MALPRACTICE POLICY (EXAMS)

2025/26

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Approved by the Governing Body October 2025	
Date of next review	October 2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	**Anesta McCullagh**
Exams officer line manager (Senior leader)	**Matthew Cooper**
Exams officer	**Paula Harris**
ALS lead/SENCo	**Vanessa Powell**
Senior leader(s)	**Anesta McCullagh, Richard Endicott, Matthew Cooper, Jen Vincent**

Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Centre Name	Engineering UTC Northern Lincolnshire
Centre Number	44340
Date policy first created	09/10/2023
Current policy approved by	Governing Body
Current policy reviewed by	Governing Body

Contents

Key staff involved in the policy 2
Introduction 5
Candidate malpractice 5
Centre staff malpractice 5
Suspected malpractice 5
Purpose of the policy 5
General principles 6
Preventing malpractice 6
Informing and advising candidates 7
Identification and reporting of malpractice 7
Escalating suspected malpractice issues 7
Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body 7
Communicating malpractice decisions 8
Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice 8
Changes 2023/2024 ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Under heading Identification and reporting of malpractice: (Added) New subheading Escalating suspected malpractice issues and ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
(Added) New subheading Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
Centre-specific changes ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Engineering UTC Northern Lincolnshire 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 Centres** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

Introduction

What is malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are related concepts, the common theme of which is 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
- 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 (SMPP 1)

Candidate malpractice

'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 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. (SMPP 2)

Purpose of the policy

To confirm Engineering UTC Northern Lincolnshire:

- 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 (GR 5.3)

General principles

In accordance with the regulations Engineering UTC Northern Lincolnshire will:

- 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

Engineering UTC Northern Lincolnshire 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)
- 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 2024-2025

- 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

- Plagiarism in Assessments

- AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications

- A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2024-2025

Additional information:

Informing and advising candidates

The centre will:

- ensure the JCQ Information for candidates (coursework, non-examination assessments, onscreen tests, social media and written examinations) is distributed to all candidates whether electronically or in hard copy format prior to assessments and/or examinations taking place.
- ensure candidates are also made aware of the content of the JCQ Unauthorised items and Warning to Candidates posters
- prior to assessments and/or examinations taking place, ensure candidates are briefed by teaching staff or members of the senior team on what they must and must not do when sitting written examinations and/or on-screen tests, and when producing coursework and/or non-examination assessments

These details are also provided in an exam information pack before the start of an exam series in an assembly, during tutor and sent home.

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)

Suspected malpractice is detailed in the incident log during an examination and reported straight to the exams officer. If it is in the event of an assessment, staff will report straight to the head of centre and exams officer. The head of centre and exams officer will conduct any investigation and gather information in accordance with the requirements of the JCQ publication, Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures. The exams officer will notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice, using the appropriate forms.

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 where a candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, must be reported using a JCQ M1 to the relevant awarding body. If at the time of the malpractice there is no entry for that candidate (who the centre intended to enter), the centre is required to submit an entry by the required entry deadline. SMPP4.5

If, in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence to implicate an individual in malpractice, that individual (a candidate or a member of staff) will be informed of the rights of accused individuals. Once the information has concluded, a written report and evidence will be submitted to the awarding body.

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 publication **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (SMPP 4.1.3)

- The head of centre will 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 (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 need not 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 (a candidate or a 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)
- 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)

  Additional information:

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:

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Engineering UTC Northern Lincolnshire 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**

AI – Use 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 still being developed and there are often 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. 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 format

What is AI Misuse

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 that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

● Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the student's own

● Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content

● Using AI to complete parts of 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.

Acknowledging AI Use

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 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.

In addition to the above, where students use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. This allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether that use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2023. The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.

Reporting and Investigation

If your suspicions are confirmed and the pupil has not signed the declaration of authentication, the centre doesn't need to report the malpractice to the appropriate awarding organisation. We can resolve the matter prior to the signing of the declarations. Teachers must not accept work which is not the pupil's own. Ultimately the Head of Centre has the

responsibility for ensuring that pupils 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/examsoffice/malpractice/).

Consequences

If AI misuse is suspected by a teacher, or if it has been reported by a pupil or member of the public, it must be reported immediately. The relevant awarding body will liaise with the Head of Centre regarding the next steps of the investigation and how appropriate evidence will be obtained. The awarding body will then consider the case and, if necessary, impose a sanction in line with JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (https://www.jcq. org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/).

The sanctions applied to a pupil committing plagiarism and making a false declaration of authenticity range from a warning regarding future conduct to disqualification and the pupil being barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time. Awarding organisations will also take action, which can include the imposition of sanctions, where centre staff are knowingly accepting, or failing to check, inauthentic work for qualification assessments. This must be submitted with the work so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own.

See https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/ for further information.