GEORGE ABBOT SCHOOL

Policy Title:	**Malpractice Policy (including the use of AI)**
Author:	**Examinations Manager**
Date of most recent review:	**October 2026**
Date of next review:	**October 2027**

School Mission Statement:
Academic excellence within a strong community of equality and respect, where potential and opportunity are realised.

George Abbot School (Centre) will adhere to the following Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) and Centre policies:

- *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*
- *JCQAI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*
- *JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments*
- *Centre - AI Guidance for Non-Examined Assessments for Students/Parents/Carers*
- *Centre - AI Guidance for Non-Examined Assessments for Students/Parents/Carers Subject Specific Instructions.*

1. Malpractice

The purpose of this policy sets out to define and confirm the procedures to be followed by the Centre in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding malpractice in the examination process:

- Centre Malpractice – Malpractice committed by a member of staff
- Candidate Malpractice – Malpractice committed by a candidate in connection with any exam/assessment including the preparation and authentication of controlled assessments (CAs), coursework (CWs) and non-examination assessments (NEAs), practical work, compilation of portfolios/assessment evidence and the writing of any examination paper.

Maladministration is generally any unintentional action or omission that results in non-compliance with regulations.

The Centre will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place
- 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
- As required by the awarding body, gather evidence of any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the JCQ Suspected Candidate Malpractice Policy.

Candidates are informed of the meaning of malpractice, what constitutes malpractice and sanctions if proved by the following:

- All JCQ Information for Candidates provided to exam candidates via school email to students/parents/carers at the beginning of the academic year
- Exam candidates receive presentations via assemblies

- Information published on the school website.

Definition of Malpractice:
'Malpractice', means any act, default or practice which is a break of the regulations or 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 of the validation 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

Malpractice includes maladministration and instances of non-compliance with the regulations and includes such activity as failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of CAs, CWs, NEAs and exams or failures of compliance with JCQ regulations in the conduct of exams/assessments and/or the handling of examination question papers, candidate scripts, mark sheets, assessment records and certificate claims.

Malpractice may or may not relate directly to sitting an examination. Awarding bodies are aware of the possibility of novel or unexpected forms of malpractice emerging as technologies and the nature and organisation of examination centres change.

Centre Malpractice
Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by staff; this list is not exhaustive:
- Assisting candidates with exam questions
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking
- Not following the JCQ Instructions for conducting CA/CW/NEAs

Centre Malpractice Procedure
The Centre will adhere to the JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies & Procedures. All investigations will be carried out as delegated by the Head of Centre (HOC). The member of staff will be:
- Informed in writing of the allegation made
- Informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- Informed of what action the Centre is required to take
- Informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven
- Given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegation
- Given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- Given the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary)
- Informed of the application appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him or her
- Informed that information relating to a serious case of malpractice will be shared with the relevant awarding body and may be shared with other awarding bodies
- Where centre malpractice is identified, the HOC will submit details of the case to the awarding body using the appropriate JCQ form.

Centre Malpractice Sanctions
Where a member of staff is found guilty of malpractice, the following sanctions may be imposed:
- Written warning: issue the member of staff with a writing warning stating that if the offence is repeated within a set period, further specified sanctions will be applied
- Training: require the member of staff, as a condition of future involvement in examinations, to undertake specific training or mentoring, within a particular period, including a review process at the end of the training
- Special conditions: impose special conditions on the future involvement in examinations by the member of staff
- Suspension: bar the member of staff in all involvement in the administration the examinations for a set period

- Dismissal: should the degree of malpractice be deemed gross professional misconduct, the member of staff could face dismissal from his/her post.

Candidate Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates; this list is not exhaustive:

- Plagiarism: the copying and passing off as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another candidate's work
- Failing to abide by the instructions of an assessor – this may refer to the use of resources which the candidate has been specifically told not to use
- The alteration of any results document
- Talking during an examination
- Mobile phone on a candidate and/or mobile phone ringing/alarm alert
- Taking unauthorised material other than those accepted by the awarding body into the examination, such as flash cards, notes
- Passing notes or papers to, or accepting notes or papers from, another candidate
- Signing the candidate declaration form where work submitted is not their own by not referencing the use of AI tools or the work of others.

