

Queen Elizabeth Sixth Form College

MALPRACTICE POLICY FOR EXAM AND NON-EXAM ASSESSMENT

Purpose and scope of the policy:

To ensure

- That assessment of all courses is carried out to the national standard for each course
- That there is equal and fair access to assessment for all learners
- To ensure that learners are given guidance on how to meet the assessment criteria
- That achievement is accurately recorded and tracked
- To ensure that assessment leads to accurate and valid certification claims.

Aim

- To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or learners.
- To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively.
- To standardise the investigation of malpractice.
- To protect the integrity of the college with regard to assessment.

In order to do this, the college will:

- Seek to avoid potential malpractice by ensuring that learners are aware of the ways in which malpractice can occur and of the possible penalties for malpractice.
- Provide all teaching staff with this policy and a copy of the JCQ publication “Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments – Policies and procedures”
- Provide all learners taking courses which involve external exams with a copy of the college’s student guide: Student Examination Guidance Booklet. This guide contains the two documents below:
 - **JCQ Notice to Candidates for written examinations. This covers:**
 - rules for examinations
 - what learners should bring to examinations
 - **College guidance and information on examinations. This includes:**
 - Information about exam sessions
 - how to access a marked script
 - how to obtain a re-mark
 - collection of results
- Provide all learners taking courses which include non-exam assessment or coursework with a copy of the college’s student guide: Student Coursework and Non-Examination Assessment Guidance Booklet. This guide contains:
 - **JCQ Notice to Candidates for coursework. This gives guidance on**
 - good practice with coursework
 - examples of possible malpractice
 - referencing
 - warnings on plagiarism
 - possible penalties for malpractice
 - **College guidance on coursework. This includes**
 - submission of coursework
 - guidance on referencing
 - warnings on cheating and plagiarism
 - how to appeal against coursework decisions or procedures
 - JCQ quick guide on AI use in assessments
 - **Teachers on each course will do the following, in accordance with the requirements and good practice of the specifications and expectations of the course:**
 - Inform learners about appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources

- ask learners to acknowledge all sources used in accordance with the requirements of the qualification
- ask learners to declare that their work is their own
- monitor learners' progress with assessment activities so that they, as teachers, remain confident that malpractice has not occurred
- remain alert to the possibility of malpractice

When malpractice with coursework is suspected or alleged the college will

- Conduct an investigation commensurate with the nature of the suspected or alleged malpractice.
- Such an investigation will be supported by the Vice Principal and other appropriate members of staff.
- The investigation will proceed through the following stages:
 - The Vice Principal must be informed of the allegation / potential malpractice.
 - The Vice Principal will instruct appropriate personnel to investigate the allegation / potential malpractice.
 - All stages of the investigation and subsequent actions taken will be recorded in writing.
 - The investigation will be carried out in a fair and unbiased manner.
 - The results of this investigation will be reported back to the Vice Principal within 5 working days.
 - The Vice Principal will review the information and evidence presented.
 - The detail of subsequent stages will depend on the seriousness of the alleged / potential malpractice, but will normally include the following :
 - The individual concerned will be informed about the allegation / potential malpractice and the possible consequences.
 - The individual concerned will be given details of the process of the investigation.
 - The individual will be informed of the evidence and outcome of the initial investigation and given an opportunity to respond both verbally and in writing.
 - In consultation with appropriate staff the Vice Principal will decide appropriate actions or sanctions to be taken.
 - Any penalty, sanction or action taken will be appropriate to the nature and seriousness of the malpractice. The level of sanction will be informed by guidance and examples provided by exam boards.
 - The individual concerned will be informed of the action or sanction being taken and given an opportunity to respond.
 - The individual will be informed of their right to appeal in accordance with the college's coursework appeals policy.
 - Where the malpractice has compromised summative assessment or has breached exam board regulations for work submitted the exam board will be informed of the incident and of the action/sanction applied.

Where malpractice is proven, the college may apply the following penalties / sanctions:

- Require the learner to withdraw all or part of their assessment work and re-submit with the issue addressed.
- Require the learner to withdraw all or part of the work and submit new work to replace it.
- Require the learner to withdraw all or part of the work and accept a mark of zero or a fail grade for the section(s) withdrawn.
- Award the learner a mark of zero or a fail grade for the section(s) affected by the malpractice.
- Award the learner a mark of zero or a fail grade for the whole assessment.
- In the case of very serious malpractice, the learner maybe required to withdraw from college.

In the case of staff malpractice appropriate training/support and/or disciplinary actions will be taken. For gross staff malpractice, college disciplinary procedures will be instigated.

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI):

1. Scope and Purpose

This section forms part of the College's Malpractice and Maladministration Policy and applies to **all qualifications**, including examined components, coursework, and **non-examination assessment (NEA)**. It reflects current Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) regulations and guidance and should be read alongside:

- Awarding body instructions for the conduct of examinations and NEA;
- Candidate declarations relating to authentication of work.

2. Definition

Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to digital tools or systems capable of generating, adapting, analysing, or transforming content (including text, images, audio, code, or data) in response to user prompts. Examples include, but are not limited to, generative chatbots, paraphrasing tools, automated translators, image generators, and AI-assisted writing or editing tools.

