



Boroughbridge
High School

Malpractice Policy

2025-26

Introduction

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Boroughbridge High 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 documents **General Regulations for Approved Centres** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

Purpose of the policy

To confirm Boroughbridge High 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 detailing 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 Boroughbridge High 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

Boroughbridge High 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 by JCQ and any further awarding body guidance. (SMPP 3.3.1)

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

Candidates are initially informed about how to avoid committing malpractice in completing NEA at the start of their GCSE courses. General guidance as well as specific information about the use of AI in assessments is published to parents and pupils in the Autumn term. Special assemblies are undertaken before external exams (April) to outline to candidates current JCQ exam regulations and the consequences of malpractice. Updated exam policies are published on the school website and this is signposted to parents and pupils before external exams take place.

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 (such as NEAs). Misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice. AI chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. AI chatbots can complete tasks as outlined in the JCQ document **AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications** (<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>)

As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the **JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres** (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/>), students must submit work for assessments which is their own.

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.

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 developments in AI tools as students must not be able to use such tools when completing these 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 (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. Boroughbridge High School has followed JCQ advice and prohibited the use of AI sites (list found in *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*) from student profiles on the school network.

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/>), 25/01/2025.

Where sources have not been correctly referenced, and the teacher suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will take steps to assure themselves that the work is the student's own. However, if this is not possible, a report of suspected malpractice will be submitted to the relevant body (form JCQ M1 Report of suspected candidate malpractice).

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)

Any suspected malpractice is reported in the first instance to the Exams Officer who gather evidence and notify the Head of Centre.

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 document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (SMPP 4.1.3)
- 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
- 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 does not need to 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 (the candidate or the 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)

Candidates (or an individual acting on their behalf)

Where a candidate might attempt to gain an unfair advantage during the centre's process on the determination of grades by, for example, submitting fabricated evidence, plagiarised work, inappropriate use of AI (see below), or any other act deemed as malpractice in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2025-2026, Boroughbridge High School will submit a report of suspected candidate malpractice to the relevant awarding body.

Where a candidate, or an individual acting on their behalf such as a parent/carer, might try to influence grade decisions by applying pressure to the centre or any of its staff, Boroughbridge High School will keep and retain clear and reliable records of the circumstances and the steps taken, and make the candidate aware of the outcome. This will include a record that confirms the candidate had been made aware of the evidence that was going to be used and understand that the range of evidence used to determine a grade was not negotiable.

However, if a candidate or an individual acting on their behalf continues to inappropriately attempt to pressure centre staff, a report of suspected candidate malpractice will be submitted to the relevant awarding body.

A report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form JCQ M1 Report of suspected candidate malpractice.

- This form must be used by the head of the centre to notify the appropriate awarding body of an instance of suspected candidate malpractice in the conduct of examinations or assessments



- It can also be used to provide a report on investigations into instances of suspected malpractice
- In order to prevent the issue of erroneous results and certificates, it is essential that the awarding body concerned is notified immediately of instances of suspected candidate malpractice

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

Boroughbridge High School will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal, where relevant (see Complaints and Appeals Policy)
- Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ document **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**

Centre staff

Boroughbridge High School will report any instances of potential malpractice (which includes maladministration) where any centre staff fail to follow the published requirements for determining grades.

Examples of potential malpractice taken from the JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for Summer 2026 includes but is not limited to:

- Exam entries are created for students who had not studied the course of entry or had not intended to enter for June 2026
- Grades created for students who have not been taught sufficient content to provide the basis for that grade
- A teacher deliberately and inappropriately disregarding the centre's published policy when determining grades
- A teacher fabricating evidence of candidate performance to support an inflated grade
- A teacher deliberately providing inappropriate levels of support before or during an assessment, including deliberate disclosure of mark schemes and assessment materials, to support an inflated grade
- A teacher intentionally submitting inflated grades
- A failure to retain evidence used in the determination of grades in accordance with the JCQ Grading guidance



- A systemic failure to follow the centre's policy in relation to the application of Access Arrangements or Special Consideration arrangements for students in relation to assessments used to determine grades
- A failure to take reasonable steps to authenticate student work
- A failure to appropriately manage Conflicts of Interest (COIs) within a centre
- A Head of Centre's failure to submit the required declaration when submitting their grades
- Grades being released to students (or their parents/carers) before the issue of results
- Failure to cooperate with an awarding body's quality assurance, appeal or investigation processes
- Failure to conduct a centre review or submit an appeal when requested to do so by a student
- [Insert any centre-specific examples which may be deemed malpractice and may require reporting/further investigation]

A report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form JCQ M2 Notification of suspected malpractice / maladministration involving centre staff.

- This form must be completed by the head of centre before an investigation commences to notify an awarding body of an instance of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice or maladministration
- The form must be completed and submitted to the appropriate awarding body immediately a suspicion is raised or an allegation received