Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Bridgnorth Endowed School

Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Centre name	Bridgnorth Endowed School
Centre number	29025
Date policy first created	11/10/2023
Current policy approved by	Mr D Street
Current policy reviewed by	Mr D Street
Date of review	29/09/2026
Date of next review	13/10/2027

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	**Name**
Head of centre	Mr M Penn
Senior leader(s)	Mr D Street Ms D Stanley Mr D Lewis Miss S Gresko Mrs S Underhill
Exams and Data Manager	Miss E Minifie
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Bridgnorth Endowed School is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations and reflects centre practice.

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 organisation 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 organisation or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding organisation 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 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 Bridgnorth Endowed School:

- has in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written malpractice policy which covers all qualifications delivered by the centre with reference to the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures*

  The policy **must** detail 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 Bridgnorth Endowed School 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 current JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures** and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11)

Preventing malpractice

Bridgnorth Endowed School has in place:

- robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (SMPP 4.3)
- this includes ensuring that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the following current JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance:
  - *General Regulations for Approved Centres*
  - *Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE)*
  - *Instructions for conducting coursework*
  - *Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments*
  - *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments*
  - *A guide to the special consideration process*
  - *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*
  - *Plagiarism in Assessments*
  - *AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications*
  - *Post Results Services*
  - *A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes*
  - *Guidance for centres on cyber security* (SMPP 3.2)

Additional information:

Roles and responsibilities

Head of Centre

Overall accountability; ensures prevention, detection, investigation, reporting, and communication of decisions. Appoints an impartial investigator if needed. Ensures parents/carers/appropriate adults are informed where the candidate is a child or adult at risk.

Exams Officer (Operational Lead)

Manages day-to-day compliance with JCQ/awarding body requirements; coordinates reports (e.g., JCQ forms), retains records and evidence, and liaises with awarding bodies.

Heads of Department / Subject Leaders

Ensure staff and candidates are trained on malpractice risks, NEA/coursework rules, authentication, referencing, and AI guidance.

SENCo

Ensures access arrangements are implemented compliantly and do not create malpractice risk.

All staff

Must follow JCQ regulations; must immediately report suspected or alleged malpractice to the Exams Officer/Head of Centre; must preserve evidence and confidentiality.

Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL)

Ensures safeguarding procedures are applied where applicable.

Prevention and staff/candidate awareness

Staff training and assurance at BES ocurrs annually covering:

JCQ requirements; ICE; NEA/coursework procedures; authentication; plagiarism; AI use and AI misuse; record-keeping; and reporting duties.

Circulation and availability of current JCQ regulations and awarding body guidance.

Periodic internal audits of assessment practice and invigilation.

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

Appropriate use of AI and AI misuse

What is AI?

For this policy, AI refers to software tools that generate or transform text, code, images, audio, data, or designs based on prompts or inputs (e.g., "generative AI"). It can also include assistive AI for spelling/grammar, translation, summarisation, or transcription.

When AI may be used

Not permitted: During **timed examinations** and any assessment sessions where access is explicitly prohibited under JCQ/awarding body rules.

Permitted with conditions: In **NEA/coursework/internal assessments** where research, drafting, or planning outside supervision is allowed, provided **the candidate's final submission is authentically their own work, all sources (including AI) are acknowledged**, and instructions from the awarding body/teacher are followed.

AI acknowledgement requirements

Where AI has been used in permitted assessments, candidates **must:**

Include an **AI Use Statement** with their work (e.g., in the bibliography or acknowledgements) stating **which tool(s)** were

used, **how**, and **for which parts** (e.g., idea generation, draft outline, proofreading).

Provide full references for any AI-assisted outputs that include specific facts, text, data, code, images, or designs not wholly authored by the candidate, alongside conventional sources.

Retain **prompt history, drafts, and versioned files** if requested, to evidence their own authorship and process.

AI Use Statement (example template)

"I used an AI tool to brainstorm initial ideas about [topic] and to proofread grammar. I reviewed, edited, and authored the final work myself. No text, code, or images were copied verbatim from AI without appropriate acknowledgement. Date of AI use: [dd/mm/yyyy]."

