



Cambridge House Grammar School

Malpractice Policy

Signed:

Chair of Board of Governors

Signed:

Principal

Updated

14.05.24

Rationale

In the pursuit of maintaining the integrity of qualifications and ensuring the appropriate delivery of assessments, this policy addresses the vital role all stakeholders play in upholding standards. Malpractice, encompassing both intentional breaches and inadvertent deviations, is defined as any act, default, or practice that compromises the examination or assessment process. It includes breaches of regulations, awarding body requirements, and established procedures, potentially leading to prejudice to candidates or damage to public confidence.

This policy applies to all individuals involved in the public qualifications system, such as candidates, centre staff, and assessment personnel. The emphasis is on prevention through clear guidance, rigorous training, and compliance with regulations. Timely identification and reporting of suspected malpractice are crucial, with responsibilities assigned to both awarding bodies and heads of centre. The goal is to conduct thorough investigations, apply appropriate sanctions, and, where necessary, protect candidates affected through no fault of their own. By adhering to these guidelines, we collectively contribute to the safeguarding of the integrity of qualifications at Lurgan College.

This policy has been written in line with guidance from JCQ: Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments and should be read in conjunction with Cambridge House Examinations policy and Controlled Assessment/Coursework Policy.

According to the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ), malpractice is defined as any act, default, or practice that involves a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. The term encompasses both "malpractice" and "maladministration." The key elements of the definition are:

1. **Breach of Regulations:** Any action that violates the regulations set forth by the awarding body.
2. **Breach of Awarding Body Requirements:** Actions that contravene the requirements specified by the awarding body regarding the delivery of a qualification.
3. **Failure to Follow Established Procedures:** Any deviation from established procedures related to a qualification.

The definition further specifies that malpractice includes acts that:

- Give rise to prejudice to candidates.
- Compromise public confidence in qualifications.
- Compromise or attempt to compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification, or the validity of a result or certificate.
- Damage the authority, reputation, or credibility of any awarding body, centre, or any associated individuals.

Malpractice can be intentional or unintentional and may involve various individuals, including candidates, teachers, assessors, examiners/invigilators, and other third parties.

Roles and Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the centre's examinations process to read, understand, and implement this policy. Members of staff involved with examinations should be fully conversant with all JCQ regulations and are recommended to consult the relevant documents. To

ensure internally and externally set examinations are carried out in accordance with JCQ Guidelines and meets the statutory responsibilities of Examination Centres the school has in place the following Team:

Head of Centre: Mr R Marsh

Examinations Officer: Dr K McClurg

Examinations Secretary: Mrs Jackie McNeill

Heads of Department

Subject teachers

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.

Any act which breaks the confidentiality of question papers or materials, and their electronic equivalents, or the confidentiality of candidates’ scripts or their electronic equivalents. It could involve:

- Failing to keep examination material secure prior to an examination.
- Discussing or otherwise revealing information about examinations and assessments that should be kept confidential, e.g. internet forums/social media
- Moving the time or date of a fixed examination beyond the arrangements permitted within the JCQ document Instructions for conducting examinations. Conducting an examination before the published date constitutes centre staff malpractice and is a clear breach of security.
- Failing to adequately supervise candidates who have been affected by a timetable variation (this would apply to candidates subject to overnight supervision by centre personnel or where an examination is to be sat in an earlier or later session on the scheduled day)
- Releasing candidates early from a timetabled assessment (e.g. before 10 a.m. for a morning session examination).
- Permitting, facilitating or obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination.
- Failing to retain and secure examination question papers after an examination in cases where the life of the paper extends beyond the particular session, e.g. where an examination is to be sat in a later session by one or more candidates due to a timetable variation.
- Tampering with candidate scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments after collection and before despatch to the awarding body/examiner/moderator

(this would additionally include reading candidates' scripts or photocopying candidates' scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body/examiner).

- Failing to keep secure computer files which contain candidates' controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments.

Deception

Any act of dishonesty in relation to an examination or assessment including, but not limited to:

- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed components (e.g. non-examination assessments) where there is no actual evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks awarded.
- Manufacturing evidence of competence against national standards.
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements.
- Entering fictitious candidates for examinations or assessments, or otherwise subverting the assessment or certification process with the intention of financial gain (fraud).
- Substituting one candidate's controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment for another's.
- Providing misleading or inaccurate information to an awarding body, candidates and/or parents.

Improper Assistance to Candidates

Any act where assistance is given beyond that permitted by the specification or regulations to a candidate or group of candidates, which results in a potential or actual advantage in an examination or assessment. For example:

- Assisting candidates in the production of controlled assessment, coursework, non-examination assessments or portfolios, beyond that permitted by the regulations.
- Sharing or lending candidates' controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments with other candidates in a way which allows malpractice to take place.
- Assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers.
- Permitting candidates in an examination to access prohibited materials (dictionaries, calculators etc.).
- Prompting candidates in an examination/assessment by means of signs, or verbal or written prompts.
- Assisting candidates granted the use of a Communication Professional, a Language Modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader or a scribe beyond that permitted by the regulations.

