

# Exam Malpractice Policy



## EXAM MALPRACTICE POLICY

LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITY: M HAZEL

RATIFIED BY BRIDGE LEARNING CAMPUS SENIOR LEADERSHIP TEAM

DATE: JANUARY 2025

REVIEW DUE: JANUARY 2026

HEADTEACHER MR R MAULE

SIGNED:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "R. Maule".

# Exam Malpractice Policy



## Candidate Identification Procedure

Centre Name	Bridge Learning Campus
Centre Number	50609
Date policy first created	11/12/2023
Current policy approved by	Senior Leadership Team
Current policy reviewed by	Senior Leadership Team
Date of next review	21.01.2026

## Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of Centre	Rupert Maule
Senior leader(s)	Marie Hazel
Exams officer	Kevin Hough/Helen Osborne
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Bridge Learning Campus 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 Centre's** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

# Exam Malpractice Policy



## Introduction

### What is Malpractice and MAL Administration

'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 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 (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 nonexamination 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)

### 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 19 SMP 2).

### Purpose of the Policy

# Exam Malpractice Policy



To confirm Bridge Learning Campus:

- 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) (GR 5.3)

## General Principles

In accordance with the regulations Bridge Learning Campus 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)
- 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)
- 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

Bridge Learning Campus 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)

# Exam Malpractice Policy



- 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 2024-2-25
  - Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2024-2025
  - Instructions for conducting coursework 2024-2025
  - Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2024-2025
  - Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2024-2025
  - A guide to the special consideration process 2024-2025
  - Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2024-2025 (this document)
  - Plagiarism in Assessments
  - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications
  - Post Results Services June 2024 and November 2024
  - A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2024-2025

Additional information: Not applicable.

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

Bridge Learning Campus informs and advises candidates prior to exams in assemblies, tutor time and emailed expectations around behaviour, rules and regulations. This is presented by SLT (MHA) and HoY (SLE ) and tutors. We acknowledge AI is a new risk and are aware of the new JCQ guidance on how to deal with this. Marie Hazel Deputy Head will brief all staff members on the new guidelines regarding AI (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2023/04/JCQ-AI-Use-in-Assessments-Protecting-the-Integrity-of-Qualifications.pdf>). Marie Hazel will brief candidates that the use of AI is deemed as malpractice and is taken very seriously and will be reported to Head of Centre who will therefore inform the appropriate exam board.

## AI use in assessments

### Malpractice and the use of AI

#### 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. While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice. Teachers and students should also be aware that AI tools are evolving quickly but there are still limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content. AI chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. Users can ask follow-up questions or ask the chatbot to revise the responses already provided. AI chatbots respond to prompts based upon patterns in the data sets (large language model) upon which they have been trained. They generate responses which are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate.

# Exam Malpractice Policy



AI chatbots can complete tasks such as the following:

- Answering questions
- Analysing, improving, and summarising text
- Authoring essays, articles, fiction, and non-fiction
- Writing computer code
- Translating text from one language to another
- Generating new ideas, prompts, or suggestions for a given topic or theme
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or formality

As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(k) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/>) students 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 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.

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

It remains essential that students are clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and that they know how to do this. Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments. If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the

# Exam Malpractice Policy



student and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.

## Preventing AI misuse in Assessments

To prevent misuse, at Park High School we will:

- a) Restrict access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;
- b) Ensure that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams;
- c) Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders;
- d) Where appropriate, I allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each student's whole work with confidence;
- e) Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages; Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident that the student understands the material;
- f) Staff will consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work;
- g) Staff will not accept, without further investigation, work which staff suspect has been taken from AI tools without proper acknowledgement or is otherwise plagiarised – doing so encourages the spread of this practice and is likely to constitute staff malpractice which can attract sanctions.
- h) Issuing tasks for centre-devised assignments which are, wherever possible, topical, current and specific, and require the creation of content which is less likely to be accessible to AI models trained using historic data.

## Identifying misuse

Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques that teachers are probably already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own. There are also some tools that can be used. We explore these different methods below. Reporting AI misuse If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation. The procedure is detailed in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/malpractice/>).

## Identification and reporting of malpractice

### 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)

If Malpractice is suspected in the exam room, the invigilators would report the case to Marie Hazel (Deputy Head), Kevin Hough (Exam manager), or Helen Osborne (Exams officer). The invigilators would need to document in the incident log and write a separate witness statement to support this. This would then be escalated to Rupert Maule -

# Exam Malpractice Policy



Head of Centre to report the malpractice case to the exam board.

If the teachers suspect malpractice outside of an exam room, with the use of AI. Then this would need to be documented and a separate witness statement to support this written and escalated to Marie Hazel and then reported to Rupert Maule for investigation.

Anyone can report malpractice and the staff at Bridge learning campus are aware they can report Malpractice to the following people: Rupert Maule, Marie Hazel, Kevin Hough or Helen Osborne.

## 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)



# Exam Malpractice Policy



- 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)

# Exam Malpractice Policy



## 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)

Additional information: Not Applicable.

## Appeals Against Decisions Made in Cases of Malpractice

Bridge Learning Campus will:

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

Additional information: not Applicable.

## Changes 2024-2025

Updated: Under heading **What is malpractice, Candidate malpractice, Suspected Malpractice** amended to reflect slight wording changes in SMPP in various sub headings.



# Exam Malpractice Policy



Updated: Under heading **Purpose of the policy**: To confirm Bridge Learning Campus has in place a written malpractice policy which covers all qualifications delivered by the Centre and 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.

Updated: Amended to reflect the change in GR 5.3 To confirm Bridge Learning Campus 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).

Updated: Under heading General Principles, bullet point amended to reflect the change in GR 5.11: take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after **assessments** have taken place.

Updated: Under heading **Preventing Malpractice**: Updated the list of JCQ documents.

Updated: Under the heading **Informing and advising candidates how to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments** updated the prompt in the insert field to: Detail the process in your Centre which confirms how, when and by whom candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments. Describe the process and 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). Confirm when this takes place and include the name(s) and/or role(s) of those staff involved in briefing candidates

## Centre Specific Changes

Updated: Senior Leader responsibilities updated to Marie Hazel, Exams Officer includes Helen Osborne

Added: AI use in assessments IN YELLOW

