



Malbank School and Sixth Form College



Rejoice in being the best that we can be

Examinations: Candidate Malpractice in Public Exams
To be used in conjunction with the JCQ's annually
updated policy

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025

Headteacher: John D. Harrison B.A. (Hons.)

Welsh Row - Nantwich - Cheshire - CW5 5HD - Tel: 01270 611009 - Email: admin@malbank.cheshire.sch.uk

Web site: www.malbank.com



Foreword

“Candidate Malpractice” means malpractice by a candidate in the course of any examination or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessment or coursework, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the writing of an examination paper (either external public examinations or mocks).

Candidates have been given, in advance of each exam session, clear instructions (both written and verbal) on what they must and must not do in public examinations and clear examples of what is considered to be malpractice. They have also been warned of the consequences should they fail to adhere to the rules and regulations laid down by the public examinations system.

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 and record any investigation of malpractice to ensure openness and fairness.
- To impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on learners or staff where Incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven.
- To protect the integrity of this centre and external qualifications.

What is Malpractice?

Definition of Malpractice

‘Malpractice’, means any act, default or practice which is a breach of the Regulations or 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.

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025

Headteacher: John D. Harrison B.A. (Hons.)

Welsh Row - Nantwich - Cheshire - CW5 5HD - Tel: 01270 611009 - Email: admin@malbank.cheshire.sch.uk

Web site: www.malbank.com



Examples by Learners

Malpractice is where a candidate, intentionally or otherwise, puts themselves at an advantage over the other candidates. Such examples include, but are not limited to:

- use of any unauthorised materials (such as notes, writing on hand, having a mobile phone on their person etc.)
- plagiarism of any nature
- talking to another candidate in a test/exam
- includes inappropriate or offensive material in scripts
- collusion by working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work
- copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying)
- deliberate destruction of another's work
- fabrication of results or evidence
- false declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework
- 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.
- **Misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments. eg Coursework and controlled assessments (See AI specific section)**

Examples by Centre Staff

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this centre at its discretion and according to the JCQ suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures document:

- improper assistance to candidates
- inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made
- failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure
- fraudulent claims for certificates
- inappropriate retention of certificates
- 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

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025



- 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
- 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.

Centre Measure to advise candidates about malpractice and how to avoid committing malpractice

All staff involved in the running of examinations have a duty to report malpractice. We try to avoid malpractice with the following measures in our centre:

- Assembly to Year 11 before mocks
- Mock exams run to JCQ standards with external invigilators
- JCQ exam announcement in all mocks to get students used to the JCQ rules for conduct of examinations
- Exam briefing with Year before the summer exam season to talk through all JCQ regulations and to carry out warnings about malpractice
- JCQ signs about permitted exam material outside and inside every exam space
- Letter home to parents/carers with JCQ guidelines for exams attached to exam timetables
- Website displays JCQ conduct of exams posters for students
- Training for invigilation team in November and April includes malpractice, what to look out for and how to record information in the invigilator log.
- Exams team meet at the end of every day during the exam season to deal with any malpractice that has been committed – exams team trained in filling in appropriate JCQ forms and in the collecting of witness statements

What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments

The school is following the advice and guidance in the JCQ AI-Use-In-Assessment booklet – some of the information there has been brought across to this document. The AI elements of this document will always be used in conjunction with the JCQ document.

AI use in this context refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments, which contributes to the award of qualifications.

When properly referenced, this can be acceptable, although students cannot be

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025

Headteacher: John D. Harrison B.A. (Hons.)

Welsh Row - Nantwich - Cheshire - CW5 5HD - Tel: 01270 611009 - Email: admin@malbank.cheshire.sch.uk

Web site: www.malbank.com



credited for any work they produce for assessment which is not their own so the benefit to them of using AI is likely to be limited and they risk committing malpractice if AI is misused.

