

Malpractice (Exams) Policy

The Altus School

Malpractice (Exams) Policy

Centre name	The Altus School
Centre number	57346
Date policy first created	14/01/2026
Current policy approved by	John Rothwell
Current policy reviewed by	John Rothwell
Date of review	14/01/2026
Date of next review	14/01/2027

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	John Rothwell
Senior leader(s)	Emma Gundry - Director Claire Greatbanks - Deputy Director
Exams officer	Chris Coffey
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at The Altus 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**.

Introduction

What are malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are distinct but related concepts, the common theme being 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, and/or
- a breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered, and/or
- a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification

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 or the validity 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 (SMPP 1)

Candidate malpractice

'Candidate malpractice' normally involves 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)

Centre malpractice

'Centre malpractice' normally involves malpractice where there is an element of systemic failure, a breach in policies or widespread malpractice such that a centre-level sanction is appropriate (SMPP 2)

Suspected malpractice

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice (regardless of how the incident might be categorised, as described in SMPP, section 1.9). (SMPP 2)

Purpose of the policy

To confirm The Altus 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 The Altus 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

The Altus 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 in the following JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance:
 - General Regulations for Approved Centres 2025-2026
 - Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2025-2026
 - Instructions for conducting coursework 2025-2026
 - Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2025-2026
 - Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2025-2026
 - A guide to the special consideration process 2025-2026
 - Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2025-2026 (this document)
 - Plagiarism in Assessments
 - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications
 - Post Results Services June 2025 and November 2025
 - A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2025-2026
 - Guidance for centres on cyber security

(SMPP 3.2)

Additional information:

Not applicable

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

When preparing students for Exams and Assessments, the Altus school will:

- Ensure that all JCQ notices are available to candidates prior to assessments/examinations taking place.
- Ensure candidates are informed verbally and in writing about the required conditions under which the assessments are conducted, including warnings about the introduction of prohibited materials and devices into the assessments, and access to restricted resources.
- Ensure that candidates are aware of actions that constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice.
- Ensure that candidates are aware of the sanctions of passing on or receiving (even if the information was not requested) confidential assessment materials. If a candidate receives confidential information, they must report it to a member of centre staff immediately.
- Ensure that candidates involved in examination clash arrangements are aware of appropriate behaviour during supervision, i.e. ensuring that candidates cannot pass on or receive information about the content of assessments, thereby committing candidate malpractice.
- Ensure that candidates completing coursework or non-examination assessments are aware of the need for the work to be their own.

AI use in assessments

This section is following JCQ's updates to AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications.

What is AI?

The Altus School uses JCQ's definition of AI:

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. Misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice.

What are the risks of using AI?

The Altus School recognises the risks of using AI. Teachers and students must be aware that there are still limitations to AI use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content. AI may pose significant issues as they have been developed to produce responses based upon the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response and so the responses cannot be relied upon. AI chatbots often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. Some AI chatbots have been identified as providing dangerous and harmful answers to questions and some can also produce fake references to books/ articles by real or fake people.

What is AI misuse?

The Altus School recognises AI misuse via the following examples which are indicative but not exhaustive. Students must submit work for assessments which is their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words and isn't copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work. AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures.

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

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment 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.

Students' marks may 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.

The centre's approach to AI

In order to protect the integrity of qualifications, students should develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying. Therefore, the Centre's approach is that AI should not be used by students in the preparation for or completion of any assessment. This includes internal and external assessments. It includes but is not limited to NEA, coursework, practical exams and terminal exams. While AI may become an established tool at the workplace in the future, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it's important for students' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI.

Acknowledging AI.

On rare occasions, a complete ban of AI may not support students' best outcomes. An example of this is using AI to generate an image in technology from which the students are assessed on their graphic design skills (not their illustration or photography, i.e. not the production of the image itself). Teachers must inform the SLT lead for Examinations, if they feel AI use is necessary to support students' best outcomes. On these rare occasions, teachers will follow recommendations on page 7 of the above guidance. On these rare occasions, students must reference all sources appropriately. Details are available on page 6 of the above guidance, which is also linked on the 'Exams' page of the school website, for students' convenience.

Reporting AI misuse

Staff training is in place to prevent and to identify AI misuse. Where AI is suspected, we will follow the actions on page 11 of the above guidance. JCQ's information for candidates on AI is available to students at all times.

Candidates will be issued with the JCQ **Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)** or similar centre document prior to completing their work/prior to signing the declaration of authentication.

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)

- 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
- 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
- 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
- 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 gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed information-gatherer) will submit a written report summarising the case to the relevant awarding body, accompanied by the information obtained

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/ 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)
- Candidate malpractice offences relating to the content of work (i.e. inappropriate/offensive content, copying/collusion, plagiarism (including AI misuse) and/or false declaration of authentication) which are discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication, do not need to be reported to the awarding body. Instead, they will be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures.

Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment where the offence does not relate to the content of candidates' work (e.g. possession of unauthorised materials, breach of assessment conditions) or 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. (SMPP 4.5)

- If, in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence that an individual may have committed malpractice, that individual (the candidate or the member of staff) will be informed of all the required information and the accused individual informed of their rights and responsibilities (SMPP 5.33-3.4)
- Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed information-gatherer) will submit a written report to the relevant awarding body summarising the information obtained and actions taken, 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:

Not applicable

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:

Not applicable

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

The Altus 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 document **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**

Additional information:

Not Applicable

Changes 2025/2026

(Added) New heading **Centre malpractice** added.

(Added) Under heading **Preventing malpractice** added to the list of JCQ documents.

(Added/amended) Under heading **AI use in assessments**:

- additional/amended text added in bullet points to reflect slight changes in SMPP
- optional insert field added referencing the JCQ document **Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)** or similar centre document.

(Amended) Under heading **Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body** text amended to reflect wording changes/additions in SMPP.

Centre-specific changes