Candidate Malpractice Procedure

The Centre will adhere to the JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies & Procedures. All investigations will be carried out as delegated by the Head of Centre (HOC). Any appeal against a Centre decision will be reviewed by an appropriately senior member of staff who was not directly involved in the original investigation wherever reasonably practicable. The candidate will be:

- Informed in writing of the allegation made against him or her
- Informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- Informed of what action the Centre is required to take
- Informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven
- Given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegation
- Given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- Candidates may be accompanied by a parent/carer for any meeting where appropriate
- Advised parents/carers will be informed of the allegation
- Investigations will normally commence as soon as reasonably practicable and candidates will be kept informed of significant developments.

Candidate Malpractice Sanctions

Where a candidate is found guilty of malpractice, the Centre will inform the awarding body by completing a Form JCQ/M1. The awarding body may impose various sanctions, dependent upon the severity of the situation such as:

- Written warning: issue the candidate with a written warning stating that if the offence is repeated within a set period, further specified sanctions will be applied
- Loss of marks for a section of the paper
- Loss of marks for a component
- Loss of marks gained for a unit
- Disqualification from the unit
- Disqualification from all units in one or more qualifications taken in the series
- Disqualification from the whole qualification
- Disqualification from all qualifications taken in that series
- Barred from entering for examinations for a set period.

If an incident has occurred during an exam, the candidate will be allowed in most cases to complete their exam.

In the event of suspected candidate malpractice:

When the examination has finished, the candidate will be either taken to another venue or kept behind to discuss what has happened. The candidate will be given an opportunity to write a candidate statement which should be signed and dated. This is the candidate's chance to tell us in their own words:

- What has happened
- If there any circumstances that led up to the incident
- If they had any intention to commit suspected malpractice.

The Examinations Manager will:
- Ask the Centre staff involved to complete an Incident Log
- Advise the candidate about the process, their rights, and timescales involved
- Inform the Head of Centre about the incident, who may decide to speak with the candidate with another senior member of staff present
- Will notify the awarding body by completing the appropriate JCQ documentation
- Will confirm actions to the candidate in writing, and their parents/carers.

When the awarding body's decision has been received by the Centre the Examinations Manager will advise the candidate and their parents/carers in writing of the outcome.

Following the conclusion of the Centre investigation, candidates will be informed of their right to access the Centre's Internal Appeals Procedure where applicable. Where a case has been referred to an awarding body, appeals against sanctions or decisions will be managed in accordance with the awarding body's published appeals process and JCQ regulations.

Information relating to a serious case of malpractice may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators and other appropriate authorities.

For further information:
www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/

2. Artificial Intelligence (AI)

The Centre will provide guidance and support to all stakeholders in relation to the use of AI within the Centre whilst ensuring to protect the integrity of assessments in line with JCQ guidance and regulations. The Centre must acknowledge the use of AI, when it may be used, the risks of using AI, what AI misuse is and how this will be treated as malpractice.

AI stands for artificial intelligence and using it is like having a computer that thinks.
Candidates are informed of AI by the following:
- Presentations via assemblies by a member of the Senior Leadership Team (SLT)
- Policy published on the schools' website
- Specific guidance by the subject staff administering the assessment

All work submitted for assessment in a qualification must be the candidates own. The guidance emphasises the following requirements:
- Candidates who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, and in accordance with JCQ regulations, may have severe sanctions imposed
- Candidates must be made of aware of the potential risks using AI and must be clear on what constitutes candidate malpractice
- Centre staff must be made aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes candidate malpractice
- Candidates must make sure that the work they submit for assessment is demonstrably their own. If any section of their work is produced 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 not rewarded in marks
- Teachers/assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the candidate's own.

AI Misuse

AI misuse is when you take something made using AI and say it's your own work. This is cheating!

As has always been the case, and in accordance with JCQ regulations, candidates must submit work for assessments which is their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words and is not copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work. Where candidates use material that is not their own work this should be clearly identified and referenced in all instances. Candidates must 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 relating to the assessment objectives for the subject relevant to the question/s or other tasks candidates have been set.