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 formality

AI tools available include:

- ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com/auth/login>)
- Jenni AI (<https://jenni.ai>)
- Jasper AI (<https://www.jasper.ai/>)
- Writesonic (<https://writesonic.com/chat/>)
- Bloom AI (<https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom>)
- Gemini (<https://gemini.google.com/>)
- Claude (<https://claude.ai/>)
- Gauth (<https://gauthmath.com/>)
- Question AI (<https://questionai.com/>)
- Brainly (<https://brainly.com/>)

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate images, music or video, such as:

- Midjourney (<https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/>)
- Stable Diffusion (<https://stablediffusionweb.com/>)
- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (<https://openai.com/dall-e-2/>)
- Soundraw (<https://soundraw.io/>)
- Musicfy (<https://create.musicfy.lol/>)
- Runway (<https://runwayml.com/>)
- LTX Studio (<https://ltx.studio/>)

It is important that teachers and students are aware that the range of AI tools and

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025



their capabilities is expanding quickly, and that there are limitations to their use such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

At Malbank school, curriculum departments receive the JCQ AI use in assessments booklet as part of a department meeting dedicated to planning for AI use in their subject. They have to consider the information in relation to their own coursework or other Non Examined Assessments and provide instruction to students on the what is and is not acceptable practice with regards to AI in relation to the specific aspects of the individual subject. The departments with coursework must consider all the ways in which students work will be checked and scutinised for use of AI.

To check for AI in JCQ coursework, centres rely on teacher authentication, student declarations, updated malpractice policies, and established procedures for identifying plagiarism, focusing on ensuring the work is the student's *own* by checking for independent development beyond AI input, proper referencing if permitted, and recognizing the limitations of AI detection tools. Teachers investigate suspicious work, as submitting unreferenced AI content is cheating and can lead to serious penalties, emphasizing original thought and skill demonstration.

For Teachers & Centres:

1. **Educate Students:** Reinforce the JCQ rules: work must be their own; AI use must be declared and referenced if allowed (tool name, date, queries).
2. **Authenticate Work:** Teachers must ensure work is independent, looking for depth beyond AI-generated text, using their professional judgment.
3. **Investigate Doubts:** If you suspect AI misuse (e.g., unreferenced AI text), investigate thoroughly.
4. **Update Policies:** Ensure your centre's malpractice policy covers AI misuse.
5. **Use JCQ Guidance:** Refer to JCQ documents like "AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications" for detailed procedures and examples.

For Students (What to Do):

1. **Submit Your Own Work:** The final output must show your skills and knowledge.

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025

Headteacher: John D. Harrison B.A. (Hons.)

Welsh Row - Nantwich - Cheshire - CW5 5HD - Tel: 01270 611009 - Email: admin@malbank.cheshire.sch.uk

Web site: www.malbank.com



2. **Declare AI Use:** If allowed, clearly state the AI tool, date, and provide screenshots of queries/results.
3. **Reference Properly:** Treat AI content like any other source if permitted; poor referencing is malpractice.
4. **Don't Sign Declarations Prematurely:** Only sign that the work is your own *after* you've added all necessary references and confirmed it's your work.

Key JCQ Principles:

- **Authenticity:** The work must demonstrate the *candidate's* own skills and understanding.
- **Misuse is Cheating:** Using AI to create work and claiming it as your own is plagiarism, leading to penalties.
- **AI Detectors are Fallible:** Don't rely solely on them; focus on authenticating the work through teaching and assessment.

The lists of certain suppliers of AI-related products are for information purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement by JCQ. It is each centre's or individual's responsibility to investigate and verify any suppliers they use, including any terms and conditions which govern the sale or use of the supplier's products. The lists provided are not exhaustive.

The use of AI tools may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments, not least the risk of committing malpractice, for which serious sanctions can apply. As also noted above, the tools have been developed to produce responses based upon the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response and so the responses cannot be relied upon. AI tools often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. Some AI tools have been identified as providing answers to questions that can prompt inappropriate actions, and some can also produce fake references to books/articles

What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments?

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025

Headteacher: John D. Harrison B.A. (Hons.)

Welsh Row - Nantwich - Cheshire - CW5 5HD - Tel: 01270 611009 - Email: admin@malbank.cheshire.sch.uk

Web site: www.malbank.com



AI use in this context refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments, which contributes to the award of qualifications.

AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

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

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 they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations may be found in Appendix A: AI misuse examples at the end of this document.

What The School's Responsibilities are:

Under the regulations the School is under obligation to:

- notify appropriate awarding body at the earliest opportunity all suspicions or actual incidents of malpractice. The only exception to this is malpractice discovered in controlled assessments or coursework before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate.(see later)
- Investigate the incident thoroughly and as quickly as possible
- Inform candidates of their individual responsibilities and rights as set out in the guidelines
- Pass on to the individuals concerned any warning or notification of penalties and ensure compliance with any requests made by the awarding body as a result of a malpractice case.

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025

Headteacher: John D. Harrison B.A. (Hons.)

