Enfield County School for Girls

Examinations Malpractice Policy

Respect, Responsibility, Co-operation, Equality and Generosity of Spirit

September 2026

Approved by:	The Governing Body	**Date:** September 2026
Last reviewed on:	September 2026	
Next review due by:	September 2027	

Contents

Purpose	3
What is Malpractice and Maladministration?	3
Preventing Malpractice	4
Centre Staff Malpractice and maladministration	4
Candidate Malpractice	5
The Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)	5
Identification and Reporting of Malpractice	6
Gathering information	8
The Rights of Accused Individuals	8
The Decision, Sanctions and Appeals Process	9
Appendix 1 - Examples of Centre Staff Malpractice	10
Appendix 2 - Examples of Candidate Malpractice	13

Purpose

This policy informs all those involved in the public qualifications system in supporting appropriate delivery of assessment and upholding the integrity of qualifications. It is based on **JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2023-24.** This document is referenced throughout as SMPP.

Malpractice can occur for a variety of reasons, intentionally, due to lack awareness and understanding of the regulations, carelessness, forgetfulness or circumstances.

Whilst we do not normally experience malpractice, it is important we all understand and are aware of the **risks** of malpractice, take steps to **prevent** it and where malpractice does occur, take **prompt actions** to safeguard the integrity of the qualifications. This policy will provide an understanding of these three areas. **(SMPP 1.1 - 1.7)**

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; 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 1.2)**

The individuals involved in malpractice in our centre may be:

- candidates;
- teachers, teaching assistants and those responsible for the conduct, administration or quality assurance of examinations and assessments including examination officers, invigilators and those facilitating access arrangements such as readers, prompters and scribes.
- assessment personnel such as examiners, assessors, moderators or internal and external verifiers;
- parents/carers, siblings or friends of the candidate. **(SMPP 1.4)**

Suspected malpractice

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

Centre staff malpractice

- 'Centre staff malpractice' means malpractice committed by a member of staff, contactors, volunteer at the centre or an individual appointed in another capacity. For example, this could be malpractice committed by teachers, teaching assistants examination officers, invigilators and those facilitating access to examinations. **(SMPP, 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)**

Please see Appendix 1 for examples of centre-staff malpractice and Appendix 2 for examples of candidate malpractice.

Preventing Malpractice

Our actions, training and education to **prevent malpractice** is based on the specific requirements for examinations as set out by the following **JCQ documents:**

- General Regulations for Approved Centres 2023-24
- Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2023-24
- Instructions for conducting coursework 2023-24
- Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2023-24
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2023-24
- A guide to the special consideration process 2023-24
- Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2023-24
- Plagiarism in Assessment 2023-24
- AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications 2023-24
- A guide to the awarding bodies' appeal process 2023-24 (SMPP 3.2)

We as a centre will take all reasonable steps to prevent malpractice which include but not limited to:

Centre Staff Malpractice and maladministration

1. **Training** – All staff involved in the delivery of assessment and examination understand key dates, deadlines, procedures, conditions and rules of the examination, coursework and non-examination assessment. All staff are appropriately trained and resourced. This training us built annually into the staff CPD calander.
2. **Following JCQ ICE requirements** – we will ensure all sites, including alternative sites used to deliver an exam, are conducted in line with JCQ ICE requirements.
3. **Special Consideration and Access arrangements** – staff who manage and implement Special Considerations and access arrangements are trained and aware of the requirements, their role and are appropriately resourced and supported.

4. **Confidentiality of the Examinations** – Members of staff are aware and reminded to not communicate confidential information about exams or assessment materials, including via social media.
5. **Exam Clash Arrangements** - are planned and managed effectively by the exam officer to prevent malpractice.
6. **Coursework and Non-Examination Assessments (NEAs)** – All staff delivering/assessing coursework or NEAs follow robust processes for identifying malpractice. For example, they know to keep watch on content, style, tone, presentation, vocabulary, spelling and punctuation (Plagiarism in Assessments 2023-4). Staff report suspected malpractice, including suspected plagiarism to the Senior Leaders for Examinations.
7. **Culture** – Through training and open communication we foster a culture of honesty and openness so that concerns of potential malpractice can be escalated and without fear of repercussion to senior leaders.

Candidate Malpractice

1. **JCQ notices –** Organised by the exam officer, all JCQ notices (e.g. information for candidates, non-examination assessments, coursework, on screen tests, written examinations, social media, plagiarism) are distributed electronically and in hardcopy to candidates prior to the exams and are explained to candidates through a formal presentation prior to assessment and examinations.
2. **Awareness –** Candidates are informed verbally and in writing about the required conditions under which the assessments are conducting. This includes warnings about their conduct in examinations, introduction of prohibited materials and devices and access to restricted resources.
3. **Informed –** Candidates are aware and are reminded of the actions that constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice or who pass on or receive confidential assessment materials, including via social media. This information is shared with candidates electronically and through a formal presentation prior to assessment and examinations. The candidates are aware and reminded that if candidates receive confidential information, they must report it to the Exams Officer or Senior Leads for Examinations.
4. **Exam Clash Arrangements –**all candidates who have exam clashes are aware of the arrangements made for them and the appropriate behaviour and conduct expected of them during supervision i.e. no access to a device and candidates cannot pass or receive information about the content of assessments, to prevent committing candidate malpractice.
5. **Coursework and Non Examination Assessments (NEAs) –** all candidates completing coursework or NEAs aware of the need for the work to be their own, not plagiarising or using AI. This information is shared with students electronically, in hardcopy and explained to candidates through a formal presentation prior to assessment and examinations.

The Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

As a centre we recognise the increased risk of malpractice due to the creation of Artificial Intelligence. All staff involved in the delivery of assessment and examination are training in the use and misuse of AI so they know the rules and risks involved if AI is misused. All candidates are likewise informed through electronic material hardcopy and a formal presentation at least annually, prior to the completion of assessment and examinations

What is AI?
AI stands for artificial intelligence and using it is like having a computer that thinks. AI tools including but exclusive to ChatGPT, Snapchat My AI can write text, make art and create music using data from the internet.

Use of AI and how should it be acknowledged
- AI tools are not allowed in an exam.
- The use of AI tools in coursework is dependent on qualification and teaching staff have the responsibility of correctly informing students according to the rules of the qualification.
- Staff involved in the teaching of a qualification have a responsibility to remind students of the need to reference AI tools clearly including the (name of the AI tool, the date the content was generated, explanation of how it was used, a saved screenshot of the questions that were asked by the candidate to get the answers the candidate used in their coursework)

The risks of using AI and misuse
All teachers, staff involved in the delivery of assessment and candidates are informed in their annual presentation and training that misuse of AI could lead to the candidate being disqualified from the subject or losing marks.

Identification and Reporting of Malpractice

To ensure robust processes for the identification of malpractice, all staff involved in the public examination system undergo training that is relevant to their role so they can identify and escalate the instance(s) of suspected malpractice. This training is organised by the Examination Officers and overseen by the Senior Leaders for Examinations.

Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff can report to the Senior Leaders for Examinations or Head of Centre.

In accordance with SMPP (4.1.3) the **Head of Centre** will:

- notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice on appropriate forms. The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate. If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the head of centre must inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate(s).

- only take the appropriate next steps or gather further information when authorisation has been received from the awarding body (SMPP 4.1.7);

- ensure the centre complies fully the awarding body's instructions, making information speedily available, co-operate with an enquiry into an allegation of malpractice;

- inform the parent/ carer when a child is subject to a malpractice investigation and keep them informed of the progress of the investigation);

- delegate, if necessary, the gathering of information to a senior member of centre staff; and in such instances agreement from awarding body is obtained and senior leader chosen is independent to the department or candidate to avoid conflict of interest; and

- remind all staff and candidates involved in the suspected or actual incident of malpractice are aware of the responsibilities as set out in this document, comply with data protection law.

Forms

- Form JCQ/M1 will be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of candidate malpractice.
- Form JCQ/M2 should be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of suspected staff malpractice/maladministration.

Coursework or Non-Examination Assessment

Unless, confidential assessment material has been breached, malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment **prior** to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication or **prior** to being entered for the qualification or unit with the awarding body; need **not be reported** to the awarding body. It will be investigated and dealt with according to internal procedures informed by SMPP (4.5). Senior Leads for Examinations must be notified immediately.

We will not give credit for any work submitted which is not the candidate's own work. If any assistance to candidate(s) is given with the controlled assessment, coursework or NEA, then this will be in line with the appropriate assistance as set by the awarding bodies. If any improper assistance has been given, a note will be made of this on the cover sheet of the candidate's work or other appropriate place.

Where malpractice by a candidate in a vocational qualification is discovered prior to the work being submitted for certification, we refer to the guidance provided by the awarding body (SMPP 4.5).

Appeals

We will inform candidates of their right to appeal, if their coursework, controlled assessment, non- examination assessment or portfolio work submitted for internal assessment is rejected by us the centre on grounds of malpractice.

Gathering information

As outlined above, all information gathered will be done so by a person appointed and/or agreed by the awarding body. Information gathering will only begin with the instructions of the awarding body.

- Information will be gathered in the form of an interview and/or statement in individuals' own words. All statements will be signed and dated. All interviews will be transcribed and a copy provided to the interviewee to sign to confirm its accuracy.

- Any member of staff being interviewed may be accompanied by a friend or adviser. The involvement of legal advisors is not necessary, where there is no allegation of criminal behaviour. However, if the individual being interviewed wishes to be accompanied by a legal advisor, the other parties must be informed beforehand. (SMPP 5.23-8). The advisor must not take an active part in the interview (e.g. by answering questions on the interviewees behalf).

- We will make all those involved in the gathering of information aware, that awarding bodies reserve the rights to share their statements, records or transcripts of any interview(s) that are undertaken, with others involved in the case and other appropriate third parties outlined in SSMP (5.29).

The Rights of Accused Individuals

Heads of Centre will ensure that the accused individuals are informed of the rights and responsibilities before a report is submitted to the awarding body.

If in the view of the information gatherer, there is sufficient evidence of suspected malpractice, the individual(s) will be informed in writing and be provided with a copy of the JCQ *Suspected Malpractice*. (SMPP 5.33). Individuals will be made aware of all the evidence that has been obtained during the investigation that supports the allegation; and the possible consequences should malpractice be proven (see SMPP appendices 4–6).

Individuals will have the opportunity and sufficient time to consider their response to the allegations; and be given an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the allegations; they will also be informed of the next steps and information they will be provided with if the case is referred to the awarding body's Malpractice Committee (SMPP 5.33).

In the event that the case is referred to the awarding body's Malpractice Committee, they will:

- be provided with a complete set of case documentation;
- have the opportunity to read, and make a statement in response to, the case documentation;
- have the opportunity to seek professional advice and to provide a supplementary statement; and
- be made aware of their right to appeal should a sanction be applied to them as set out in the JCQ document *A Guide to the Awarding Bodies' Appeals Processes* (SMPP 5.33)

The awarding body may decide that there is a need to exercise discretion in the light of the circumstances of the case in terms of how the evidence is presented to the accused individual, for example, if there are concerns about revealing the identity of a third party mentioned in the documentation (SMPP 5.34).

Completing and submitting the report

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 evidence obtained during the course of their enquiries.

This evidence could include,

- written statements from/transcriptions of interviews;
- details of how the centre informs centre staff and candidates about the awarding bodies' regulations;
- seating plans;
- copies of unauthorised material found in the examination room;
- candidate work/associated material which is relevant to the investigation;
- teaching resources/material/details of feedback given to candidates relevant to the investigation;
- details of any other information relevant to the investigation, such as applications for/ documentation relating to access arrangements;
- relevant information or evidence such as CCTV footage; and
- a summary of the actions which will be taken by the centre to mitigate the impact of any malpractice, and the actions to be taken to avoid a recurrence of such a malpractice incident. (SMPP 5.35-5.39).

Forms - JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used (SMPP 5.37)

The Decision, Sanctions and Appeals Process

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).

Awarding bodies impose sanctions on individuals and on centres (SSMP 7.1). The Head of Centre will:

- communicate the decision to the individuals concerned and pass on details of any sanctions and actions. (SMPP 11.1);
- inform the individuals they have the right to appeal, the process and timeframe to make an appeal;
- refer individuals to *A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes* SSMP 12.2-12.3);and
- inform individual(s) that malpractice cases are usually confidential however awarding bodies in cases of serious malpractice retain the right to exchange and share information with the regulators; other awarding bodies; other regulatory or investigative bodies; and other centres where the malpractice may affect the delivery of an awarding body's qualification (SSMP 11.2 to 11.3).

Appendix 1 - Examples of Centre Staff Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice are taken from Appendix 2 of SSMP. It is not an exhaustive list and staff are reminded that other instances of malpractice may be identified and considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion.

