

Malpractice Policy



Undershaw

Policy Title	Malpractice Policy
First Published	October 2023
Last Date of Review	October 2024
Next Review by Date	October 2025
Reviewed By	Exams Officer
Approved By	Headteacher
For publication on website	Yes / No
Signed by	Headteacher October 2024

Centre Information

Centre Name	Undershaw
Centre Number	64524

Key staff involved in the procedure

Role	Name
Exams officer	Paula Williams
Senior leader(s)	Victoria Walker
Head of Centre	Emma West
Other staff (if applicable)	Not Applicable

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Undershaw Education Trust 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 writing of any examination paper. (SMPP 2).

Candidate malpractice – Artificial Intelligence (AI)

The use of AI software and not correctly referencing this.

Referencing

Full details of referencing are found in **Information For Candidates 2024/2025**.

This states:

'If you use the same wording as a published source, you must place quotation marks around the passage and state where it came from. This is called 'referencing'. You must make sure that you give detailed references for everything in your work which is not in your own words. A reference from a printed book or journal should show the name of the author, the year of publication and the page number, for example: (Morrison, 2000, p29). For material taken from the internet, your reference

should show the date when the material was downloaded and must show the precise web page, not the search engine used to locate it. This can be copied from the address line. For example: http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/october/28/newsid_2621000/2621915.stm, downloaded 5 February 2024.

Where computer-generated content has been used (such as an AI Chatbot), your reference must show the name of the AI bot used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2024. You should retain a copy of the computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes.'

- 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.
 - 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.

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 Undershaw Education Trust: 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 Undershaw Education Trust 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). Screen work using Turnitin.co.uk and AI detection websites if plagiarism or AI use are suspected.
- 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

Undershaw Education Trust 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 (SMPP 3.3.1)

Informing and advising candidates

Students and parents will be informed in writing of our malpractice policy in January prior to the Exams Season by the exams officer in a pack to parents and students. Students will also be informed by a senior leader in an assembly prior to the main exam series in the Spring annually.

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)

- Malpractice issues will be escalated to the Deputy Headteacher and Head of Centre as soon as is practically possible by the Exams Officer.

Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body:

1. 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) .
Specific examples of events that must be reported to the relevant examination body are -
 - a) Talking to, attempt to communicate with or disturb other candidates once they have entered the examination room.
 - b) Candidates opening the question paper until the examination begins.
 - c) Failure to hand in any unauthorised item including phones
2. 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)
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)

4. 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)
5. Teachers are aware of computer detection tools to identify potential AI misuse and use them for suspected unreferenced AI use.
6. Several programs and services use this difference to statistically analyse written content and determine the likelihood that it was produced by AI:
 - OpenAI Classifier (<https://openai.com/blog/new-ai-classifier-for-indicating-ai-written-text/>)
 - GPTZero (<https://gptzero.me/>)
 - The Giant Language Model Test Room (GLTR) (<http://gltr.io/dist/>)
 - Turnitin Originality (<https://www.turnitin.com/products/originality>)
 - 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)
7. 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)
8. Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used (SMPP 5.37)
9. 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)

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 Undershaw Education Trust 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

Policy No/Name:	Malpractice Policy			
Statutory: Y /N	Online: Y /N		Parago: Y /N	
Review Frequency: Annual	Committee Review:	N/A		
	2021	2022	2023	2024
Staff Member responsible			Exams officer	Exams Officer

Nature of changes made			New	Specific examples of events that must be reported to the relevant examination body
Date reviewed by Committee				Oct 2024
Date next review is due			Oct 2024	Nov 2025
File Version			1	2024/25