



GLEBE SCHOOL

Malpractice in Exam & Assessments Policy

Date approved by Trustees	Autumn 2024
Date of next review	Autumn 2025

CONTENTS

Statement of Intent	3
Legal framework	3
Definitions and information.....	3
Roles and responsibilities	4
Preventing malpractice	6
Identifying and reporting malpractice	7
Investigations.....	8
Gathering information from individuals	8
The rights of accused individuals	9
Completing and submitting the report.....	10
Sanctions.....	10
Appeals.....	10
Artificial Intelligence and Malpractice – JCQ – 2nd February 2024.....	11
JCQ - Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments.....	12
JCQ - Identifying misuse of AI	12
Comparison with previous work.....	13
Private candidates.....	13
Potential indicators of AI misuse	13
Automated detection.....	14
JCQ - Reporting	15
Monitoring and review	15

Statement of Intent

As an authorised centre for the delivery of public qualifications, Glebe School is fully aware of the role it plays in supporting the appropriate delivery of assessments and upholding the integrity and security of the examination and assessment system.

Adopting this policy will ensure that the school is able to take all reasonable steps to prevent malpractice and, where malpractice does occur, take prompt action to address breaches and safeguard the integrity of qualifications.

Legal framework

This policy has due regard to all relevant legislation and statutory guidance including, but not limited to, the following:

- DfE (2021) Teachers' Standards
- Equality Act 2010
- JCQ (2024) 'Instructions for conducting examinations'
- JCQ (2024) 'General Regulations for Approved Centres'
- JCQ (2024) 'AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications'
- JCQ (2024) 'Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures'

This policy operates in conjunction with the following school policies:

- Assessment and Examinations Policy
- Non-examination Assessment Policy
- Exam Appeals Policy
- Exam Access Arrangements
- Exam Contingency Plan
- Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy

Definitions and information

Malpractice and maladministration are related concepts, both of which involve a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This policy and procedure will use the word malpractice to cover both malpractice and maladministration

Malpractice and maladministration refer to any act, default or practice which constitutes:

- 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.

Incidents of malpractice may arise for a variety of reasons:

- Some incidents are intentional and aim to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment.
- Some incidents arise due to a lack of awareness of the regulations, carelessness, or forgetfulness in applying the regulations – maladministration.
- Some occur as a result of the force of circumstances which are beyond the control of those involved, e.g. a fire alarm disrupting the supervision of candidates.

The individuals involved in malpractice also vary and may include:

- Candidates.
- Teachers, lecturers, tutors, trainers, assessors.
- Staff responsible for the conduct, administration or quality assurance of examinations and assessments including
 - Examination officers.
 - Invigilators.
 - Those facilitating access arrangements, e.g. readers, scribes and practical assistants.
- Assessment personnel such as examiners, assessors, moderators or internal and external verifiers.
- Other third parties, e.g. parents/carers, siblings or friends of the candidate.

Malpractice may or may not relate directly to sitting an examination, as there is the possibility that novel or unexpected forms of malpractice may emerge as technologies and the nature and organisation of examination centres change.

Examples of malpractice

Appendix 2 of the JCQs 'Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures' provides a list of examples illustrating what may constitute suspected malpractice. The list is not intended as an exhaustive list, and other instances of malpractice may be identified and considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion.

For the purposes of this policy, and to ensure school arrangements are effective, staff will be made aware of the contents of this document when preparing for exams and assessments, especially relating to Centre staff malpractice and candidate malpractice.

Roles and responsibilities

The governing board will be responsible for:

- Ensuring the school has a culture in which all staff and learners are aware that malpractice will not be accepted and that any concerns of malpractice or other wrongdoing can be freely and confidently reported.
- Ensuring the security and integrity of all exams and assessments undertaken at the school.
- Ensuring that this policy does not discriminate on any grounds.
- Reviewing this policy, in conjunction with relevant members of staff.

The headteacher will be responsible for:

- Ensuring this policy complies with current legislation and guidance.

- Ensuring this policy is implemented, monitored and adhered to consistently across the school.
- Familiarising themselves with relevant guidance from awarding bodies and the JCQ.
- Ensuring the school complies with relevant guidance from awarding bodies and the JCQ.
- Ensuring that all staff involved in the delivery and assessment of qualifications have the appropriate skills and experience and have received appropriate training.
- Ensuring staff with responsibilities relating to assessment and examinations meet internal and external deadlines.
- Advising parents that they must not contact awarding bodies directly and that all queries must be directed to the school.
- Handling complaints regarding this policy in line with the school's Complaints Procedure Policy.
- Reviewing this policy as and when necessary to ensure practices are effective and consistent within the school.
- Notifying the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice.

