



Holmer Green Senior School

Examination Malpractice Policy

December 2025

HGSS Examination Malpractice Policy

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Centre Name | Holmer Green Senior School |
| Centre Number | 52241 |
| Date policy first created | 09/10/2023 |
| Current policy approved by | Governors |
| Current policy reviewed by | Anna Lee |

Key staff involved in the policy

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Role | Name |
| Head of Centre | Ed Hillyard |
| Senior leader(s) | SLT member responsible for examinations |
| Exams officer | Anna Lee |
| Other staff (if applicable) | |

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Holmer Green Senior 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 publications General Regulations for Approved Centres, AI Use in Assessments and Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures.

Introduction

What is malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are distinct but 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 (SMPP 1)

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 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 Holmer Green Senior School:

- has in place for inspection a policy 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 Holmer Green Senior School will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations 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 JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11)

Preventing malpractice

Holmer Green Senior School has in place:

- Robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures. (SMPP 4.3)
- 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:

- *General Regulations for Approved Centres 2023-2024*
- *Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2023-2024*
- *Instructions for conducting coursework 2023-2024*
- *Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2023-2024*
- *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2023-2024*
- *A guide to the special consideration process 2023-2024*
- *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2023-2024*
- *Plagiarism in Assessments*
- *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*
- *A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2023-2024* (SMPP 3.3.1)

Informing and advising candidates

All examination candidates are emailed JCQ Information for Candidates documents at the start of the academic year. An SLT member will deliver a presentation during tutor time detailing key rules and regulations to which they must adhere for all examinations. This is also reinforced in emails to parents and carers. The school will provide ongoing opportunities for students to discuss and clarify malpractice issues in tutor groups and subject lessons. This will include specific sessions on ethical use of AI and academic integrity to support students with SEND and those who might be at greater risk of misunderstanding regulations. Specific details around malpractice in examinations will be communicated to all students.

With regards to coursework, NEA (Non Exam Assessment) subject teachers will reinforce the JCQ regulations regarding the production of such work, and confirm that they have read the necessary guidance through an online form

AI (Artificial Intelligence) use in assessments (AIIA)

AI, or Artificial Intelligence, describes computer systems that can perform tasks usually requiring human intelligence (DfE).

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.

When properly referenced, this can be acceptable, although students cannot be credited for any work they produce for assessment which is not their own so the benefit to them of using AI is likely to be limited and they risk committing malpractice if AI is misused.

It is important that teachers and students are aware that the range of AI tools and their capabilities is expanding quickly, and that there are limitations to their use such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content. The use of AI tools may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments, not least the risk of committing malpractice, for which serious sanctions can apply. As also noted above, the tools have been developed to produce responses based upon the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response and so the responses cannot be relied upon. AI tools often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. Some AI tools have been identified as providing answers to questions that can prompt inappropriate actions, and some can also produce fake references to books/articles. (JCQ *AI Use in Assessments*, April 2025)

With reference to the JCQ guidance for Teachers and Assessors – AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications, students complete all of their exams and a large number of other assessments under close supervision with limited access to authorized materials and no permitted access to the internet. The delivery of these assessments is under controlled conditions and teachers are encouraged to highlight any potential malpractice with the use of AI tools.

Identifying and reporting the use of AI at HGSS

Responsibility of the head of centre

- Ensure that all teaching staff, and those responsible for the marking and submission of assessments are given the time to be fully trained and aware of the use of AI and malpractice which may arise
- Report any instances of malpractice to the relevant awarding body directly, or through an appointed senior leader, detailed in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>)

Responsibility of Senior Examinations staff/the Examinations Manager

- Regularly review the use of AI in qualification assessments and agree the approach to managing use of AI by students at HGSS
- Make students aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment
- Make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice
- Explain to students the importance of submitting work that is a result of their own independent efforts for assessments, and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice
- Regularly review the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy to acknowledge the use of AI
- Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students must reference appropriately (including websites)
- Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students must acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse
- Ensure teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools
- Ensure, where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, teachers and relevant centre staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access where this is prohibited
- Ensure each student is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ *Information for Candidates* (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents) document
- Reinforce to students the significance of their declaration where they confirm the work they submit is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject
- Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice
- Ensure teachers are aware they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work
- Ensure teachers and Heads of Department are clear about their responsibility to only authenticate and submit work for assessment by the awarding organisation that they are confident is the student's own
- Have a process in place for teaching staff to follow where misuse of AI is suspected before the student has signed the declaration form as this does not need reporting to the awarding organisation and must be dealt with in the centre directly

Responsibility of teaching staff

- Know what AI is and how it can be used. Familiar with the JCQ *AI Use in Assessments* guidance
 - Sign the relevant online form to confirm that guidance has been read and understood
- Know what the risks are and how HGSS is managing and mitigating them
- Understand how the approach applies to the relevant subject area

- Plan how to prevent AI misuse in assessments, by allowing time in class to prepare work under exam conditions, to understand the student's standard and style
- Talk to students about their understanding of different areas of the subject, before marking formal assessments
- Be clear about if, when and how students should use AI tools
- Ensure students know how to reference AI tools accurately, and that they understand that any referenced work cannot be awarded marks; any AI work not referenced will be considered malpractice
- Reinforce the importance of the candidate declaration, which references the use of AI and potential consequences, when submitting their work for assessment
- Only accept work which is considered to be the student's own, considering the use of AI detection tools
- Teaching staff will receive annual refresher training on malpractice, including updates on AI tools and detection methods, and will participate in moderation activities to calibrate understanding of academic integrity standards.

Responsibility of students and parents/carers

- Understand the rules, regulations, and guidance on the use of AI, and implications for misuse
- Reference any appropriate use of AI, naming the AI tool used, explaining how this was used; marks cannot be awarded for any AI generated content
- Declare that it is their own work, with appropriate referencing
- Parents/carers should have an awareness of student responsibilities and risks of using AI as detailed above

Identification and reporting of malpractice

The school will provide clear guidance for students on how to reference AI-generated content, including examples and templates, and will incorporate this guidance into the school's broader academic integrity and plagiarism policies.

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)
- Members of staff (including invigilators) would immediately inform the examinations officer or head of centre, in the event of suspected malpractice, according to the JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures document. Should the head of centre be suspected of malpractice, the Chair of Governors would be responsible for further investigations. If a student or parent/carer suspects malpractice, they should inform the exams officer or head of centre.
- The exams officer/head of centre must take appropriate action to inform the relevant awarding body. Statements from those involved would be taken as necessary and student(s) or staff suspected of malpractice would be informed of the due process and potential consequences. Any evidence collected would be retained by the centre (HGSS).
- Should a candidate disagree with a decision to report their work on the grounds of malpractice, they should refer to the current HGSS Internal Appeals Policy
- All assessment records will be updated to reflect details of improper assistance

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 (SMPP 4.1.3)
- 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 (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 to implicate an individual in malpractice, that individual (a candidate or a 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)

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Holmer Green Senior School will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal, where relevant
- The policy will explicitly state the timeframe within which an appeal must be submitted, the process for submitting an appeal, and the support available to students and staff during the appeals process
- Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ publication A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes

Approved by Governors: December 2025

To be reviewed: December 2026