signed the authentication forms.

- as required by an awarding body, gather evidence of any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures* and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require.

Malpractice v Maladministration

Malpractice and maladministration both refer to *any act, default or practice which is a breach of the regulations that apply to the assessment being taken*. This can involve centre staff as well as students.

Malpractice can be intentional, with the aim of giving an unfair advantage to a candidate or candidates. It can be unintentional or negligent, arising through ignorance, carelessness or forgetfulness about assessment rules and regulations. It can also be caused by

[1] Joint Council for Qualifications

circumstances beyond the control of those involved, such as where disruption is caused to an assessment by an external event or unplanned incident, such as a critical incident.

Maladministration is a type of malpractice committed by a centre specifically relating to the administration of assessments.

Most malpractice allegations that awarding bodies deal with involve unintentional regulation breaches, usually caused by a lack of knowledge of the JCQ 'Instructions for conducting examinations' (ICE) document.

Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

AI use, in this context, refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments, which contributes to the award of qualifications. Misuse of AI is one type of malpractice.

The JCQ document 'AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications' is key to our practice. It relates to Non-Examination Assessments (NEAs), coursework and internal assessments for General Qualifications (GQs) and Vocational and Technical Qualifications (VTQs) primarily, although care will be taken when a student uses a laptop or similar device in an examination to ensure there is no access to AI tools (eg chatbots).

When properly referenced, AI use can be acceptable, although students cannot be credited for any work they produce for assessment which is not their own. If the work does not show that the student has independently met the marking criteria, it will not be rewarded. Therefore, the benefit of using AI is likely to be limited and students risk committing malpractice if AI is misused.

If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in the work as normal. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students must independently verify the AI-generated content and reference the sources used for this.

Student acknowledgement of AI use 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' instead of just 'ChatGPT'.

The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and the 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. This must be included in the work the student submits for assessment.

Subject teachers will make it clear to students before they start any NEAs, coursework or internal assessments for GQs or VTQs how, if at all, AI can be used in the piece of work they are completing, the risks involved and the possible consequences of the misuse of AI.

AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own.

Examples include, but are not limited to:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that 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 the use of AI tools when used as a source of information.
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools.
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

Subject teachers will never use AI as a sole means of marking a student's assessment. A human assessor must review the work in its entirety and determine the mark it warrants.

Teachers know their students best and so are best placed to judge the authenticity of work submitted to them for assessment. They must take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own and **must not** accept work which they believe is not the student's own. They will use the strategies they feel are the most helpful in authenticating student work in their subject. Examples of methods that could be used, but are not prescribed, are:

- Allocating time for sufficient portions of work to be completed in class under direct supervision.
- Examining intermediate stages in the production of work to ensure it represents a natural continuation of earlier stages.
- Introducing lesson activities that check the level of knowledge and understanding of a part of the course relevant to the assessed work.
- A short verbal discussion of the work with the student to ascertain understanding.
- Use of one or more AI detection tools.
- Comparison of the assessed work with other work created by the student.

If a teacher suspects a student of malpractice in relation to any NEA, coursework or internal assessment for GQs or VTQs, they **must** seek advice immediately from the Examinations Officer. As long as the student has not signed the declaration of authenticity, there is no requirement to report it to the awarding body. The exception to this is a timed assessment in Art.

Subject teachers will reinforce with students the significance of the signing of the declaration of authenticity confirming that the work is the student's own and that they have understood and followed the subject requirements. It will be reiterated that the malpractice sanctions for *making a false declaration of authenticity* and *plagiarism* include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years.

JCQ regulations and guidance

Planning ahead is the best defence against things going wrong. It is essential that all those involved with assessments are familiar with the JCQ regulations that are relevant to their part of the process before the assessment starts. The Examinations Team will ensure that this happens.

Key JCQ documents:

Shared with relevant staff:

- Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures
- General regulations for approved centres
- Instructions for Conducting Examinations (ICE)
- Instructions for conducting non-examination examinations (Vocational and Technical Qualifications)
- Instructions for conducting non-examination examinations (GCE and GCSE)
- Teachers sharing non-examination assessment material and candidates' work
- Instructions for conducting coursework
- Plagiarism in assessments: guidance for teachers / assessors
- AI use in assessments: protecting the integrity of qualifications
- Preventing AI misuse in assessments: a summary for teachers
- Powerpoint to help teachers understand and prevent AI misuse

Shared with students / parents / carers:

- Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures
- Information for candidates: Written examinations
- Information for candidates: On-screen tests
- Information for candidates: 'On your exam day' checklist
- Information for candidates: Non-examination assessments
- Information for candidates: Coursework assessments
- Information for candidates: Using social media and examinations / assessments
- Information for candidates: AI and assessments
- Poster: AI and Assessments: A quick guide for students
- Powerpoint: AI and Assessments: A quick guide for students
- Powerpoint to help teachers understand and prevent AI misuse

To ensure all parties are clear about the rules, relevant information is shared with:

- The Exam Team, including invigilators and the Head of Centre.
- The SENCo and SEN Examination Access Coordinator.
- The IT Team.

- Heads of Department.
- Directors of Learning and tutors of Key Stages 4 and 5.
- Students in Key Stages 4 and 5 and their parents / carers:
    - via email before Y10/12 mock examinations, before Y11/13 mock examinations and before the final examinations. (s/p/c)
    - through the Examinations Information section of our website. (s/p/c)
    - in person during Y10 Mock Preparation and Y11 Examination Information Parent / Carer Evenings. (p/c)
    - in class before starting any NEA, coursework or internal assessment for GQs or VTQs. (s)
    - in tutor time through an Exams Office video. (s)

Reporting

Anyone who feels they have information regarding potential malpractice or maladministration is encouraged to come forward to report it. The Examinations Officer should be contacted in the first instance. The Examinations Officer will always inform the Head of Centre and will adhere to JCQ guidelines about when to report it to the relevant awarding body. Anyone concerned about raising a suspected issue with the Examinations Officer, should contact the Head of Centre directly. Anyone concerned about raising a suspected issue with the Head of Centre, should contact the awarding body directly.

A request for anonymity will be respected by an awarding body unless it is legally obliged to report the identity of the person making the allegation. The identity of any employee making allegations of suspected malpractice within the centre may be protected by the Public Interest Disclosure Act, which offers legal protection from being dismissed or penalised for raising certain serious concerns. Alternatively, the GMS Whistleblowing Policy can be found on the website.

Consequences

The consequences of malpractice can be significant, even when it is unintentional. It does not necessarily only affect the students involved – a breach of the regulations could potentially impact all students at every centre taking that assessment.

When an awarding body has received a credible allegation of malpractice, it has a duty to establish whether the malpractice has occurred. The process that awarding bodies follow is set out in the JCQ document ‘Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures’.