Campion School & Language College
The best in everyone™
Part of United Learning

MALPRACTICE POLICY

2025/2026

Review Date – March 2027

Person responsible for the Policy – Examinations Manager

Noted by Governors – 24th March 2026

Key staff involved

Role	Name(s)
Head of Centre	**Kim Bradley-Smith**
Exams officer	**Karen Jones**
SLT member(s)	**Rebecca Bain**

Staff Malpractice Policy

Introduction

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding staff malpractice in the assessment of internally assessed qualifications (such as GCSE, GCE, BTEC, EL, EPQ, etc.).

Campion School follows the JCQ guidance about Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures.

Reporting to awarding bodies

The centre will adhere to the awarding bodies' malpractice and maladministration policies and procedures in reporting any instances of malpractice.

What is malpractice?

Malpractice, which includes maladministration and non-compliance, means any act, default or practice which is a breach of the regulations or which:

- 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

Examples of malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- tampering with candidate-controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments after collection and before despatch to the awarding body/ examiner/ moderator
- failing to keep candidates' computer files secure which contain controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements

Staff malpractice procedure

Investigations into allegations will be coordinated by the head of centre or a member of the senior leadership team appointed by the head of centre, who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out in a timely fashion. The investigation will involve establishing the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true. Where appropriate, the staff member concerned and any potential witnesses will be interviewed, and their version of events recorded.

The member of staff will be:

- informed of the allegation made against him or her
- informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven
- given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations
- given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- given the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required)
- informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him/her
- informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice will be shared with the relevant awarding body and may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators, JCQ, Ofqual, the police and/or professional bodies including the GTC

If work is submitted for moderation/verification or for marking which is not the candidate's own work, the awarding body may not be able to give that candidate a result.

Staff malpractice sanctions

Where a member of staff is found guilty of malpractice, Campion School may impose the following sanctions:

1) Warning: issue the member of staff with a verbal or written warning making clear that if the offence is repeated within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied
2) Training: require the member of staff, as a condition of future involvement in both internal and external assessments, to undertake specific training or mentoring, within a particular period of time, including a review process at the end of the training
3) Special conditions: impose special conditions on the future involvement in assessments by the

member of staff

4) Suspension: bar the member of staff in all involvement in the administration of assessments for a set period of time

5) Dismissal: should the degree of malpractice be deemed gross professional misconduct the member of staff could face dismissal from his/her post

Appeals

The member of staff may appeal against sanctions imposed on them. Appeals will be conducted in line with the organisation's Appeals Policy.

Candidate Malpractice Policy

Introduction

This policy sets out to define the procedures to be followed in the event of any dispute or allegation regarding candidate malpractice in the assessment of internally assessed qualifications (such as GCSE, GCE, BTEC, EL, EPQ, etc.).

Campion School follows the JCQ guidance about Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures

Candidates and parents are informed of this policy and links shared via email at the start of the exam series. Campion School also shares this via assemblies and posters.

Examples of malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates. This list is not exhaustive:

- Plagiarism: the copying and passing of as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another person's work allowing work to be copied e.g., posting work on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as the candidate's only
- Failing to abide by the instructions of an assessor. This may refer to the use of resources which the candidate has been specifically told not to use
- The alteration of any results document
- The use of AI is treated as malpractice. Students must make sure that work submitted for assessment is demonstrably their own. If any sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified by the student and they must understand that this will not allow them to demonstrate that they have independently met the

marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded (please see AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications and Acknowledging AI Use (http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice). Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the student's own (in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres). Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate and take appropriate action.

Candidate Malpractice Procedure

Investigations into allegations will be coordinated by the head of centre or a member of the senior leadership team appointed by the head of centre, who will ensure the initial investigation is carried out in a timely fashion. The investigation will involve establishing the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true. Where appropriate, the candidate(s) concerned and any potential witnesses will be interviewed, and their version(s) of events recorded.

The candidate and their parent(s)/carer (s) will be:

- informed of the allegation made against him or her
- informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven
- given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations
- given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- informed of the applicable awarding body's appeals process, should a decision be made against him/her
- informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice will be shared with the relevant awarding body and may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators, JCQ and Ofqual

- What AI is
- When and how AI can be used in exams and assessments
- What AI misuse is
- When and how teachers, assessors and other relevant staff are made aware of appropriate use of AI and their role in managing the risk of AI misuse
- The approaches used within the centre to ensure that teachers can be assured the work they accept for assessment is authentically the students own work

What is AI

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 evolving quickly but there are still 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 formality

Potential indicators of AI misuse - NEA

If the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication that the student has misused AI:

- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations
- A default use of language or vocabulary which might not accord with the qualification level*
- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected
- Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
- A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects
- Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered
- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work 10
- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
- A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected

- A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themself, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
- The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output
- The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
- The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth and variety or to overcome its output limit
- The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
- Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.

Teachers, assessors and other staff must discuss the use of AI in qualification assessments and agree their approach to managing students' use of AI in their school, college or exam centre. Centres must make students aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment. They should also make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice. Centres should consider communicating with parents to make them aware of the risks and issues and ensure they support the centre's approach.

Centres should do the following:

- Explain the importance of students submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice;
- Ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools (see the What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments? and What is AI misuse? sections);
- Ensure that, where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, teachers and relevant centre staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access where this is prohibited;
- Consider whether students should be required to sign a declaration that they have understood what AI misuse is, and that it is forbidden in the learning agreement that is signed at enrolment in some centres;
- Reinforce to students the significance of their (electronic) declaration where they confirm the work they're submitting is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and that they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject;
- Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice

Identifying misuse

Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques that teachers are probably already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own. There are also some tools that can be used. We explore these different methods below.
Comparison with previous work When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the student. Where the work is made up of writing, one can make note of the following characteristics:
• Spelling and punctuation
• Grammatical usage
• Writing style and tone
• Vocabulary
• Complexity and coherency
• General understanding and working level
• The mode of production (i.e. whether handwritten or word-processed) Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions

Reporting

If your suspicions are confirmed and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, your centre doesn't need to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation. Steps to resolve such incidents should be detailed in the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy. These should include ensuring that 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 that students do not submit inauthentic work.

If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation.

Appeals

In the event that a malpractice decision is made, which the candidate feels is unfair, the candidate has the right to appeal in line with the Appeals Policy.