Failure to cooperate with an investigation

- Failure to make available information reasonably requested by an awarding body in the course of an investigation, or in the course of deciding whether an investigation is necessary; and/or.
- Failure to investigate on request in accordance with the awarding body's instructions or advice; and/or.
- Failure to investigate or provide information according to agreed deadlines; and/or.
- Failure to immediately report all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice to the awarding body.

Maladministration

Failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of controlled assessments, coursework, examinations and non-examination assessments, or malpractice in the conduct of examinations/assessments and/or the handling of examination question papers, candidate scripts, mark sheets, cumulative assessment records, results, and certificate claim forms, etc. For example:

- Failing to ensure that candidates'-controlled assessment, coursework, non-examination assessment or work to be completed under controlled conditions is adequately completed and/or monitored and/or supervised.
- Failure, on the part of the head of centre, to adhere to awarding body specification requirements in the delivery of non-examination assessments, Endorsements and other projects required as part of a qualification. These include the GCSE Computer Science Programming Project, GCSE English Language Spoken Language Endorsement and/or the GCE A-level Biology, Chemistry, Geology and Physics Practical Skills Endorsement.
- Failing to adhere to awarding body key dates and deadlines relating to the delivery of examinations and assessments (such as those relating to the return of scripts, reporting of internal assessment marks/grades, making entries/claims, and Head of Centre declarations).
- Inappropriate members of staff assessing candidates for access arrangements who do not meet the criteria as detailed within Chapter 7 of the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments.
- Failure to use the correct tasks/assignments for assessments.
- Failure to train invigilators and those facilitating access arrangements adequately, e.g. readers and scribes, leading to non-compliance with the JCQ documents.
- Failing to issue to candidates the appropriate notices and warnings, e.g. JCQ Information for candidates documents.
- Failure to inform the JCQ Centre Inspection Service of alternative sites for examinations.
- Failing to post notices relating to the examination or assessment outside all rooms (including Music and Art rooms) where examinations and assessments are held.
- Not ensuring that the examination venue conforms to the requirements as stipulated in the JCQ document Instructions for conducting examinations.
- Failing to prevent the introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room, either prior to or during the examination (NB this precludes the use of the examination room to coach candidates or give subject-specific presentations, including power-point presentations, prior to the start of the examination).
- Failing to remind candidates that any mobile phones or other unauthorised items found in their possession must be handed to the invigilator prior to the examination starting.

- Failure to invigilate examinations in accordance with the JCQ document Instructions for conducting examinations.
- Failure to have on file for inspection purposes accurate records relating to overnight supervision arrangements.
- Failure to have in place a malpractice policy.
- Failure to have on file for inspection purposes appropriate evidence, as per the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments, to substantiate approved access arrangements processed electronically using the Access arrangements online system.
- Granting access arrangements to candidates who do not meet the requirements of the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments.
- Granting access arrangements to candidates where prior approval has not been obtained from the Access arrangements online system or, in the case of a more complex arrangement, from an awarding body.
- Failure to supervise effectively the printing of computer-based assignments when this is required.
- Failing to retain candidates' controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments securely after the authentication statements have been signed or the work has been marked.
- Failing to maintain the security of candidate scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body or examiner.
- Failing to despatch candidates' scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments to the awarding bodies, exam

Candidate Malpractice

As defined by JCQ "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 writing of any examination paper."

Examples include:

- The alteration or falsification of any results document, including certificates;
- A breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding body in relation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations;
- The unauthorised use of alternative electronic devices or technology during remote assessment and remote invigilation;
- Accessing the internet, online materials or ai tools during remote assessment and remote invigilation, where this is not permitted;
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments;
- Collusion: working collaboratively with others, beyond what is permitted;
- Copying from another candidate (including the use of technology to aid the copying);
- Allowing work to be copied, e.g. Posting work on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment;

- The deliberate destruction of another candidate's work;
- Disruptive behaviour in the examination room or during an assessment session (including the use of offensive language);
- Failing to report to the centre or awarding body the candidate having unauthorised access to assessment related information or sharing unauthorised assessment related information online;
- Exchanging, obtaining, receiving, passing on information (or the attempt to) which could be assessment related by means of talking, electronic, written or non-verbal communication;
- Making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of controlled assessment, coursework, non-examination assessment or the contents of a portfolio;
- Allowing others to assist in the production of controlled assessments, coursework, nonexamination assessments, examination responses or assisting others in the production of controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments or examination responses;
- The misuse, or the attempted misuse, of examination and assessment materials and resources (e.g. Exemplar materials);
- Being in possession of unauthorised confidential information about an examination or assessment;
- Bringing into the examination room notes in the wrong format (where notes are permitted in examinations) or inappropriately annotated texts (in open book examinations);
- The inclusion of offensive comments, obscenities or drawings; discriminatory language, remarks or drawings directed at an individual or group in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments or portfolios;
- Personation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one's place in an examination or an assessment;
- Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from, or reproduction of, third party sources or incomplete referencing (including the internet and artificial intelligence (ai) tools);
- Theft of another candidate's work;
- Being in possession (whether used or not) of unauthorised material during an examination or assessment, for example: notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators (when prohibited), dictionaries (when prohibited), watches, instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries (when prohibited), translators, wordlists, glossaries, ipods, mobile phones, airpods, mp3/4 players, pagers, or other similar electronic devices;
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick or similar device where a candidate uses a word processor;
- Facilitating malpractice on the part of other candidates;
- Behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.