Welsh Row - Nantwich - Cheshire - CW5 5HD - Tel: 01270 611009 - Email: admin@malbank.cheshire.sch.uk

Web site: www.malbank.com



What are the centres responsibilities regarding AI

The centre's approach to AI (informed by page 5 of the JCQ AI use in assessments guidance document)

In order to protect the integrity of qualifications, students should develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying. Therefore, the Centre's approach is that AI should not be used by students in the preparation for or completion of any formal assessment. This includes internal and external assessments. It includes but is not limited to NEA, coursework, practical exams and terminal exams. While AI may become an established tool at the workplace in the future, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it's important for students' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI.

Acknowledging AI (informed by pages 7 of the JCQ guidance)

On rare occasions, a complete ban of AI may not support students' best outcomes. An example of this is using AI to generate an image in technology from which the students are assessed on their graphic design skills (not their illustration or photography, i.e. not the production of the image itself). Teachers must inform the SLT lead for Examinations, if they feel AI use is necessary to support students' best outcomes. On these rare occasions, teachers will follow recommendations on page 7 of the above guidance. On these rare occasions, students must reference all sources appropriately. Details are available on page 6 of the above guidance, which is also linked on the 'Exams' page of the school website, for students' convenience.

Reporting AI misuse (informed by page 14 of the JCQ guidance)

If a student has not signed the declaration of authentication, centres do not have to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation. Steps to resolve such incidents must be detailed in the centre malpractice/plagiarism policy. These steps must include:

- ensuring students are aware of what malpractice is,
- how to avoid malpractice,
- how to properly reference sources and acknowledge AI tools, etc.

Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own. Ultimately the Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring students submit authentic work.

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025



If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed by the student, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation. The procedure is detailed in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>).

Staff training is in place to prevent and to identify AI misuse. Where AI is suspected, we will follow the actions on page 11 of the above guidance

The Right of the accused individual

When, in the view of the investigation, there is sufficient evidence to implicate a candidate in malpractice, that individual must:

- be informed of the allegation made against him or her (preferably in writing but only if circumstances dictate)
- know what evidence there is to support that allegation
- know the possible consequences should malpractice be proven
- have the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations (if required)
- have an opportunity to submit a written statement
- have an opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and provide a supplementary statement (if required)
- be informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him or her
- be informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice may be shared with the individual or all awarding bodies.

What will happen in the case of suspected malpractice?

Coursework Assessment (where the authentication form has been signed by the candidate):

1. The member of teaching staff who suspects the malpractice will interview the candidate in the presence of the Head of Year (HoY) and/or the senior leader if the HoY is not available.
2. The candidate will be advised of their rights as outlined above prior to the interview commencing and will be interviewed in accordance with the School's policy on conduction of disciplinary interviews.

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025

Headteacher: John D. Harrison B.A. (Hons.)

Welsh Row - Nantwich - Cheshire - CW5 5HD - Tel: 01270 611009 - Email: admin@malbank.cheshire.sch.uk

Web site: www.malbank.com



3. Following the interview the candidate will be given full details of what may be the outcome of the investigation and when they will be notified
4. Either the Examinations and Data Officer or Head of Year will contact the family, as soon as possible, to advise them of the situation and to confirm that an investigation is taking place
5. Following the interview an investigation will take place and the outcome notified to the candidate/candidate's parents within 24 hours.
6. If the investigation suspects malpractice has occurred, then this will be notified to the Awarding Body and their decision will be notified to the candidate and candidate's family within 24 hours of receipt.

N.B. -A centre will not give credit for any work submitted which is not the candidate's own work

Coursework Assessment (where the authentication forms have not yet been signed by the candidate):

The candidate may be allowed to repeat the coursework but this will be at the discretion of the Head of Centre and depend on the severity of the malpractice.

Written Exam or Controlled Assessment

If a candidate is suspected of malpractice in a written exam or controlled assessment, the following procedure will apply:

1. The candidate will have any unauthorised material confiscated or asked to wash off any unauthorised material written on their body. They will be allowed to finish the paper along with all other candidates.
2. Once the exam is concluded they will be asked to remain behind and will be supervised until the Examinations and Data Officer and HoY and/or senior leader can meet with the candidate. This will usually be within 15 minutes of the end of the exam. In the case of a clash of subjects i.e. the candidate is due to sit one paper after another, this will take place following the 2nd paper if the suspected malpractice occurs during the 1st paper.
3. The Examinations and Data Officer will attempt to contact the candidate's parents prior to the interview to advise them of the incident and confirm that the candidate will be interviewed following the exam. (If they are not contactable within this window then the

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025



Examinations and Data Officer will attempt to contact them in another form so that they are aware of the incident and can discuss it with the candidate when he or she gets home).

4. The candidate will be advised of their rights as outlined above and then interviewed (in accordance with the School's policy on conducting disciplinary interviews) by the Examinations and Data Officer (or their Assistant if unavailable) in the presence of Head of Year/Assistant Principal
5. The candidate will be asked to provide a statement which they can either do there and then or produce one at home and bring in to the Examinations and Data Officer the next day. This must be done within 24 hours of the incident or will not be eligible for submission to the awarding body in mitigation should it be deemed necessary.
6. Following the interview an investigation will take place in which Examinations and Data Officer will speak to the Examinations Invigilator at the very least and any other third party and the outcome notified to the candidate/candidate's parents within 24 hours.
7. If the investigation concludes that there is suspected malpractice then this will be notified to the Awarding Body.
8. The Awarding Body's decision (which should reach the centre within 14 days of the notification but can take up to 1 month depending on the severity of the malpractice) will be sent to the Examinations and Data Officer and they will notify the candidate and candidate's family within 24 hours of receipt.

Please note:

In certain circumstances it may be necessary for the Examinations and Data officer to exercise discretion, in light of all the circumstances of the case, as to the timing and the means by which an allegation of malpractice and the supporting evidence is presented to the individual involved.

In the circumstance of the identification of improper assistance during coursework this will be noted on the assessment records and the awarding body will be notified.

In the circumstance of staff giving improper assistance after the declaration of authentication has been signed, the details will be noted and the awarding body informed.

The awarding body's response to an allegation of malpractice:

In the case of notifications of suspected malpractice received from centres, the awarding body will consider the information provided and may decide to:

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025

Headteacher: John D. Harrison B.A. (Hons.)

Welsh Row - Nantwich - Cheshire - CW5 5HD - Tel: 01270 611009 - Email: admin@malbank.cheshire.sch.uk

Web site: www.malbank.com



- take no further action;
- make a decision on the case in accordance the procedures (see section 8 to 13 of JCQ Suspected Malpractice guidelines);
- carry out a further investigation as described in sections 5 (as above) and provide further evidence;
- investigate the matter further itself

Please note:

- It should be noted that where an Awarding Body had decided to apply a sanction or penalty, to ensure consistency of approach, they will not take into account consequential effects (for example on university applications) of any particular sanction or penalty which might arise from circumstances of an individual.
- Unless a penalty is accompanied by a bar on future entry (extremely rare), all candidates penalised by loss of marks or disqualification, may retake the component or for GCSEs the subject in the next examination series.

Appeals

If a candidate wishes to appeal the decision by the Awarding Body then the following procedures should be followed:

- 1) The parent or guardian of the candidate, but not the candidate acting alone, must contact the Examinations Office to confirm that they wish to appeal the outcome of the Awarding Body's decision, outlining the grounds upon which they wish to make the appeal. The application must be made within 48 hours of the outcome being made available to the candidate. This will allow the School time to investigate and, if the view of the candidate is upheld, get the appeal in to the Examinations Board with the 14 calendar day deadline.
- 2) The Examinations and Data Officer together with the Head of Centre (or their delegated representative) will then review the evidence, in line with the JCQ guidelines and advise the parent/guardian or candidate of the outcome. It must be stressed that only the School is able to make the appeal and it will only do so if it is satisfied that it is able to support the evidence of the candidate. The Headmaster's decision is final.
- 3) The outcome of the School's investigations will be reported, in writing, to the parents or guardian of the candidate within 48 hours.
- 4) If the Appeal is upheld by the School then the Examinations Office will make the necessary application by the deadline

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025

Headteacher: John D. Harrison B.A. (Hons.)

Welsh Row - Nantwich - Cheshire - CW5 5HD - Tel: 01270 611009 - Email: admin@malbank.cheshire.sch.uk

Web site: www.malbank.com



Malbank School and Sixth Form College



Rejoice in being the best that we can be

- 5) The Examinations Office will then report the outcome of the appeal to the Awarding Body to parent/guardian and Head of Subject within 24 hours of receipt.
- 6) If the appeal is not upheld then the outcome is final and no further recourse is available.

Further information may be found in the JCQ publication *'guide to the awarding bodies' appeal process*

Reviewed by NRH/DCS November 2025

Headteacher: John D. Harrison B.A. (Hons.)

Welsh Row - Nantwich - Cheshire - CW5 5HD - Tel: 01270 611009 - Email: admin@malbank.cheshire.sch.uk

Web site: www.malbank.com
