



The Thomas Hardy School

# Malpractice Policy (Exams) 2024/25

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Date of next review	Autumn Term 2025

## Key staff involved in the exams policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	<b>Mr N Rutherford</b>
Exams Manager line manager (Senior leader)	<b>Mrs L Morrison</b>
Exams Manager	<b>Mrs C Boyles</b>
SENCo	<b>Ms H Rowden</b>
SLT member(s)	<b>M J Dean, Mrs C Noble, Ms C Tanner, Mr R Nicholls, Mrs R Glennie, Mr S Walker</b>

## Introduction

The Thomas Hardy School manages malpractice in accordance with the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (section 5). Under normal deliver arrangements we take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations and report and investigate according to the requirements.

## Purpose of the policy

This policy addresses malpractice under the specific arrangements for delivery in academic year 2024-2025 and confirms The Thomas Hardy School has in place a written policy that covers all qualifications delivered by the centre. The policy 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.

## General principles

In accordance with the regulations, The Thomas Hardy School will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after the determination of grades process
- Candidates are informed prior to undertaking any formally assessed work about the required conditions under which assessments must be conducted. This includes the consequences of accessing prohibited materials, the presentation of work which is not their own, including the misuse of AI and inappropriate behaviour during a written examination (this list is not exhaustive)

- Candidates are made aware of the malpractice process, including the escalation to the awarding body and the sanctions which might be imposed if malpractice is found to have taken place
- Have in place a member of the SLT who will provide effective support and supervision for the examination officer to ensure the integrity and security of examinations and assessments are maintained
- Students who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations. Students and staff are made aware of the risks of using AI and students are informed to make sure the work they submit is their own work. Teachers and assessors are aware they must not accept work which they consider not the work of any individual student. Staff must investigate and take appropriate action for any misuse of AI
- Inform the awarding body immediately of an alleged, suspected or actual incident of malpractice or maladministration, involving a candidate or a member of staff, by completing the appropriate documentation, including:
  - The JCQ M1 form in a case of suspected candidate malpractice
  - The JCQ M2 form in a case of suspected malpractice/maladministration involving a member of centre staff
- As require by an awarding body, investigate any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the JCQ publication JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2024-2025 and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require
- Ensure appropriate controls are in place, which allow accurate data to be submitted to the awarding bodies e.g. entries, internally assessed marks

*See Appendix 1 for more information on AI.*

## **Reporting malpractice**

### Candidates (or an individual acting on their behalf)

In accordance with JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for academic year 2024-2025, each candidate will be made aware of the evidence that is going to be used and understand that the range of evidence used to determine a grade is not negotiable.

Where a candidate might attempt to gain an unfair advantage during the centre's process of the determination of grades by, for example, submitting fabricated evidence or plagiarised work, or any other act deemed as malpractice in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2024-2025, The Thomas Hardy School will submit a report of suspected candidate malpractice to the relevant awarding body.

Where a candidate, or an individual acting on their behalf such as a parent/carers, might try to influence grade decisions by applying pressure to the centre or any of its staff, The Thomas Hardy School will keep and retain clear and reliable records of the

circumstances and the steps taken, and make the candidate aware of the outcome. This will include a record that confirms the candidate had been made aware of the evidence that was going to be used and understand that the range of evidence used to determine a grade was not negotiable.

However, if a candidate or an individual acting on their behalf continues to inappropriately attempt to pressure centre staff, a report of suspected malpractice will be submitted to the relevant awarding body.

A report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form JCQ M1 Report of suspected candidate malpractice.

- This form must be used by the head of centre to notify the appropriate awarding body of an instance of suspected candidate malpractice in the conduct of examinations or assessments
- It can also be used to provide a report on investigations into instances of suspected malpractice
- In order to prevent the issue of erroneous results and certificates, it is essential that the awarding body concerned is notified immediately of instances of suspected candidate malpractice

#### Centre staff

The Thomas Hardy School will report any instances of potential malpractice (which includes maladministration) where any centre staff fail to follow the published requirements for determining grades.

Examples of potential malpractice take from the JCQ Guidance on the determination of grades for A/AS Levels and GCSEs for academic year 2024-2025 include but is not limited to:

- Exam entries are created for students who had not studied the course of entry or and not intended to enter for November, January or June 2024-2025
- Grades created for students who have not been taught sufficient content to provide the basis for that grade
- A teacher deliberately and inappropriately disregarding the centre's published policy when determining grades
- A teacher fabricating evidence of candidate performance to support an inflated grade
- A teacher deliberately providing inappropriate levels of support before or during an assessment, including deliberate disclosure of mark schemes and assessment materials to support an inflated grade
- A teacher intentionally submitting inflated grades
- A failure to retain evidence used in the determination of grades in accordance with the JCQ Grading Guidance
- A systemic failure to follow the centre's policy in relation to the application of Access Arrangements or Special Consideration arrangements for students in relation to assessments used to determine grades

- A failure to take reasonable steps to authenticate student work
- A failure to appropriately manage conflicts of interest (COIs) within a centre
- A head of centre's failure to submit the required declaration when submitting their grades
- Grades being released to students (or their parents/carers) before the issue of results
- Failure to co-operate with an awarding body's quality assurance, appeal or investigation processes
- Failure to conduct a centre review or submit an appeal when requested to do so by a student.

A report will be submitted by completing the appropriate documentation as guided by the individual awarding body concerned, including the form JCQ M2 Notification of suspected malpractice/maladministration involving centre staff.

- This form must be completed by the head of centre before an investigation commences to notify an awarding body of an instance of alleged, suspected or actual malpractice or maladministration
- The form must be completed and submitted to the appropriate awarding body immediately after a suspicion is raised or an allegation received.

## **AI – Additional Information**

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.

While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice.

Teachers and students should also be aware that AI tools are still being developed and there are often limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

AI chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. Users can ask follow-up questions or ask the chatbot to revise the responses already provided. AI chatbots respond to prompts based upon patterns in the data sets (large language model) upon which they have been trained. They generate responses which are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate. AI chatbots can complete tasks such as the following:

- Answering questions
- Analysing, improving, and summarising text
- Authoring essays, articles, fiction, and non-fiction
- Writing computer code
- Translating text from one language to another
- Generating new ideas, prompts, or suggestions for a given topic or theme
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or format

### What is AI Misuse

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of 'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism' include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students' marks may also 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.

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

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

### Acknowledging AI Use

If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way.

Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.

In addition to the above, where students use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. This allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether that use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

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.

See <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/> for further information.