The requirements for students are set out in the documents:

- *JCQ Information for candidates – non-examination assessments (NEAs)*
- *JCQ Information for candidates – Coursework assessments*
- *School Policy for AI Guidance for NEAs*

Any use of AI which means candidates have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice.

AI tools must only be used when the conditions of the assessment permit the use of the internet and where the candidate is able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking. If the NEA conditions permit the use of AI tools, then you must reference the information received clearly. This should include the name of the AI tool used, screenshots of the prompt used, and the output generated. This must be included as part of the NEA submission.

The Centre recognises that AI detection software is not sufficiently reliable to be used as the sole basis for a malpractice allegation. Any concerns regarding potential AI misuse will be considered alongside a range of evidence, including the candidate's previous work, supervised work completed in class, discussions with the candidate, assessment records and any other relevant information before a decision is made to refer a matter to an awarding body.

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 candidate'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 candidate'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 Use in Assessments

AI use refers to the use of AI tools such as large language models to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications

While a 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 if a candidate does not reference it. Candidates 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 data sets 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 formality.

Examples of AI chatbots currently available include (but not exclusively):

- ChatGPT
- Snapchat My AI
- Jenni AI
- Writesonic
- Bloom AI
- Google Gemini
- Jasper AI
- Gemini
- Gauth
- Question AI
- Brainly.

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate images such as:

- Midjourney
- Stable Diffusion
- Ray-Ban Meta glasses
- Dalle-E 2
- Musicfy
- Runway
- LTX Student.

Monitoring of AI Use

To reduce the risk of plagiarism and inappropriate use of AI the class teacher:

- Explain the importance to all candidates of submitting their own independent work for assessments
- Ensure candidates are clear about how to acknowledge and reference the use of technology and websites appropriately
- Ensure students are familiar with AI tools, their risks and the available AI detection tools
- Ensure, if necessary, candidates know how to disable access to AI/internet where this is prohibited
- Reinforce to candidates the importance of their declaration when they confirm that the work they submit is their own and the consequences of a false declaration
- Where appropriate, ensure that a sufficient proportion of the work is completed under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate the candidate's work with confidence
- It may occasionally be necessary to engage the candidate in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and it reflects their own independent work
- Not accept, without further investigation, any work that they suspect may have been generated without proper acknowledgement
- Ensure they will not use AI tools as the sole marker of candidate work

Identification of AI Use

Teachers and leaders will use a wide range of approaches to review work; these may include comparing the assessment material with previously created work by the candidate regarding:

- Spelling and punctuation
- Grammatical usage
- Writing style and tone
- Vocabulary
- Complexity and coherency
- General understanding and working level

- The mode of production eg, handwritten or word-processed
- Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified
- Lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date.

Any member of centre staff who identifies any AI-based activities or software that is, or may be, in violation of the JCQ regulations must report the activity or software immediately to the Examinations Manager. If this is prior to the candidate signing the declaration form, the Centre will resolve this matter internally.

No allegation of malpractice will be based solely on the output of AI detection software. The Centre will consider a range of evidence before determining whether a referral to the awarding body is necessary.

IF AI misuse is detected or suspected by the Centre and the declaration form has been signed, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding body, and the Centre will adhere to the guidance as set out in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures. The awarding body will liaise with the Centre regarding the next steps if the investigation and how appropriate evidence will be obtained. If AI misuse is identified the sanction applied may include, but are not limited to:

- Invalidation of the NEA in question
- Sanctions are determined by the awarding body and may include loss of marks, disqualification from a component, unit, qualification or examination series as specified within JCQ regulations.

All documentation and evidence relating to malpractice investigations will be securely retained in accordance with JCQ and awarding body requirements.

For NEAs moderators who receive sample work from Centres will raise issues to their Exams Integrity Team should they suspect the misuse of AI in the work they have received.

Where suspected candidate malpractice is identified, the matter will be investigated in accordance with JCQ regulations and, where required, referred to the relevant awarding body for determination.

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