



Examinations

MALPRACTICE POLICY

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Reviewing Member of Staff: Mrs M Wall

Examinations Officer

Date Updated 09/10/2024

Review Date: Autumn Term 2025

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of Centre	Dr A Evans
Exams Officer	Mrs M Wall
Deputy Exams Officer	Mrs H Green
Assistant Exams Officer	Mrs C Whiteley
Senior Leader(s)	Mrs A Lungley/Mr B Freeman

Introduction

Prince Henry's High School manages malpractice, in accordance with the JCQ [General Regulations for Approved Centres](#) (section 5). Under normal delivery arrangements we take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations and report and investigate as detailed in the Centre's Examinations Policy (available on the main school website) according to the requirements.

Our general Centre policies regarding malpractice, maladministration and conflicts of interest have been reviewed to ensure they address the specific challenges of delivery in academic year 2024-2025.

Purpose of the policy

This policy addresses malpractice under the specific arrangements for delivery in academic year 2024-2025 and confirms Prince Henry's High School has in place a written policy that covers all qualifications delivered by the Centre. The policy details 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 staff involved have been made aware of this policy.

General principles

In accordance with the regulations Prince Henry's High School will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after the determination of grades process: candidates can access the Exams Candidate Handbook from the main school website, which details information on malpractice and how to avoid committing malpractice. All candidates are given an assembly on internal and external examinations/assessment with a PowerPoint detailing Malpractice from the Exams Department. For internally assessed units, candidates are spoken to by their class teachers at the start of the course and are shown relevant JCQ documentation.
- Candidates are made aware of the malpractice process including the escalation to the awarding body.
- Have in place a member of the Senior Leadership Team who will provide effective support and supervision for the Examinations Team to ensure the integrity and security of examinations and assessments it has maintained an examination series.

Artificial intelligence (AI) prevention and processes

- AI misuse is plagiarism of written content. It is commonly misused in education when writing non-examination assessment (NEA) and coursework components. Candidates use AI to copy or paraphrase existing work without reference to the work of others.
- Candidates are made aware, by their subject teacher, of appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment:
 - o Having to re-do NEA/coursework if AI has been used before a declaration has been signed.
 - o Work not being submitted to the awarding body as AI misuse is discovered and the declaration has been signed.

- o The awarding body identifies AI misuse when marking/moderating NEA/coursework and the candidate's work is not counted
 - o AI misuse affects other components for the same qualification awarding body
 - o AI misuse affects a candidate's option to take exams with any awarding organisation
- Candidates are issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates – Course/NEA.
- Teachers and assessors ensure they are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools.
- Clear guidance on how candidates should reference appropriately (including websites) is discussed at the start of any NEA or Coursework component.
 - o Candidates need to reference all sources used in their work and list any AI to avoid misuse claims. The reference must show the name of the AI bot used and the date the content was generated.
- Candidates and staff are made aware of the risks of using AI and candidates are informed to make sure the work they submit is their own work.
- Teachers and assessors are aware they must not accept work, which they consider not the work of any individual candidate. Staff must investigate and take appropriate action for any misuse of AI.
- Access to online tools are restricted on centre devices.
- All NEA and Coursework is marked and moderated by teachers in school. The teachers have read and reviewed the JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications document.
- Teachers have familiarised themselves with the signs that indicate the misuse of AI:
 - o A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations
 - o A default use of language or vocabulary which might not accord with the qualification level
 - o A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected
 - o Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
 - o A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects
 - o Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered
 - o A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a candidate in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
 - o A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a candidate has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
 - o A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
 - o A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
 - o Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the candidate, themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
 - o The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output
 - o The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
 - o The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth and variety or to overcome its output limit
 - o The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content

- o Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style
- Candidates' work is reviewed throughout the NEA/coursework process, which enables teachers to review AI misuse and that sources have been referenced correctly.
- Candidates are reminded at this stage about the use of AI.
- Work of private candidates is marked and moderated by teachers from Centre 24080, the sources checked and AI misuse reviewed.
- Candidates are supervised as per the requirements of each specification.
- Candidates who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations.
- Work produced by candidates must be their own work and, if they use any AI to help them produce any work, it would result in a candidate's work being discounted. This could also lead to other units and awarding organisations disqualifying the candidate from awards.

The Centre's commitment to the awarding bodies – Malpractice procedure

- 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, including:
 - o the [JCQ M1 form](#) in a case of suspected candidate malpractice
 - o the [JCQ M2 form](#) in a case of suspected malpractice/maladministration involving a member of Centre staff
- As required by an awarding body, investigate any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the JCQ publication [JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2023-24](#) and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require.
- Ensure appropriate controls are in place, which allow accurate data to be submitted to the awarding bodies, e.g. entries, internally assessed marks.
- Can confirm to an awarding body the external governance arrangements so that the awarding body has confidence in the integrity of Centre activities, such as the delivery of qualifications and the conducting of examinations and assessments.

Reporting malpractice

Candidates (or an individual acting on their behalf)

In accordance with [The JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures 2024 - 2025](#) each candidate will be made aware of the evidence that is going to be used and understand that the range of evidence used to determine a grade is not negotiable.

