

Bedales Senior Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Implementation date: Autumn 2024

Date/term of last review: Summer 24

Author	Exams & Operations Officer
Review body (individual or group)	Deputy Head (Academic)
Approval Body	Head of Bedales School
ISI Regulatory Paragraph Number	N/A
Next Review Period	Autumn 2025

Tick relevant box(es) ✓ how this Policy should appear:

Website	Upload	✓
	Signpost	
SharePoint		✓

Bedales Senior Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Introduction

What is malpractice and maladministration?

'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 use 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, 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 paper (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.
- 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).

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 19) (SMPP 2)

Purpose of the policy

To confirm Bedales School:

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 Bedales School will:

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

Bedales School 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 2024-2-25
- Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2024-2025
- Instructions for conducting coursework 2024-2025
- Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2024-2025
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2024-2025
- A guide to the special consideration process 2024-2025
- Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2024-2025 (this document) • Plagiarism in Assessments
- AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications
- Post Results Services June 2024 and November 2024
- A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2024-2025

(SMPP 3.3.1)

Additional information:

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. 'Turn It In' software must be used to check any work suspected of being AI generated before submission to the exam board.

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

Students and parents will be provided with both written and verbal guidance through assemblies and information shared by email and on My School Portal on what constitutes exam malpractice and how it can be avoided.

JCQ guidelines will be followed for all internal 'mock' assessments as a way of familiarising students with the guidelines and instances of malpractice within these assessments will be followed up with Houseparents to help students to understand where they have not met the standard expected of them and what needs to happen next time.

Students and parents will be briefed on AI misuse both verbally and in writing prior to conducting coursework assessments. We will 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. We will also make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice

AI use in assessments

Students must be able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

- 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:
 1. Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own
 2. Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
 3. Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
 4. Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
 5. Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
 6. 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 that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work

Students must acknowledge any use of AI tools in their NEAs. This would normally include referring to the AI company that created / hosts the software:

Reference Format:

Author. (Year of publication). Name of AI (Version) [Description]. Originating company only if different from author. URL,

Reference Example: OpenAI. (2023). ChatGPT (Mar 3 version) [Large language model], <https://chat.openai.com/>

Citation Example:

(OpenAI, 2023)

It might also include a less formal acknowledgement of AI use, stating clearly what has been created and how it has been used.

Preventing malpractice

Bedales School has in place:

- Robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (SMPP 4.3).
- 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. 'Turn It In' software must be used to check any work suspected of being AI generated before submission to the exam board.

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)

All suspected malpractice instances must be recorded at the time of occurrence by invigilators on the Exams notes sheets. The time and particulars of the incident should be noted down in as much detail as possible and any evidence collated. Taking photographs may, sometimes, be an appropriate course of action. Where possible, this should be on a school issued device.

The Malpractice should then be reported to the exams officer at the very first opportunity. The exams officer should report the malpractice to the Head of Centre providing the relevant forms. The Deputy Head of Centre or Head of Centre will support the Exams Officer in conducting an internal investigation.

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 publication Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (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).
- Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment 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. The only exception to this is where the awarding body's confidential assessment material has potentially been breached. The breach will be reported to the awarding body immediately (SMPP 4.5).

- 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 (SMPP 5.33).
- Once the information gathering has concluded, the Head of Centre (or other appointed information-gatherer) will submit a written report summarising the case to the relevant awarding body, accompanied by the information obtained during the course of their enquiries (SMPP 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).

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).

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Bedales School will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process 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**.

Changes 2024/2025

Under headings What is malpractice, Candidate malpractice, Suspected Malpractice amended to reflect slight wording changes in SMPP.

Under heading Purpose of the policy: To confirm Bedales 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

(Amended to reflect the change in GR 5.3) To confirm Bedales School: 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)

Under heading General Principles, bullet point amended to reflect the change in GR 5.11: take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations assessments have taken place

Under heading Preventing Malpractice: Updated the list of JCQ documents.

Under the heading Informing and advising candidates how to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments updated the prompt in the insert field to: Detail the process in your centre which confirms how, when and by whom candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments. Describe the process and 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). Confirm when this takes place and include the name(s) and/or role(s) of those staff involved in briefing candidates.

All School policies are available to staff and can be found here:

<https://bedaleschools.sharepoint.com/sites/bdd-wholeschoolpolicies>