Breach of security

Any act which breaks the confidentiality of question papers or materials, and their electronic equivalents, or the confidentiality of candidates' scripts or their electronic equivalents. It could involve:

- failing to keep examination material secure prior to an examination;
- discussing or otherwise revealing information about examinations and assessments that should be kept confidential, e.g. internet forums/social media;
- moving the time or date of a fixed examination beyond the arrangements permitted within the JCQ document Instructions for conducting examinations. Conducting an examination before the published date constitutes centre staff malpractice and is a clear breach of security; • failing to adequately supervise candidates who have been affected by a timetable variation (this would apply to candidates subject to overnight supervision by centre personnel or where an examination is to be sat in an earlier or later session on the scheduled day);
- releasing candidates early from a timetabled assessment (e.g. before 10 a.m. for a morning session examination);
- permitting, facilitating or obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination;
- failing to retain and secure examination question papers after an examination in cases where the life of the paper extends beyond the particular session, e.g. where an examination is to be sat in a later session by one or more candidates due to a timetable variation;
- tampering with candidate scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments after collection and before despatch to the awarding body/examiner/ moderator (this would additionally include reading candidates' scripts or photocopying candidates' scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body/examiner);
- failing to keep secure computer files which contain candidates 'controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments.

Deception

Any act of dishonesty in relation to an examination or assessment including, but not limited to:

- inventing or changing marks for internally assessed components (e.g. non-examination assessments) where there is no actual evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks awarded;
- manufacturing evidence of competence against national standards;
- fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements;
- entering fictitious candidates for examinations or assessments, or otherwise subverting the assessment or certification process with the intention of financial gain (fraud);
- substituting one candidate's controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment for another's;
- providing misleading or inaccurate information to an awarding body, candidates and/or parents.

Improper assistance to candidates

Any act where assistance is given beyond that permitted by the specification or regulations to a candidate or group of candidates, which results in a potential or actual advantage in an examination or assessment. For example:

- assisting candidates in the production of controlled assessment, coursework, none amination assessments or portfolios, beyond that permitted by the regulations;
- sharing or lending candidates' controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments with other candidates in a way which allows malpractice to take place;
- assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers;
- permitting candidates in an examination to access prohibited materials (dictionaries, calculators etc.);
- prompting candidates in an examination/assessment by means of signs, or verbal or written prompts;
- assisting candidates granted the use of a Communication Professional, a Language Modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader or a scribe beyond that permitted by the regulations.

Failure to co-operate with an investigation

- failure to make available information reasonably requested by an awarding body in the course of an investigation, or in the course of deciding whether an investigation is necessary; and/or
- failure to investigate on request in accordance with the awarding body's instructions or advice; and/or
- failure to investigate or provide information according to agreed deadlines; and/or
- failure to immediately report all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice to the awarding body.

Maladministration

Failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of controlled assessments, coursework, examinations and non-examination assessments, or malpractice in the conduct of examinations/assessments and/or the handling of examination question papers, candidate scripts, mark sheets, cumulative assessment records, results and certificate claim forms, etc. For example:

- failing to ensure that candidates' controlled assessment, coursework, non-examination assessment or work to be completed under controlled conditions is adequately completed and/or monitored and/or supervised;
- failure, on the part of the head of centre, to adhere to awarding body specification requirements in the delivery of non-examination assessments, Endorsements and other projects required as part of a qualification. These include the GCSE Computer Science Programming Project, GCSE English Language Spoken Language Endorsement and/or the GCE A-level Biology, Chemistry, Geology and Physics Practical Skills Endorsement;
- failing to adhere to awarding body key dates and deadlines relating to the delivery of examinations and assessments (such as those relating to the return of scripts, reporting of internal assessment marks/grades, making entries/claims, and Head of Centre declarations);
- inappropriate members of staff assessing candidates for access arrangements who do not meet the criteria as detailed within Chapter 7 of the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments;
- failure to use the correct tasks/assignments for assessments;
- failure to train invigilators and those facilitating access arrangements adequately, e.g. readers and scribes, leading to non-compliance with the JCQ documents;
- failing to issue to candidates the appropriate notices and warnings, e.g. JCQ Information for candidates documents;
- failure to inform the JCQ Centre Inspection Service of alternative sites for examinations;

- failing to post notices relating to the examination or assessment outside all rooms (including Music and Art rooms) where examinations and assessments are held;
- not ensuring that the examination venue conforms to the requirements as stipulated in the JCQ document Instructions for conducting examinations;
- failing to prevent the introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room, either prior to or during the examination (NB this precludes the use of the examination room to coach candidates or give subject-specific presentations, including power-point presentations, prior to the start of the examination);
- failing to remind candidates that any mobile phones or other unauthorised items found in their possession must be handed to the invigilator prior to the examination starting;
- failure to invigilate examinations in accordance with the JCQ document Instructions for conducting examinations;
- failure to have on file for inspection purposes accurate records relating to overnight supervision arrangements;
- failure to have in place a malpractice policy;
- failure to have on file for inspection purposes appropriate evidence, as per the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments, to substantiate approved access arrangements processed electronically using the Access arrangements online system;
- granting access arrangements to candidates who do not meet the requirements of the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments;
- granting access arrangements to candidates where prior approval has not been obtained from the Access arrangements online system or, in the case of a more complex arrangement, from an awarding body;
- failure to supervise effectively the printing of computer-based assignments when this is required; • failing to retain candidates' controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments securely after the authentication statements have been signed or the work has been marked;
- failing to maintain the security of candidate scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body or examiner;
- failing to despatch candidates' scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or nonexamination assessments to the awarding bodies, examiners or moderators in a timely way;
- failing to notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice;
- failing to conduct a thorough investigation into suspected examination or assessment malpractice when asked to do so by an awarding body;
- breaching the published arrangements for the release of examination results; inappropriate retention or destruction of certificates;
- failing to recruit learners with integrity, including the recruitment of learners who have not met the qualification's minimum entry requirements wherever stipulated and/or the recruitment of learners who are unable or otherwise unlikely to complete the qualification.
- failing to ensure that, where candidates are producing work for assessments which are not completed under examination conditions, teaching staff check that the assessment tasks being completed and the approach candidates are taking are appropriate, giving due consideration to ethical standards and the centre's safeguarding responsibilities.

Appendix 2 - Examples of Candidate Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice are taken from Appendix 2 of SSMP:

- the alteration or falsification of any results document, including certificates;
- a breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding body in relation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations; This section was amended on 6 March 2024. 39
- the unauthorised use of alternative electronic devices or technology during remote assessment and remote invigilation;
- accessing the internet, online materials or AI tools during remote assessment and remote invigilation, where this is not permitted;
- failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments;
- collusion: working collaboratively with others, beyond what is permitted;
- copying from another candidate (including the use of technology to aid the copying);
- allowing work to be copied, e.g. posting work on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment;
- the deliberate destruction of another candidate's work;
- disruptive behaviour in the examination room or during an assessment session (including the use of offensive language);
- failing to report to the centre or awarding body the candidate having unauthorised access to assessment related information or sharing unauthorised assessment related information online;
- exchanging, obtaining, receiving, passing on information (or the attempt to) which could be assessment related by means of talking, electronic, written or non-verbal communication;
- making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of controlled assessment, coursework, non-examination assessment or the contents of a portfolio;
- allowing others to assist in the production of controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments, examination responses or assisting others in the production of controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments or examination responses;
- the misuse, or the attempted misuse, of examination and assessment materials and resources (e.g. exemplar materials);
- being in possession of unauthorised confidential information about an examination or assessment;
- bringing into the examination room notes in the wrong format (where notes are permitted in examinations) or inappropriately annotated texts (in open book examinations);
- the inclusion of offensive comments, obscenities or drawings; discriminatory language, remarks or drawings directed at an individual or group in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments or portfolios;
- personation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one's place in an examination or an assessment;
- plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from, or reproduction of, third party sources or incomplete referencing (including the internet and artificial intelligence (AI) tools);
- theft of another candidate's work;

- being in possession (whether used or not) of unauthorised material during an examination or assessment, for example: notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators (when prohibited), dictionaries (when prohibited), watches, instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries (when prohibited), translators, wordlists, glossaries, iPods, mobile phones, AirPods, MP3/4 players, pagers, or other similar electronic devices;
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick or similar device where a candidate uses a word processor;
- facilitating malpractice on the part of other candidates;
- behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.