Preventing Malpractice

Cambridge House Grammar School will take all reasonable steps to prevent malpractice. These can include but are not limited to:

- Ensure that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the JCQ documents above and any further awarding body guidance.
- Ensure that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the key dates and deadlines and that there are robust procedures in place to ensure these are met.
- Ensure that examination officers are appropriately trained, resourced and supported.
- Ensure that exams at alternative sites are conducted in accordance with JCQ ICE requirements.
- Ensure that all staff who manage and implement special consideration and access arrangements are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced.
- Ensure that members of staff do not communicate any confidential information about examinations and assessment materials, including via social media.
- Ensure that examination clash arrangements are planned and managed effectively.
- Ensure that staff delivering/assessing coursework or non-examination assessments have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting plagiarism or other potential candidate malpractice.
- Ensure that the centre has a culture of honesty and openness so that any concerns of potential malpractice can be escalated appropriately without fear of repercussion.

Candidate Malpractice

- Ensure that all JCQ notices, e.g. Information for candidates, nonexamination assessments, coursework, on-screen tests, written examinations, social media, plagiarism are distributed to candidates prior to assessments/examinations taking place.
- Ensure candidates are informed verbally and in writing about the required conditions under which the assessments are conducted, including warnings about the introduction of prohibited materials and devices into the assessments, and access to restricted resources.
- Ensure that candidates are aware of actions that constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice.
- Ensure that candidates are aware of the sanctions of passing on or receiving (even if the information was not requested) confidential assessment materials. If a candidate receives confidential information, they must report it to a member of centre staff immediately.
- Ensure that candidates involved in examination clash arrangements are aware of appropriate behaviour during supervision, i.e. ensuring that candidates cannot pass on or receive information about the content of assessments, thereby committing candidate malpractice.
- Ensure that candidates completing coursework or non-examination assessments are aware of the need for the work to be their own.

Response to Suspected Malpractice

Cambridge House Grammar School investigates allegations of malpractice swiftly and thoroughly. Such investigation would be led by the Head of Centre and a full written report of any case then submitted to the relevant examination board including:

- A statement of the facts; a detailed account of the circumstances of the alleged malpractice and detail of any investigation carried out by the centre
- The evidence relevant to the allegation; such as written statement(s) from the invigilator(s), assessor, internal verifier(s), or other staff who are involved
- Written statement(s) from the candidate(s)
- Any exculpatory evidence and/or mitigating factors
- Information about the school's procedures for advising candidates of examination board regulations
- Seating plans showing the exact position of candidates in the examination room
- Any unauthorised material found in the examination room
- Any of the candidate's work and associated material, e.g. relevant source material for coursework

JCQ has its own policies and procedures for dealing with allegations of malpractice and our school adheres to these:

The head of centre must:

- Notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice. The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate. If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the head of centre must inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate(s);
- Report malpractice using the appropriate forms
- Be accountable for ensuring that the centre and centre staff comply at all times with the awarding body's instructions regarding an investigation;
- 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;
- Ensure that if it is necessary to delegate the gathering of information to a senior member of centre staff, the awarding body's agreement is obtained and the senior member of centre staff chosen is independent and not connected to the department or candidate involved in the suspected malpractice. The head of centre should ensure there is no conflict of interest which might compromise the investigation;
- Respond speedily and openly to all requests for an investigation into an allegation of malpractice. This will be in the best interests of centre staff, candidates and any others involved;
- Make information requested by an awarding body available speedily and openly;
- Co-operate with an enquiry into an allegation of malpractice and ensure that their staff do so also, whether the centre is directly involved in the case or not;

- Ensure staff members and candidates are informed of their individual responsibilities and rights as set out in this document;
- Forward any awarding body correspondence and evidence to centre staff and/or provide staff contact information to enable the awarding body to do so;
- At all times comply with data protection law;
- Pass on to the individuals concerned any warnings or notifications of sanctions and ensure compliance with any requests made by the awarding body as a result of a malpractice case.
- Verbal announcements before the beginning of every exam, candidates are given a verbal reinforcement of the awarding body's regulations. In addition, candidates are given the opportunity to hand in mobile phones/banned devices that are kept in the office until the end of the exam.

Use of AI in Assessments and Coursework

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.

While AI is becoming a useful tool in the workplace, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it is important students develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying and do not rely on AI. Students must be able to demonstrate 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 they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Identifying Misuse of AI

Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques teachers are already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own. There are also some tools that may be used. These different methods are explored below.

Comparison with previous work

- Where the work is made up of writing, it is possible to make note of the following characteristics:
- Spelling and punctuation
- Grammatical usage
- Writing style and tone
- Vocabulary
- Complexity and coherency
- General understanding and working level
- The mode of production (i.e. whether handwritten or word-processed)

If a student has not signed the declaration of authentication, centres do not have to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation.

Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own. Ultimately the Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring students submit authentic work. If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed by the student, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation.