



Saint Benedict

A Catholic Voluntary Academy

Part of the Ralph Sherwin Multi-Academy Trust

Malpractice Policy -Exams 2025- 2026

Saint Benedict CVA

Malpractice Policy -Exams 2025- 2026

Centre name	Saint Benedict CVA
Centre number	23354
Date policy first created	02/12/2025
Current policy approved by	Angela King and Abbie Thompson
Current policy reviewed by	Angela King and Abbie Thompson
Date of review	02/12/2025
Date of next review	02/12/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Hazel Boyce
Senior leader(s)	Angela King
Exams officer	Abbie Thompson
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Saint Benedict CVA 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 Saint Benedict CVA:

- 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 Saint Benedict CVA 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

Saint Benedict CVA 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:

Documentation is shared with teaching staff every year with updates highlighted to make sure that they know of any changes.

Staff have had training on the range of AI outlets that a student may try to use and ways to spot if a student has potentially used AI in their work submission and how to respond.

Anywhere where a student has submitted work as their own text that has been created by AI and not referenced correctly is classed as plagiarism and malpractice.

Any work produced by AI should be referenced as such clearly so that the assessor can clearly see what work should actually be awarded marks for.

Students

must not declare that their work is their own in any declaration if it is not.

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

The JCQ Information to Candidates 2025/2026 is shared with both students and parents/carers in parents information evenings held in the Advent term.

This information is also shared electronically and published on the schools website.

Students and parent's/carers are reminded that as a centre we run all our PPEs following JCQ regulations and any malpractice during the PPEs is reported to parents/carers and sanctions issued.

Students are issued with all relevant warning documents prior to the exams, they are informed that these are also available on the school's website.

Teachers also make students aware in their lessons prior to commencing any work for which it is relevant.

AI use in assessments

Students are made aware that if they use AI tools, they must reference them clearly, name the AI tool used, add the date that the content was generated, explain how it was used, a screenshot of the questions asked and the answers you received.

Students are made aware that they must only declare that work they have produced is their own.

The Warning to Candidates notice (effective from 1 September 2021) is printed on the reverse side of their examination timetables issued to candidates in advance of the timetabled examinations.

The relevant posters are displayed outside the examination room, and before the examination starts a senior member of our school staff or exam invigilator goes through the invigilator's announcement as suggested in the JCQ ICE booklet (appendix 3 page 65).

As artificial intelligence (AI) technology is rapidly evolving the JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications guidance is intended to provide teachers/assessors involved in delivering JCQ qualifications with the information they need to manage use of AI in assessments.

This document has been shared with centre teaching staff involved in Non-Examined Assessments (NEAs) for General Qualifications, coursework and internal assessments to share with the students involved.

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, and may attract severe sanctions.

JCQ AI use in assessments documentation has been shared with relevant teaching staff so they know the expectations. Staff are aware that assessments should be checked using software.

Staff are asked to randomly sample any work that has been produced using Technology, using any of the methods suggested by relevant exam boards.

Candidates will be issued with of 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)

Any suspected malpractice issues should be escalated to the Senior Assistant Headteacher/Line manager for exams. All incidents of suspected malpractice will be investigated immediately.

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:

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:

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Saint Benedict CVA 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:

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

Upon review in September 2025, no centre-specific updates or changes were applicable to this document.