



## MALPRACTICE POLICY

---

Status	Statutory (to comply with JCQ reg.s)	Date created	Summer 2025
Any other statutory names for this policy (where applicable)		Date first approved	Summer 2025
Responsibility for this policy (job title)	Exams Officer and Deputy Headteacher	Date last reviewed	Summer 2025
Governors' Committee with responsibility for its review	T&L	Frequency of review	Annually
Tick here if Bucks Policy attached in its entirety		To be put on the school website?(Yes/No)	Yes
Approval necessary	Committee		

## Centre Details

Centre Name	Aylesbury High School
Centre Number	52105

## Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Exams Officer	Mrs Ritu Tripathy
Deputy Headteacher	Mrs Caroline Wilkes
Head of Centre	Mrs Marieke Forster

## 1. Introduction - What is malpractice and maladministration?

1.1. '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

### 1.2. 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.

### 1.3. 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
- 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

### 1.4. Suspected malpractice

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice.

## 2. Purpose of the Policy

2.1. To confirm Aylesbury High School 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

## 2.2. General principles

In accordance with the regulations Aylesbury High School will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place.
- 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.
- 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

2.3. Where NEA work is involved, this policy should be read in conjunction with the NEA Policy.

## 3. AI Use in Assessments

For details on the use and misuse of AI and how it should be acknowledged, prevented, identified and reported can be found in section 6 of the NEA policy.

## 4. Preventing Malpractice

4.1. Aylesbury High School follows the guidance in section 3.3 of the **JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures** document including:

4.2.

- training of staff, including the Exams Officer and Exams Team and the SENDCo and access arrangements team
- sharing of key dates and deadlines and robust procedures to ensure these are met
- close liaison with Aylesbury Grammar School, where some of our students sit exams
- individual arrangements for students with clashes
- clear guidance for candidates on the need for NEA work to be their own, including information on the misuse of AI, and arrangements for staff to report plagiarism, including suspected AI use, in NEA and other internal assessments
- a culture of openness and honesty
- sharing of JCQ documents and guidance on conduct in assessments with students via assemblies, the AHS Exam Handbook and the website
- outlining with students the possible sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice

4.3. Candidates will be informed and advised regarding the prevention of malpractice both verbally and in writing. They will receive assemblies explaining all rules and regulations.

## 5. Identification and reporting of malpractice

### 5.1. Centre Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice by centre staff. The list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by an awarding organisation at its discretion:

- Failing to keep any awarding organisation mark schemes secure
- Alteration of any awarding organisation mark schemes
- Alteration of awarding organisation's assessment and grading criteria
- Assisting learners in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves centre staff producing work for the learner
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the learner's own, to be included in a learner's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation
- Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as an amanuensis, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment
- Failing to keep learner computer files secure
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud
- Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment
- Failing to keep assessment/examination/test papers secure prior to the assessment/examination/test

### 5.2. Process for reporting Centre Malpractice

Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre can report it using the appropriate channels. The process is as follows:

- Alleged malpractice reported to the Exams Officer
- The Exams Officer will inform the Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum)
- An M2 form will be completed and sent to the relevant awarding body on the same day the allegation is made
- The Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum) will then conduct a preliminary investigation on the suspected malpractice and will then act on any advice given from the awarding body

### 5.3. Centre Malpractice - support

Processes will be explained clearly to those staff involved and they will be supported if necessary. If the centre malpractice has had a negative impact on candidates, processes and next steps will be clearly explained to candidates, they will be supported and parents/carers will be informed.

#### 5.4. Candidate Malpractice

Attempting to, or conducting, any malpractice activity is not permitted by the School or any awarding organisation. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates; this list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by the School or an awarding organisation at its discretion:

- Plagiarism by copying and passing off, as the learner's own, the whole or part(s) of another person's work, including artwork, images, words, computer generated work (including AI and other Internet sources), thoughts, inventions and/or discoveries whether published or not, with or without the originator's permission and without appropriately acknowledging the source
- Collusion by working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work, beyond that permitted by the specification.
- Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test
- Fabrication of results and/or evidence
- Failing to abide by the instructions or advice of an assessor, a supervisor, an invigilator, or Awarding organisation conditions in relation to the assessment/examination/test rules, regulations and security
- Misuse of assessment/examination material
- Introduction and/or use of unauthorised material contra to the requirements of supervised assessment/examination/test conditions, for example: notes, study guides, personal organisers, calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited), personal stereos, mobile phones or other similar electronic devices
- Obtaining, receiving, exchanging or passing on information which could be assessment/examination/test related (or the attempt to) by means of talking or written papers/notes during supervised assessment/examination/ test conditions
- Behaving in such a way as to undermine the integrity of the assessment/examination/test
- The alteration of any results document, including certificates

#### 5.5. Process for reporting Candidate Malpractice

Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre can report it using the appropriate channels. The process is as follows:

- Alleged candidate malpractice reported to the Exams Officer
- The Exams Officer will inform the Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum)
- An M1 form is completed and sent to the relevant awarding body on the same day as the allegation
- The Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum) will investigate within 5 working days of the incident. This may be aided by the Exams Officer if needed. If this is serious malpractice, the Headmistress will be informed immediately.
- The outcome will be communicated to the candidate(s) and parents, if applicable, together with any disciplinary action, as outlined in our Behaviour Matrix

**5.6. Candidate Malpractice during an exam**

If the suspected malpractice occurs during an exam (e.g. possession of an unauthorised item), the incident will be immediately dealt with and reported to the Exams Officer. The candidate will be allowed to finish the exam before being spoken to by the investigating member of SLT.

**5.7. Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body**

The Headmistress, or Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum), 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.

- The Headmistress, or Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum), will ensure that where a candidate is the subject of a malpractice investigation, the candidate's parent/carer is kept informed of the progress of the investigation.
- Form JCQ/M1 will be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of candidate malpractice.
- Form JCQ/M2 will be used to initially notify an awarding body of an incident of suspected staff malpractice/maladministration. Form JCQ/M3 will be used to submit the report following the gathering of information.
- Malpractice by a candidate discovered in an NEA 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. This will involve interviewing the student with regards to the suspected malpractice, asking them to redraft parts where it is not clear it is their own in exam conditions and considering the use of a viva to satisfy the teacher that they understand the work submitted. If malpractice continues to be suspected, a mark of 0 may be submitted.
- The only exception to the point above 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 Headmistress, or Deputy Headteacher (Curriculum), 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.
- 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.

## 6. **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.

## 7. **Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice**

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice Aylesbury High 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 publication **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**