Where a candidate might attempt to gain an unfair advantage during the Centre's process on the determination of grades by, for example, submitting fabricated evidence or plagiarised work, or any other act deemed as malpractice in the [JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2024-2025](#), Prince Henry's High School will submit a report of suspected candidate malpractice to the relevant awarding body.

Where a candidate, or an individual acting on their behalf such as a parent/carer, might try to influence grade decisions by applying pressure to the Centre or any of its staff, Prince Henry's High School will keep and retain clear and reliable records of the circumstances and the steps taken, and make the candidate aware of the outcome. This will include a record that confirms the candidate had been made aware of the evidence that was going to be used and understand that the range of evidence used to determine a grade was not negotiable.

However, if a candidate or an individual acting on their behalf continues to inappropriately attempt to pressure Centre staff, a report of suspected candidate malpractice will be submitted to the relevant awarding body.

A report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form [JCQ M1 Report of suspected candidate malpractice](#).

- This form must be used by the Head of Centre to notify the appropriate awarding body of an instance of suspected candidate malpractice in the conduct of examinations or assessments
- It can also be used to provide a report on investigations into instances of suspected malpractice
- In order to prevent the issue of erroneous results and certificates, it is essential that the awarding body concerned is notified immediately of instances of suspected candidate malpractice

Private candidate

Is defined as a student who is entered by the Centre for a qualification in a particular subject but has not received any tuition at the Centre for that subject during the academic year in which the exam series occurs. The student may have received teaching at the Centre for different subjects or qualifications, or for the same subject or qualification for a previous exam series. Where reference is made to candidates, this includes any private candidates accepted by the Centre

Centre staff

Prince Henry's High School will report any instances of potential malpractice (which includes maladministration) where any Centre staff fail to follow the published requirements for determining grades.

Examples of potential malpractice taken from the [JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures 2024 - 2025](#) includes but is not limited to:

- Exam entries are created for students who had not studied the course of entry or had not intended to enter for November, January or June 2024-2025 ~~2023-24~~
- Grades created for students who have not been taught sufficient content to provide the basis for that grade
- A teacher deliberately and inappropriately disregarding the Centre's published policy when determining grades
- A teacher fabricating evidence of candidate performance to support an inflated grade
- A teacher deliberately providing inappropriate levels of support before or during an assessment, including deliberate disclosure of mark schemes and assessment materials, to support an inflated grade
- A teacher intentionally submitting inflated grades
- A failure to retain evidence used in the determination of grades in accordance with the JCQ Grading guidance
- A systemic failure to follow the Centre's policy in relation to the application of Access Arrangements or Special Consideration arrangements for students in relation to assessments used to determine grades
- A failure to take reasonable steps to authenticate student work
- A failure to appropriately manage Conflicts of Interest (COIs) within a Centre
- A Head of Centre's failure to submit the required declaration when submitting their grades
- Grades being released to students (or their parents/carers) before the issue of results
- Failure to cooperate with an awarding body's quality assurance, appeal or investigation processes

- Failure to conduct a Centre review or submit an appeal when requested to do so by a student
- Failure to report the misuse of AI by a candidate
- Supporting the misuse of AI in assessments

Reporting candidate malpractice

A report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form [JCQ M1 Notification of suspected candidate malpractice](#)

- Any member of staff can report suspected candidate malpractice.
- Candidates must be given the opportunity to write a statement.
- Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment 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 (whom the Centre intended to enter), the Centre is required to submit an entry by the required entry deadline.
- If coursework, controlled assessment, non-examination assessment or portfolio work which is submitted for internal assessment is rejected by the Centre on grounds of malpractice, the internal process in place would be to request that the student completes the work again to ensure the malpractice identified was not repeated and submitted to the awarding body. If the candidate contested malpractice, an investigation with senior members of staff would be carried out.

Reporting staff malpractice

A report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form [JCQ M2 Notification of suspected malpractice/maladministration involving Centre staff](#)

- This form must be completed by the Head of Centre before an investigation commences to notify an awarding body of an instance of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice or maladministration
- The form must be completed and submitted to the appropriate awarding body immediately a suspicion is raised or an allegation received
- The School must not proceed with any further investigation until the awarding body requests further information following the submission of form JCQ M2
- The Head of Centre will appointment an information gatherer to conduct an investigation, who has no connection to the incident
- The suspected member of staff will have the chance to plead their case and write a statement
- The investigation would be submitted by the Centre to the awarding body
- Upon the outcome of the investigation, the School would ensure any actions or recommended changes are implemented

Appeals

The following individuals have the right to appeal against a malpractice decision by an awarding body, information on how to appeal would be sent with the outcome of the malpractice investigation:

- Heads of Centre, who may appeal against sanctions imposed on the centre or on the centre staff, as well as on behalf of candidates entered or registered at the centre
- Members of Centre staff, including those who may be under contract to fulfil assessment-related functions
- Private (external) candidates
- Third parties who have been barred from taking or delivery of the awarding bodies' examinations or assessments