The examinations officer will be responsible for:

- Familiarising themselves with, and following, relevant guidance from awarding bodies and the JCQ.
- Carrying out tasks that support the administration and management of all examination assessments.
- Carrying out all necessary duties as directed by the headteacher.
- Ensuring subject leaders are kept up to date with JCQ regulations and information.
- Ensuring candidates are entered for the correct assessments and the entry forms reach the relevant awarding body at the specified time.

The Deputy Head and Head of Year will be responsible for:

- Identifying and assessing the candidate's requirements for access arrangements.
- Notifying the exams officer of any access arrangements required well in advance of the assessment.
- The administration of access arrangements and any special arrangements for candidates.
- Having in place trained personnel to assist access candidates with assessments where required.
- Keeping accurate and up to date records of all access arrangements.
- Determining all appropriate arrangements for pupils with SEND and coordinating appropriate support.
- Inform pupils during assembly of key concepts for malpractice and misuse of Ai in terms that they will understand.

Invigilators will be responsible for:

- Familiarising themselves with, and following, relevant guidance from awarding bodies and the JCQ.
- Ensuring non-examination assessments comply with JCQ's and the awarding body's specifications.

- Efficiently running all exams in a safe and secure environment and dealing with any issues that arise during an examination or assessment.
- Ensuring the security of the examination materials during examinations.
- Preventing and reporting possible pupil malpractice.
- Preventing possible administrative failures.
- Collecting papers and other material from the exams officer prior to the commencement of the exam.
- Contacting the exams officer for clarification of any issue.
- Collecting and returning papers in the correct order to the exam officer on completion of the assessment.
- Ensuring all pupils have an equal opportunity to demonstrate their abilities, e.g. making sure no additional notes are brought into the examination room.

Candidates will be responsible for:

- Checking that their personal details and entries are correct.
- Signing declarations that authenticates course work and/or controlled assessment as their own.
- Conducting themselves in an appropriate manner by abiding by school and assessment rules in accordance with JCQ regulations.
- Lodging an appeal with the exam board for awarding grades or for reports of malpractice.
- Making a complaint to the exams officer regarding anything connected with the assessment process.

The site manager will be responsible for:

- Collaborating with the exam officer to ensure rooms allocated for assessments are set up in accordance with JCQ regulations.
- Ensuring that rooms used for assessments are clean, well-ventilated with all access and fire exits obstacle free.

The DPO will be responsible for:

- Managing data within the school in regard to assessments.
- Managing internal data protection activities.
- Ensuring risk and impact assessments are conducted in accordance with ICO guidance.
- Maintaining expert knowledge of data protection law and practices.

Preventing malpractice

The school will take all reasonable steps to prevent malpractice.

Centre staff malpractice and maladministration.

The school will 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.

- 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.
- Examination officers are appropriately trained, resourced and supported.
- Exams at alternative sites are conducted in accordance with JCQ ICE requirements.
- Staff who manage and implement special consideration and access arrangements are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced.
- Members of staff do not communicate any confidential information about examinations and assessment materials, including via social media.
- Examination clash arrangements are planned and managed effectively.
- Staff delivering or assessing coursework or non-examination assessments have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting plagiarism or other potential candidate malpractice.
- There is a culture of honesty and openness so that any concerns of potential malpractice can be escalated appropriately without fear of repercussion.

Candidate malpractice

The school will ensure that 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.
- Are aware of actions that constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice.
- Understand the sanctions of passing on or receiving confidential assessment materials. If a candidate receives confidential information, they must report it to a member of centre staff immediately.
- 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.
- Completing coursework or non-examination assessments are aware of the need for the work to be their own.

To ensure candidates are well informed and understand their responsibilities and expectations of behaviour the school will distribute all JCQ notices prior to assessments and examinations taking place. This will include notices and information on the following issues:

- Information for candidates
- Non-examination assessments
- Coursework
- On-screen tests
- Written examinations
- Social media
- Plagiarism

Identifying and reporting malpractice

Where there are any concerns or suspicions of malpractice the school will:

- Notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice.
- Report malpractice using the appropriate forms as provided by the JCQ.
- Be accountable for ensuring that school staff comply with the awarding body's instructions regarding an investigation.
- Ensure that the candidate's parents are kept informed of the progress of an 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.
- Ensure that member of staff chosen is independent and not connected to the department or candidate involved in the suspected malpractice.
- Ensure there is no conflict of interests which might compromise an investigation into malpractice.
- Respond speedily and openly to all requests for an investigation into allegations of malpractice and provide information requested available in a timely manner.
- Co-operate with enquiries into allegations of malpractice.
- Ensure staff and candidates are informed of their individual responsibilities and rights.
- Forward any awarding body correspondence and evidence to members of staff and provide staff contact information to enable the awarding body to do so.
- 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.

If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the school will inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by candidates.

The school is aware that failure to comply with the requirements above may itself constitute malpractice.

Investigations

The school is aware that, following a report of suspected malpractice, an awarding body may decide to conduct an investigation in order to determine whether or not there is any evidence to support the allegation made. An allegation of malpractice will be considered unproven until the relevant information has been gathered and considered.

The head of centre will oversee the process of information gathering in accordance with the deadlines and requirements set by the awarding body.

The school will ensure that the appointed information gatherer will obtain the information specified by the awarding body, in the formats and to the timescales required, regardless of their assessment of the matter.

Gathering information from individuals

Staff will conduct interviews with staff or students in accordance with the school's own internal policy for conducting enquiries, ensuring the rights of accused individuals are observed.

The information gatherer will take dated notes or a transcript of the interview and provide this to the interviewee for a signature to confirm its accuracy.

Any statements obtained will be in the witness' own words and be signed and dated

Any member of staff being interviewed may be accompanied by a friend or advisor, who may be a representative of a teacher association or other association.

Although the involvement of legal advisors is not necessary, at least where there is no allegation of criminal behaviour, the school will ensure that, if an interviewee wishes to be accompanied by a legal advisor, the other parties must be informed beforehand to give them the opportunity to be similarly supported.

All interviewees will be informed that the person accompanying the interviewee should not take an active part in the interview, and must not answer questions on the interviewee's behalf.

All those being interviewed or making a statement will be made aware that awarding bodies reserve the right to share their statements, records or transcripts of any interviews that are undertaken. This information may be shared at any stage during or after the investigation.

The rights of accused individuals

If the information-gatherer feels that there is sufficient evidence that an individual may have committed malpractice, the school will ensure that the candidate or the member of staff in question is:

- Informed of the allegation made against them, preferably in writing.
- Provided with a copy of the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures: <http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>.
- Made aware of all evidence that has been obtained during the investigation which supports the allegation.
- Knows the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.
- Afforded the opportunity and time to consider their response to the allegations.
- Given an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the allegations.
- Provided with a complete set of case documentation, in the event of the case being referred to the awarding body's Malpractice Committee.
- Informed that in the event of the case being referred to the awarding body's Malpractice Committee, they will:
 - Be provided with a complete set of case documentation.
 - Have the opportunity to read, and make a statement in response to, the case documentation.
 - Have the opportunity to seek professional advice and to provide a supplementary statement.
 - Be made aware of their right to appeal should a sanction be applied to them, as set out in the JCQ document A Guide to the Awarding Bodies' Appeals Processes.

The headteacher will ensure that any individual accused of malpractice is informed of their rights and responsibilities.

Completing and submitting the report

Once the information gathering has concluded, the school will submit a written report to the relevant awarding body summarising the information obtained and actions taken, along with any information obtained during the course of their enquiries.

The report will contain a statement of the facts of the case, including a detailed account of the circumstances of the alleged malpractice and an objective description of the information gathered during the course of the investigation. It will also include details of any exculpatory information, or mitigating factors, found during the investigation process.

Sanctions

A permanent record will be kept of the impact of any sanctions on an individual candidate's results.

The headteacher will inform those individuals found guilty of malpractice that information may be passed on to other awarding bodies or appropriate authorities. This information will typically include the names, offences and sanctions applied to those found guilty of breaching the published regulations

Where an allegation of malpractice is upheld awarding bodies may choose to apply one or more sanctions, as outlined in the [appendices](#) of JCQs 'Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures'.

Depending upon the nature of the malpractice allegation and the parties concerned, the school is aware that sanctions may be applied against:

- The school
- School staff
- Candidates

The headteacher will assume responsibility for communicating the decision to the individuals concerned and to pass on details of any sanctions and action in cases where this is indicated.

The headteacher will inform candidates if they have the right to appeal.

The headteacher will notify the awarding body:

- If a member of staff moves to another centre while being subject to a sanction.
- If a centre changes awarding body for a qualification, and a member of staff involved in the delivery or assessment of the qualification is subject to a sanction.

Appeals

The school is aware that all awarding bodies have established procedures for considering appeals against sanctions arising from malpractice decisions.

The school will ensure that the following individuals are informed of their right to appeal against decisions of the Malpractice Committee or officers acting on its behalf:

- Heads of centre, who may appeal against sanctions imposed on the school or on school staff, as well as on behalf of candidates entered or registered through the school.
- Members of school staff, or examining personnel contracted to a school, who may appeal against sanctions imposed on them personally.
- Private (external) candidates.
- Third parties who have been barred from taking or delivery of the awarding body's examinations or assessments.

Artificial Intelligence and Malpractice – JCQ – 2nd February 2024

While the potential for student artificial intelligence (AI) misuse is new, most of the ways to prevent its misuse and mitigate the associated risks are not; centres will already have established measures in

place to ensure that students are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work

for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice. This guidance reminds teachers and assessors in centres of best practice in this area, applying it in the context of AI use.

The guidance emphasises the following requirements:

- 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/>), teachers and assessors must only accept work for qualification assessments which is the students' own;
- Students who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations, and may attract severe sanctions;
- Students and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice;
- Students must make sure that work submitted for assessment is demonstrably their own. If any sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified by the student and they must understand that this will not allow them to demonstrate that they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded (please see the Acknowledging AI use and AI use and marking sections below and Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work at the end of this document); and
- Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate and take appropriate action.

JCQ - Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments

While there may be benefits to using AI in some situations, there is the potential for it to be misused by students, either accidentally or intentionally. AI misuse, in that it involves a student submitting work for qualification assessments which is not their own, can be considered a form of plagiarism. JCQ has published guidance on plagiarism which provides guidance on what plagiarism is, how to prevent it, and how to detect it (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachers-assessors/>).

Teachers and assessors must be assured that the work they accept for assessment and mark is authentically the student's own work. They are required to confirm this during the assessment process. To prevent misuse, education and awareness of staff and students is likely to be key. Here are some actions which should be taken (many of these will already be in place in centres as these are not new requirements):

- Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate and take appropriate action.
- Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;
- Ensure that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams;
- Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders;
- Where appropriate, 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- Do 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.
- 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.

JCQ - Identifying misuse of AI

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.

Comparison with previous work

When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other

work created by the student. Where the work is made up of writing, one can 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)

Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions.

Private candidates

Verifying the authenticity of work submitted by private candidates can be more challenging for centres, given that they may not have a good understanding of the standard the student is currently working at. Before accepting work for assessment, teachers/assessors must take steps to ensure it is the student's own independent work. This may involve a review of the student's portfolio of evidence

across a range of qualifications and a short discussion with the student regarding their work.

Further guidance on authenticating student work can be found in the JCQ Instructions for conducting coursework (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/coursework/>).

Potential indicators of AI misuse

- If the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication that the student has misused AI:
- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations*
- A default use of language or vocabulary which might not appropriate to the qualification level*
- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected~
- Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
- A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects
- Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered

- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
- A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
- A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
- The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output
- The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
- The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth and variety or to overcome its output limit
- The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
- Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.

*Please be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages and levels of proficiency when generating content.

~However, some AI tools will produce quotations and references.

Automated detection

AI chatbots, as large language models, produce content by 'guessing' the most likely next word in a sequence. This means that AI generated content uses the most common combinations of words, unlike humans who tend to use a variety of words in their normal writing. Several programs and services use this difference to statistically analyse written content and determine the likelihood that it was produced by AI, for example:

- Turnitin AI writing detection (<https://www.turnitin.com/solutions/topics/ai-writing/ai-detector/>)
- Copyleaks (<https://copyleaks.com/ai-content-detector>)
- GPTZero (<https://gptzero.me/>)
- Sapling (<https://sapling.ai/ai-content-detector>)

These can be used as a check on student work and/or to verify concerns about the authenticity of student work. However, it should be noted that the above tools, as they base their scores on the predictability of words, will give lower scores for AI-generated content which has been subsequently amended by students. The quality of these detection tools can vary and AI and detection tools will continue to evolve. Spending time getting to know how the detection tools work will help teachers and assessors understand what they are and aren't capable of.

AI detection tools, including those listed above, employ a range of detection models which can vary in accuracy depending on the AI tool and version used, the proportion of AI to human content, prompt types and other factors (such as an individual's English language competency). In instances where misuse of AI is suspected it can be helpful to use more than one detection tool to provide an additional source of evidence about the authenticity of student work.

The use of detection tools, where used, should form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of students' work; all available information should be considered when reviewing any malpractice concerns. Teachers will know their students best and so are best placed to assess the authenticity of work submitted to them for assessment – AI detection tools can be a useful part of the evidence they can consider.

JCQ - Reporting

If your suspicions are confirmed and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, your centre doesn't need to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation. Steps to resolve such incidents should be detailed in the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy. These should include ensuring that students are aware of what malpractice is, how to avoid malpractice, how to properly reference sources and acknowledge AI tools, etc.

Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own. Ultimately the Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring that students do not submit inauthentic work.

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/exams-office/malpractice/>

This policy has been updated with respect to the guidance on Artificial Intelligence from JCQ – 7th February 2024

Monitoring and review

- This policy will be reviewed by the Headteacher, Deputy Head and Exams Officer on an annual basis.