

Malpractice POLICY

2025/26

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Reviewed by	
L. Podmore	
Date of next review	September 2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of Centre	Mrs K Crawford
Senior Leader	Mrs G Singleton
Exam Officer	Miss L Podmore

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Hungerhill Academy 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

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.

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

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

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).

Purpose of the policy

To confirm Hungerhill Academy:

- 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)

General principles

In accordance with the regulations Hungerhill Academy will:

- take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes 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
- 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

Preventing malpractice

Hungerhill Academy has in place:

- Robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures.
- 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

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. Pupils must submit work for assessments which is their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words, and isn't 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's 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.

Risk 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 will share with teachers the JCQ guidance on Artificial Intelligence in Assessments (updated for this year).

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 pupils e.g. through pupil check-ins; verbal questioning so that they are familiar with pupils' work and their conceptual development.

Informing and advising candidates

Students will be reminded about AI misuse via assemblies and during the coursework window, before signing candidate declaration forms. Students are provided with written guidance via email prior to examinations and assessments outlining the appropriate use of AI.

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, although care must be taken when a student is allowed to use a laptop or similar device for exams, to ensure they have no access to AI tools.

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, coursework and internal assessments for General Qualifications and Vocational & Technical Qualifications. JCQ's guidance which is designed to help students and teachers to complete NEAs coursework and other internal assessments is successfully followed in relation to these assessments.

The following JCQ support materials are also used to help teachers understand and prevent AI misuse and to help students to better understand the rules for use of AI in assessments:

AI information sheet for teachers

AI poster for students

AI senior leader presentation for teachers

AI teacher presentation for students

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 must report it to the Head of Centre, the Deputy Headteacher of Exams and the Exams Officer.

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
- 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
- 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
- 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.

- 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
- 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
- Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used
- 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

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.

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Hungerhill Academy will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal,
- Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ document A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes