



**BROOKTHORPE
HALL SCHOOL**

Malpractice Policy (Exams) 2025/26

Brookthorpe Hall School
part of
Options Autism

Malpractice Policy (Exams)

Centre name	Brookthorpe Hall School
Centre number	
Date procedures first created	November 2024
Current procedures approved by	Jon Bell
Current procedures reviewed by	Choe Boothman
Date of next review	30/11/2026

Key staff involved in the procedures

Role	Name
Head of centre	Jon Bell
Senior leader(s)	Louise Waller: Deputy Headteacher Curriculum Sabrina Chowdhury: Deputy Headteacher (Inclusion) & SENDCo
Exams Officer	Chloe Boothman
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Brookthorpe Hall School 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 nonexamination assessments, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the completion of any examination. (SMPP 2)

Examples of Candidate Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated.

Coursework or non-examination assessments

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. 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
- **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

Examinations

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to examinations. This list is not exhaustive:

- Talking during an examination
- Taking a mobile phone into an examination
- Taking any item other than those accepted by the Awarding Body into the examination, such as a book or notes
- Leaving the examination room without permission
- Passing notes or papers or accepting notes to, or accepting notes or papers from another candidate

Further examples of candidate malpractice:

- the alteration or falsification of any results document, including certificates;
- a breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding body in relation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations;
- the unauthorised use of alternative electronic devices or technology during remote assessment and remote invigilation;
- accessing the internet, online materials or AI tools during remote assessment and remote invigilation, where this is not permitted;
- failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments;
- collusion: working collaboratively with others, beyond what is permitted;
- copying from another candidate (including the use of technology to aid the copying);
- allowing work to be copied, e.g. posting work on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment;
- the deliberate destruction of another candidate's work;
- disruptive behaviour in the examination room or during an assessment session (including the use of offensive language);
- failing to report to the centre or awarding body the candidate having unauthorised access to assessment related information or sharing unauthorised assessment related information online;
- exchanging, obtaining, receiving, passing on information (or the attempt to) which could be assessment related by means of talking, electronic, written or non-verbal communication;
- making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of controlled assessment, coursework, non-examination assessment or the contents of a portfolio;
- allowing others to assist in the production of controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments, examination responses or assisting others in the production of controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments or examination responses;
- the misuse, or the attempted misuse, of examination and assessment materials and resources (e.g. exemplar materials);

- being in possession of unauthorised confidential information about an examination or assessment;
- bringing into the examination room notes in the wrong format (where notes are permitted in examinations) or inappropriately annotated texts (in open book examinations);
- the inclusion of offensive comments, obscenities or drawings; discriminatory language, remarks or drawings directed at an individual or group in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments or portfolios;
- personation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one's place in an examination or an assessment;
- plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from, or reproduction of, third party sources or incomplete referencing (including the internet and artificial intelligence (AI) tools);
- theft of another candidate's work;
- being in possession (whether used or not) of unauthorised material during an examination or assessment, for example: notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators (when prohibited), dictionaries (when prohibited), watches, instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries (when prohibited), translators, wordlists, glossaries, iPods, mobile phones, AirPods, MP3/4 players, pagers, or other similar electronic devices;
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick or similar device where a candidate uses a word processor;
- facilitating malpractice on the part of other candidates;
- behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.

Consequences of Malpractice – Internal and External Assessments

All suspected malpractice will be reported to the relevant awarding body (on completion of Form JCQ/M1) immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice.

Awarding bodies have a number of penalties and sanctions that they can apply if they uphold a report of malpractice:

1. **Warning:** The candidate is issued with a warning that if he/she commits malpractice within a set period of time, further specified sanctions may be applied.
2. **Loss of all marks for a section:** The candidate loses all the marks gained for a discrete section of the work. A section may be part of a component, or a single piece of non-examination assessment if this consists of several items.
3. **Loss of all marks for a component:** The candidate loses all the marks gained for a component. A component is more often a feature of a linear qualification than a unitised qualification, and so this sanction can be regarded as an alternative to sanction 4. Some units also have components, in which case a level of sanction between numbers 2 and 4 is possible.
4. **Loss of all marks for a unit:** The candidate loses all the marks gained for a unit. This sanction can only be applied to qualifications which are unitised. For linear qualifications, the option is sanction 3. This sanction usually allows the candidate to aggregate or request certification in that series, albeit with a reduced mark or grade.
5. **Disqualification from a unit:** The candidate is disqualified from the unit. This sanction is only available if the qualification is unitised. For linear qualifications the option is sanction 7. The

effect of this sanction is to prevent the candidate aggregating or requesting certification in that series, if the candidate has applied for it. For qualifications with assessments taken throughout the academic year, the candidate will be disqualified from the unit and will not be able to use the unit to aggregate/certificate. The candidate will need to redo the unit in order to be eligible for aggregation/certification, subject to the awarding body's qualification requirements.