AI misuse (treated as malpractice)

Examples include (not exhaustive):

- Presenting **AI-generated content as one's own** without acknowledgement.
- Fabricating **citations, references, data, or analysis** using AI.
- Using AI in **prohibited conditions** (e.g., during exams or controlled assessments).
- Relying on AI to produce work that **does not evidence the candidate's own understanding**.
- Using AI to **evade detection** (e.g., paraphrasing solely to hide copying).
- Any use that **breaches awarding body instructions** or **JCQ regulations**.

Staff responsibilities regarding AI

Teachers/assessors must:

- Make students aware of permitted use and risks.
- Use strategies to assure authenticity.
- Report suspected AI misuse immediately.
- Avoid implying that AI detectors are definitive; **judgement must rely on evidence**, process records, and professional assessment.

All staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations will advise students of the risks of not following the rules and regulations they need to adhere to and how this can result in malpractice.
They are made aware that all work produced must be their own and they must reference sources used. They are also advised of the risk of using AI, how using this tool can result in malpractice and warned of potential sanctions (warnings, mark reductions, disqualification, loss of aggregation, prohibition from future entries) determined by awarding bodies.

The staff at BES refer to the JCQ Guidance, AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications, to support the students understanding of AI.

Informing candidates

Candidates are briefed each year and prior to assessments via assemblies, tutor briefings, subject sessions, posters, and the school website.

Candidates receive the relevant **JCQ Information for Candidates** (including the **AI (Artificial Intelligence) and assessments** information).

Candidates sign declarations of authentication where required and are reminded that all submitted work must be their **own**, with **sources and AI use properly acknowledged.**

AI use in assessments (and preventing AI misuse)

With reference to the JCQ Guidance for Teachers & Assessors - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications:

- 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 the developments in AI tools as the students must not be able to use such tools when completing theses assessments.
- 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 assessmnets for General Qualifications (GQs). JCQs guidance, which is designed to help students and teachers to complete NEAs, coursework and other internal assessments successfully, is followed in relation to these assessments.

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

- Information Sheet for Teachers, Senior Leader Presentation for Teachers, Poster for Students, Teacher Presentation for Students.
- Ofqual guidance designed to help teachers and school and college leaders develop an approach to the use of AI in assessed work, and to speak to students about it. (Reference: AI in coursework: resources for schools www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-in-coursework-resources-for-schools)

Prior to beginning their work, candidates are issued with the JCQ **Information for candidates** documents: **AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)**, (as applicable to any of their qualifications) **Coursework assessments**, **Non-examination assessments** and **Social media** (GR 5.8)

Relevant subject staff ensure that all candidates have read the **Notice to candidates** within the relevant awarding body's **Candidate declaration form** (Authentication form) prior to beginning their work.

Candidates will not sign the declaration until they have completed their work and handed it in for final assessment.

Authenticating candidates' work

With reference to relevant sections of the JCQ documents, e.g. Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments / Instructions for conducting coursework, AI Use in Assessments:

- Teachers will monitor candidates' work throughout the production process through regular check-ins. This, alongside internally assessed work, helps them to gain an understanding of the candidates' expected standards and writing style. Where it is suspected that work has been AI assisted, checks can be made through CoPilot to supplement human oversight.

Rejecting a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice – and add appropriate detail. (As example and with reference to SMPP 4.5)

- Where a candidate's work may be rejected on the grounds of malpractice there is an internal process in place so that candidates can request an internal appeal against this decision.
- Candidates use the centre's internal appeals procedure relating to internal assessment decisions.

Identification and reporting of malpractice

All staff at Bridgnorth Endowed School have a responsibility for reporting any potential malpractice that they may identify.

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)

Candidate malpractice discovered before authentication (NEA/coursework)

Where offences **relate to the content of work** (e.g., inappropriate/offensive content, copying/collusion, plagiarism (including AI misuse), or **false** declaration where not yet signed):

- **Do not** report to the awarding body at this stage.
- Address under **internal procedures** including **marking adjustments, resubmission decisions** (if permitted), and **record updates**.
- If the offence **does not relate to content** (e.g., possession of unauthorised materials, breach of assessment conditions), or **after** authentication is signed—**report** using JCQ/M1.

If a candidate has not yet been entered at the time of malpractice (but was intended to be entered), the centre will **submit the entry by the relevant deadline** where required by JCQ.

Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding organisation

- The head of centre will notify the appropriate awarding organisation immediately of all* alleged, suspected or actual incidents of (staff, centre and candidate) 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)

  (*The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments where the offence relates to the content of candidate work (e.g. copying/collusion, plagiarism and/or AI misuse and the authentication forms have not been signed by the candidate)
- 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)
- Form JCQ/M1 will be used to notify an awarding organisation of an incident of suspected candidate malpractice. Form JCQ/M2 will be used (**before** an investigation commences) to notify an awarding organisation 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 organisation. 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 organisation. 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 information gatherer, 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 informed of their rights and responsibilities as the accused individual, prior to the submission of the report to the awarding organisation (SMPP 5.35-36, 40)
- Where it is identified that there is a need to exercise discretion in the light of the circumstances of the case in terms of how the evidence is presented to the accused individual (for example, if there are concerns about revealing the identity of a third party mentioned in the documentation), this will be discussed with the awarding organisation.

  If the accused individual is provided with a reduced or redacted set of case documentation by the information gatherer, then the awarding organisation will be provided with the same information as provided to the individual. Where there are multiple individuals involved in the same incident, copies of the redacted documents for each individual will be provided to the awarding organisation. (SMPP 5.36)
- Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed information gatherer) will submit a written report to the relevant awarding organisation summarising the information obtained and actions taken, accompanied by the information obtained during the course of their enquiries (SMPP 5.37)

- Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used (SMPP 5.39)
- The awarding organisation 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 5.42)

Additional information:

Not Applicable

Communicating malpractice decisions

Once a decision has been made by the awarding organisation, 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:

Updating assessment records (improper assistance and internal findings)

BES will maintain accurate **assessment records** to reflect any findings of **improper assistance** or **malpractice**, including cases handled internally (e.g., candidate malpractice **before** authentication). This includes:

- **Candidate's assessment record** updated to reference the incident, outcome, and any marking **adjustments** or **restrictions** applied (with dates and staff signatures).
- **Authentication status** clearly recorded (e.g., "authentication not accepted; work resubmission required" or "authentication accepted following viva/oral clarification").
- **Centre's malpractice log** updated (unique case ID, date, individuals involved, summary, action taken, whether reported to awarding body).
- **MIS/markbook annotations** where permitted, ensuring data protection.
- **Retention** of evidence and records for the period required by JCQ/awarding bodies and at least until all reviews and appeals are concluded.

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Bridgnorth Endowed School 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 document **A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes**

Additional information:

Authenticity assurance: How teachers assure work is the student's own

To protect the integrity of assessments and provide staff assurance, BES uses a layered approach, which may include:

- **Supervised sessions** for key stages of NEA/coursework.
- **Staged submissions** (plan → draft → final) with **version control**.
- **Viva voce/oral questioning** to probe understanding and decision-making.
- **Individualised tasks/datasets**, and rotation/variation of briefs.
- **Draft and prompt logs**, including **AI prompts/outputs** where relevant.
- **Source lists, bibliographies, and citations** assessed for credibility.

- **Plagiarism detection tools** (where appropriate), with professional judgement; AI detectors are not **sole** evidence.
- **Teacher observation logs** and classroom notes.
- **Collaboration boundaries** made explicit; peer/parental assistance prohibited unless specified.

Appendix A: Candidate checklist (to be shared with students)

- I understand the rules for exams, NEA, and coursework.
- I know that all work must be my own, with sources and AI use acknowledged.
- I will not use AI or unauthorised materials where prohibited.
- I will keep drafts, notes, prompt logs, and be ready to explain my work.
- I understand potential sanctions for malpractice.
- I will read the JCQ Information for Candidates documents (all available on the website) and follow any centre guidance.

Changes effective from September 2026

(Updated)

- Wording updated under heading **Purpose of the policy**
- JCQ documents updated under heading **Preventing malpractice**
- Wording in certain bullet points updated under various headings
- Insert prompts updated in various *Additional information* sections
- Updated various SMPP section references
- References to awarding 'body' in the SMPP document updated to 'organisation'

(Amended)

- Heading **AI use in assessments** amended to **AI use in assessments (and preventing AI misuse)**
- Bullet point referring to *Information for candidates* documents amended

(Added)

- New insert sections added under various headings
- New bullet point added under heading **AI use in**... referring to the *Candidate declaration form*
- Under heading **Identification and reporting of**... added a sentence with reference to all staff responsibility

Centre-specific changes

Upon review in October 2026 there are no centre specific changes