



# Weald of Kent Grammar School

## Malpractice Policy

---

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations.

### Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	<b>Mr R Booth</b>
Senior leader(s)	<b>Ms A Beasley</b>
Exams officer	<b>Mrs S Dyos</b>

## Introduction

### Key documents:

This policy is reviewed in line with the following key documents:

- JCQ Suspected Policies and Procedures
- JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres
- JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments
- AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications

### What is malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are related concepts, the common theme being that they involve a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This policy and procedure use 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 Weald of Kent Grammar School:

- as 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 also acknowledges 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)
- Information related to qualifications delivered by the centre can be sought from the Examinations Office on request.

## General principles

In accordance with the regulations Weald of Kent Grammar 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)

Weald adheres to the above with the following:

- Internal appeals process
- Working within key dates / deadlines
- Adhering to necessary AA requirements.
- The centre holds itself accountable to all JCQ requirements

- 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

Weald of Kent Grammar 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: (SMPP 3.3.1)

- 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
- 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

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

Weald of Kent follows an established 'Malpractice Prevention Plan' which contains:

- a rolling programme of **NEA & Coursework assemblies** with a heavy focus on malpractice prevention:
  - Term 3 of Year 10 & 12 (when the majority of GCSE and A-Level coursework/NEA subjects are beginning the process)
  - Term 2 of Year 11 & 13 as a timely reminder prior to any Student Declaration Forms being filled in.

Key Content:

- Malpractice:
  - Definition of 'candidate malpractice'
  - What constitutes malpractice
  - Offences relating to the content of student work
  - What constitutes 'undermining the integrity of the examinations system'
- Sanctions:
  - Reasons for sanctions
  - Possible sanction range
- Reporting malpractice:
  - Internal processes for reporting malpractice
- Malpractice prevention:
  - Planning ahead
  - Importance of referencing
  - Definition of plagiarism
  - Use of quotation marks
  - Bibliography formatting
- AI Use in assessments:
  - Definition of AI misuse

- Sanctions available
- Risks of using AI in assessments
- Importance of demonstrating own work
- AI misuse examples (malpractice)
- Acknowledging AI
- IFC Documents:
  - Accessed via the Student Area on Intranet and the Parent Area on school website.

The above assemblies are delivered by A Beasley (SLT) and Sharon Dyos (Examinations Officer). The content is supported via Tutors and Learning Support, and through input within departments along the course of study.

- A rolling programme of **Public Examination assemblies** including malpractice prevention in written examinations:
  - Term 2 of Year 11 & 13 prior to PPEs
  - Term 4 of Year 11 & 13 prior to summer examinations

The above assemblies are delivered by A Beasley (SLT) and Sharon Dyos (Examinations Officer). The content is supported via Tutors and Learning Support, and through input within departments along the course of study.

- Parent information evening presentations
  - Term 1 of Year 10, Year 11 & 12

Key Content:

- Importance of Parents / Carers in discussing planning and timing of their child's work given the importance of deadline hitting.
- Signposting to key IFC documentation in student area on Intranet
- Signposting to Parent Examinations area on school website.

The above presentations are delivered by Heads of Year.

## Unauthorised items

### Arrangements for unauthorised items taken into the exam room

Refer to ICE (18) Procedures detailed in section 19 of ICE will be followed. Key points to note:

- Candidates must not be in possession of the following items:
  - iPods; mobile phones; MP3/4 players or similar devices; watches.
- In Art Examinations: the invigilator must ensure that when candidates take preparatory supporting studies into the examination room, these are their own studies
- If candidates have access to unauthorised items in the examination room this may be considered as malpractice. They could be subject to penalties in accordance with the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures.

## Invigilators

- Are informed of the arrangements through training delivered by the Examinations Officer.

## AI use in assessments

**AI Use:** (*JCQ AI Use in Assessments* 'What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments?')

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.

**AI Misuse:** (JCQ *AI Use in Assessments 'What is AI Misuse?'*)

Students must be able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

- 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 of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:
- 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
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of 'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism' include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

## **Identification and reporting of malpractice**

### **Responsibilities:**

- All staff have a responsibility to report any suspected malpractice.
- All incidents of suspected staff and centre malpractice / maladministration must be reported to the Awarding organisation.

Heads of Department are made aware of appropriate use of AI and their role in managing the risk of AI misuse through communication of the relevant JCQ documentation (Term 1) and through Head of Department meetings.

Authentication of a student's work can be assured through:

- sharing and reinforcing JCQ IFC documents.
- delivery of NEA & Coursework assemblies at key points in Year 10-13 studies
- standardised notification slides used when any NEA is launched and submitted in departments
- explaining the importance of students submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice
- reminding students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice (see the Awarding Organisation actions section below and the examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations can be found in Appendix A: AI misuse examples at the end of this document)

- reinforcing to students the significance of their (electronic) declaration where they confirm the work that they are submitting is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and that they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject
- setting reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders
- awareness of a student's level and comparison with previous work
- awareness of the indicators that submitted work is not a student's own

*(JCQ AI use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications' p.5 & 8 and 'Identifying Misuse' pp.9-10)*

### **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)
- Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own.

Weald of Kent staff can report any suspected malpractice to their Head of Department who reports it to the Examinations Officer and SLT Link. EO then commences a timeline report; HoD with EO/SLT link discuss category of suspected malpractice. All suspected malpractice is reported to Head of Centre.

### **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)
- Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication does not need to 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 (SMPP 4.5)
  - If, in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence to implicate an individual in malpractice, that individual (the candidate or the member of staff) will be informed of the rights of accused individuals (SMPP 5.33)
  - 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 (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)

## 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) In the case of any improper assistance, the relevant assessment records (Form M2) will be completed and any relevant Awarding Body cover sheet.

## Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Weald of Kent Grammar School will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal, where relevant (this includes any appeals against staff decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice where the candidate has not signed the student declaration of authentication and has therefore been dealt with internally without reporting to the exam board)
- Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ document *A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes*

<b>Authors:</b>	Ms A Beasley Mrs S Dyos	<b>Date:</b>	Jan 2026
<b>Next Review Date:</b>	Jan 2027	<b>Link Trustees:</b>	Quality of Education Committee
<b>Ratified:</b>	FTB 3 February 2026		