



Malpractice Policy (exams) 2025-2026

Author:

Examinations Officer

Approved by the Board of Governors:

August 2025

Date of next review:

August 2026

**MORE
HOUSE
SCHOOL**

KNIGHTSBRIDGE

Contents

1. [Key staff involved in the policy](#)
2. [Purpose of the policy](#)
3. [Key definitions](#)
4. [General principles](#)
5. [Preventing malpractice](#)
6. [Identification and reporting of malpractice](#)
7. [Communicating malpractice decisions](#)
8. [Appendix one - Malpractice during assessments](#)
9. [Appendix two - Artificial Intelligence and its use in assessments](#)

1.Key staff involved in the policy

Head of centre	Claire Phelps
Senior leaders	Toby Robertson, <i>Head of Academics</i> Wayne Benskin, <i>Head of Sixth Form</i> Mike Keeley, <i>DSL</i>
Exams officer	Jorge Rodriguez

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at More House School 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.

2.Purpose of the policy

This policy covers all qualifications delivered by the school and its purpose is to ensure that all staff and students:

- are aware of what constitutes malpractice;
- understand how to prevent it occurring so that they can actively take steps to prevent it; and
- where malpractice does occur, take prompt action to report it.

This policy outlines how students are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments, and how suspected malpractice issues should be escalated within the school and reported to the relevant awarding body. It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the exam processes to read, understand and implement the policy. The Malpractice Policy will be reviewed annually by the Head of Centre, Head of Academics and the Exams Officer. This policy covers all forms of assessment, including exams and non-exam assessment taken as part of students' GCSE and A-level qualifications.

3.Key Definitions

3.1 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)

Malpractice may be:

- intentional, aiming to give a candidate or candidates an unfair advantage or disadvantage in an examination or assessment;
- due to a lack of awareness of the regulations, carelessness, or forgetfulness in applying the regulations (which may often be called ‘maladministration’); and/or
- as a result of the force of circumstances which are beyond the control of those involved (e.g. a fire alarm sounds and the supervision of students is disrupted).

3.2 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 writing of any examination paper. (SMPP 2)

3.3 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)

3.4 Suspected malpractice

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice. (SMPP 2)

4. General principles

In accordance with the regulations More House School 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)

5. Preventing malpractice

More House School 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 2024-2024;
 - 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 (SMPP 3.3.1)

Additional information:

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

JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications guidance for Teachers & staff has been shared with staff.

JCQ AI & Assessments: A Quick Guide for Students is shared with students via assemblies. Also available on the website - together with all other candidate information.

Students are informed about what constitutes malpractice and about the misuse of AI, ie that the work they submit for assessments if it is not their own, that they will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations and may attract severe sanctions.

Students are reminded through assemblies and information evenings about what items they can and cannot bring into the exam room and what constitutes malpractice.

5.2 AI Use in Assessments

NEA Non-examination assessments: Students must reference the use of AI by including specific details about the AI tool or model they utilised and describe how AI was integrated into their work.

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 developments in AI tools as students must not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments.

Staff refer to the JCQ guidance for Teachers & Assessors - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications:

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 (NEAs), coursework and internal assessments for General Qualifications (GQs) and Vocational & Technical Qualifications (VTQs). JCQ's 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.

More House School ensures that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams. Internet connection is disabled.

6. Identification and reporting of malpractice

6.1 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)
- Initially the malpractice will be reported to the Exams Officer who then escalates to the Assistant Head responsible for exams and the Head of Centre.

6.2 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:

7. 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)

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice More House 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 publication A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes

8. Appendix One - Malpractice during assessments

Candidates must not:

- submit work which is not their own
- make available their work to other candidates through any medium
- allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material
- assist other candidates to produce work
- use AI, books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution
- misuse AI
- submit work that has been word processed by a third person without acknowledgement
- include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material

These prohibitions mean that candidates must not publicise their work by posting it on social media or by any other electronic means. (ICC 6.1)

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 More House School'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 (ICC 6.2; SMPP 4.5)

Details of any work which is not the candidate's own must be recorded on the authentication form supplied by the awarding body or other appropriate place. (ICC 6.2)

Where irregularities in a controlled assessment, coursework or non- examination assessment component are identified after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, the Head of Centre must submit full details of the case to the relevant awarding body immediately, completing Form JCQ / M1. (ICC 6.3)

9. Appendix Two - Artificial Intelligence and its use in assessments

In accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres, all work submitted for qualification assessments must be 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 (AI Executive Summary)

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 formality

Acknowledging AI Use

Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments. If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the 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.

Misuse of AI and Malpractice

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures. 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 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.

Centres must make students aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment. They should also make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.

Head of Centre:
Ms C Phelps

Examinations Officer:
Mr J Rodriguez

Date: August 2025