6. **Disqualification from all units in one or more qualifications taken in that series or academic year:** If circumstances justify, sanction 5 may be applied to other units taken during the same examination or assessment series. (Units which have been banked in previous examination series are retained.) This sanction is only available if the qualification is unitised. For linear qualifications the option is sanction 8. For qualifications with assessments taken throughout the academic year, the candidate will be disqualified from the unit(s) and will not be able to use the unit(s) to aggregate/certificate. The candidate will need to redo the unit in order to be eligible for aggregation/certification, subject to the awarding body's qualification requirements.
7. **Disqualification from a whole qualification:** The candidate is disqualified from the whole qualification taken in that series or academic year. This sanction can be applied to unitised qualifications only if the candidate has requested aggregation. Any units banked in a previous examination series are retained, but the units taken in the present series and the aggregation opportunity are lost. If a candidate has not requested aggregation, the option is sanction 6. It may also be used with linear qualifications.
8. **Disqualification from all qualifications taken in that series or academic year:** If circumstances justify, sanction 7 may be applied to other qualifications. This sanction can be applied to unitised qualifications only if the candidate has requested aggregation. Any units banked in a previous examination series are retained, but the units taken in the present series and the aggregation opportunity are lost. If a candidate has not requested aggregation, the option is sanction 6. It may also be used with linear qualifications. This sanction is only applied by the affected awarding body.
9. **Candidate debarral:** The candidate is barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time. This sanction is applied in conjunction with any of the other sanctions above, if the circumstances warrant it.

Awarding bodies will communicate decisions to the head of centre who will then cascade the outcome to the candidate and parent /carer/ appropriate adult.

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)

Examples of Malpractice and Maladministration

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 candidates work prior to external moderation/verification
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements

The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regard to examinations

- Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone or go to the toilet unsupervised
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place.

*In the case of improper assistance, a note must be made to the cover sheet of the candidates work.

Further examples of malpractice and maladministration:

- Failure to carry out internal assessment, internal moderation or internal verification in accordance with the requirements of the awarding body
- Deliberate failure to adhere to the learner registration and certification procedures of the awarding body
- Deliberate failure to maintain appropriate auditable records, e.g. certification claims and/or forgery of evidence
- Fraudulent claim for certificates
- The unauthorised use of inappropriate materials / equipment in assessment settings (e.g. mobile phones)
- Intentional withholding of information from the awarding body which is critical to maintaining the rigour of quality assurance and standards of qualifications;
- Collusion or permitting collusion in exams/assessments;
- Learners still working towards qualification after certification claims have been made;
- Contravention by the centre and learners of the assessment arrangements specified by the awarding bodies
- A loss, theft of, or a breach of confidentiality in, any assessment materials
- Plagiarism by learners/staff
- Unauthorised amendment, copying or distributing of exam/assessment papers/materials
- Inappropriate assistance to learners by staff (e.g. unfairly helping them to pass a unit or qualification)
- Submission of false information to gain a qualification or unit;
- Deliberate failure to adhere to, or to circumvent, the requirements of the policies of the awarding bodies

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 Brookthorpe Hall 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 Brookthorpe Hall School 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

Brookthorpe Hall 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 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)

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

Prior to their first exam series, candidates and parents/carers are informed of exam rules and regulations including committing malpractice. Tutors and Subject Leads inform candidates using the **JCQ Information for candidates document** and the *Information for candidates written examinations* animation (The Exams Office). These are both shared with parents and are available on the school website all year round. Candidates sit mock exams which also help familiarise candidates with exam conditions and expectations to prevent malpractice.

Prior to any formal assessment, students undertaking qualifications containing coursework and/or NEA components are well informed of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and the associated risks of AI malpractice. Students who misuse AI to the extent that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice in accordance with JCQ regulations and could attract severe sanctions. 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.

AI use and misuse in assessments

“Artificial Intelligence (AI) is technology that enables computers and machines to stimulate human learning, comprehension, problem solving, decision making, creativity and autonomy” [IBM](#)

Whilst AI can be a powerful tool, there are inherent risks to their use significantly in an educational or assessment context. It is critical that learners develop and demonstrate their own skills in generating and developing ideas and carrying out independent research. The JCQ state “all work submitted for qualification assessments must be the learner’s own”. Therefore, work cannot be copied, paraphrased or heavily derived from another source including content produced by AI tools. In reference to exam

and assessment, this is referred to as AI misuse which is a form of candidate malpractice. Therefore, **Brookthorpe Hall School does not permit the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in any circumstances including coursework or non-examination assessments.**

With reference to the JCQ guidance for Teachers & Assessors- **AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications:**

- Students complete all of their exams and a large number of other assessments under close staff supervision with limited access to authorised materials and no permitted access to the internet. The delivery of these assessments should be unaffected by developments in AI tools as students must not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments, although care must be taken when a student is allowed to use a laptop or similar device for exams, to ensure they have no access to AI tools. This also enables teachers to feel assured that the work submitted for assessment is authentically the students own work.
- There are some assessments in which access to the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages. The majority of these assessments will be Non-Examined Assessments (NEAs), coursework and internal assessments for General Qualifications (GQs) and Vocational & Technical Qualifications (VTQs). JCQ's guidance which is designed to help students and teachers to complete NEAs, coursework and other internal assessments successfully is followed in relation to these assessments.
- The following JCQ support materials are also used to help teachers understand and prevent AI misuse and to help students to better understand the rules of AI in assessments:

- [JCQ Information for candidates - AI \(Artificial Intelligence and assessments\)](#)

- [JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications](#)

Identification and reporting of malpractice

All staff have a responsibility for maintaining the integrity of qualifications and assessment and therefore have a duty to report any suspected malpractice.

Escalating suspected malpractice issues

Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre, parent or student can report it using the appropriate channels: (SMPP 4.3)

- All suspected malpractice should be reported to the Exams Officer in the first instance. This can initially be in person however it is likely that
- In the absence of the Exams Officer, in line with the Escalation Policy, all suspected malpractice should then be reported to the Deputy Headteacher Curriculum.
- In any other circumstance or for any other reason, suspected malpractice can be reported to the Head of Centre.

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)

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

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

Brookthorpe Hall School 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**
- Appeals granted by the head of centre must be submitted to the awarding body within 14 days of receiving the malpractice outcome decision.