3. Principle of Authenticity

In accordance with JCQ General Regulations, the College must ensure that **only work which is the candidate's own is accepted for assessment**. Where AI tools are used inappropriately such that the work submitted is no longer the student's own, this constitutes **candidate malpractice**.

4. Acceptable Use of AI

The College recognises that AI tools may have legitimate educational uses. However, their use in relation to assessment is **strictly limited**.

AI may be used:

- to support learning, revision, or research **outside of assessed work**;
- to assist with planning or idea generation, provided the final assessed submission is independently produced;
- to support spelling, grammar, or accessibility needs, where this does not alter meaning and is permitted by the awarding body.

Any use of AI must:

- comply with awarding body and subject-specific instructions;
- not compromise the requirement that work submitted for assessment is the student's own;
- be clearly acknowledged where required.

Students must understand that AI-generated content **cannot demonstrate independent achievement of assessment criteria and will not be credited**.

5. AI Misuse as Malpractice

The misuse of AI is treated as a form of malpractice under this policy. Examples of AI-related malpractice include, but are not limited to:

- submitting AI-generated or AI-paraphrased content as original work;
- copying or re-working AI outputs so that the work is no longer the student's own;
- using AI tools to complete or substantially edit coursework or NEA where this is not explicitly permitted;
- using AI during examinations or controlled assessment conditions without authorisation;
- failing to declare the use of AI where required;
- using AI to disguise plagiarism or evade detection;
- sharing live assessment materials or confidential tasks with AI tools.

These examples are not exhaustive. Any use of AI that results in a breach of JCQ regulations will be treated as malpractice.

6. Authentication and Declarations

As part of normal assessment procedures:

- students must confirm that work submitted for assessment is their own;
- teachers must authenticate work before submission to the awarding body.

Where AI use is suspected or declared, students may be required to:

- explain how their work was produced;
- identify where and how AI tools were used;
- provide drafts, notes, or other evidence of independent work.

Failure to satisfy authentication requirements may result in the work not being submitted for assessment.

7. Identification and Investigation

Where there are concerns regarding the authenticity of a student's work, the matter will be investigated in line with the College's established malpractice procedures.

This may include:

- comparison with the student's previous work;
- professional judgement by teaching staff;
- discussion with the student to confirm authorship and understanding;
- review of drafts or development evidence;

If malpractice is suspected, the case will be recorded and, where required, reported to the awarding body.

8. Sanctions

If AI misuse is confirmed, sanctions will be applied in accordance with this policy and awarding body regulations.

The severity of the sanction will reflect the nature, scale, and intent of the malpractice.

9. Responsibilities

The Head of Centre retains overall responsibility for ensuring compliance with JCQ regulations.

Staff are responsible for:

- making expectations regarding AI use clear for each assessment;
- authenticating student work;
- reporting suspected malpractice promptly.

Students are responsible for:

- ensuring all work submitted is their own;
- understanding and complying with this policy;
- seeking guidance where there is any uncertainty about the use of AI.

Appendix: Examples of learner and staff malpractice

The following examples of learner and staff malpractice are taken from the JCQ publication “Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments – Policies and procedures”.

Readers should be aware that these are examples of malpractice and do not constitute a full list of actions which may be judged as malpractice.

Examples of learner malpractice

- 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.
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments.
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates, beyond what is permitted.
- Copying from another candidate (including the use of it to aid the copying).
- Allowing work to be copied e.g. Posting written coursework 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).
- Exchanging, obtaining, receiving, passing on information (or the attempt to) which could be examination related by means of talking, electronic, written or non-verbal communication;
- Making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of controlled assessments, coursework or the contents of a portfolio;
- Allowing others to assist in the production of controlled assessments, coursework or assisting others in the production of controlled assessments or coursework.
- The misuse, or the attempted misuse, of examination and assessment materials and resources (e.g. Exemplar materials).
- Being in possession of confidential material in advance of the examination.
- 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 inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or portfolios;
- Impersonation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one’s place in an examination or an assessment;
- Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from published sources or incomplete referencing; theft of another candidate’s work; bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material, for example: notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators (when prohibited), dictionaries (when prohibited), instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries (when prohibited), translators, wordlists, glossaries, iPods, mobile phones, mp3/4 players, pagers, smartwatches or other similar electronic devices;
- The unauthorised use of a memory stick or similar device where a candidate uses a word processor;
- Behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.
- AI misuse, taking something made using AI and saying it’s your own work.

Examples of staff malpractice

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 secure information in public, e.g. Internet forums; moving the time or date of a fixed examination beyond the arrangements permitted.
- Within the JCQ publication instructions for conducting examinations. Conducting an examination before the published date constitutes centre staff malpractice and a clear breach of security.
- Failing to supervise adequately 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.)
- 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. For example, 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 or controlled assessments or coursework 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. The only instance where photocopying a candidate's script is permissible is where he/she has been granted the use of a transcript.)
- Failing to keep candidates' computer files secure which contain controlled assessments or coursework.

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. Coursework) 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 or coursework for another.

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 assessments or coursework, or evidence of achievement, beyond that permitted by the regulations.
- Sharing or lending candidates' controlled assessments or coursework 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 an oral language modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader, a scribe or a sign language interpreter beyond that permitted by the regulations.