# Exams Malpractice Policy 2026-27

The Crypt School

## Exams Malpractice Policy 2026-27

| | |
|---|---|
| Centre name | The Crypt School |
| Centre number | 57117 |
| Date policy first created | 08/10/2026 |
| Current policy approved by | Deputy Head - Academic |
| Current policy reviewed by | Louise Coughlin |
| Date of review | 08/10/2026 |
| Date of next review | 01/11/2027 |

## Key staff involved in the policy

| **Role** | **Name** |
|---|---|
| Head of centre | Nicholas Dyer |
| Senior leader(s) | Senior Deputy Head<br>Deputy Head - Academic<br>Deputy Head - Director of Post 16 Education & Personal Development<br>Deputy Head - Pastoral |
| Exams Officer | Louise Coughlin |
| Other staff (if applicable) | Karen Newman - Exams Assistant |

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at The Crypt School is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations and reflects centre practice.

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 organisation 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 organisation or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding organisation 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 The Crypt 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 with reference to the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures*

  The policy **must** detail 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 The Crypt 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

The Crypt 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 current JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance:
    - *General Regulations for Approved Centres*
    - *Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE)*
    - *Instructions for conducting coursework*
    - *Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments*
    - *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments*
    - *A guide to the special consideration process*
    - *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*
    - *Plagiarism in Assessments*
    - *AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications*
    - *Post Results Services*
    - *A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes*
    - *Guidance for centres on cyber security* (SMPP 3.2)

Additional information:

The exams officer will signpost staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations to teh above mentioned JCQ documents and any other relevant documents issued by awarding bodies. This may be email to staff or in staff briefings.

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

Students are advised about malpractice - what it is and possible sanctions - in exam assembly briefings by the Deputy Head Academic and Exams Officer, by email of JCQ documentation at the start of the academic year and in the Exam Candidate Handbook. AI posters (JCQ IFC AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments) and JCQ AI and Assessments - A quick guide for students) are displayed around the school and also copies emailed to students. The JCQ AI presentation for students is also delivered at the start of the academic year.

Malpractice includes but is not limited to the following actions:

a. Plagiarism

b. Cheating during examinations

c. Unauthorised use of electronic devices during examinations

d. Collusion between students

e. Impersonation

f. Tampering with examination materials

g. Any form of dishonesty during examinations & non-examined assessments, including the misuse of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

**What is AI and what are the risks of using it?**

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 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.

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. 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.

Centre staff are aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice. Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the students' own (in accordance with section 5.7 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. Should improper assistance be found to have been used this will be recorded on the candidate's assessment record/ authentication form.

Centre staff will 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 and remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice.

**AI use in assessments (and preventing AI misuse)**

Students complete the majority 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 (as detailed in sections 14.20-27 of the JCQ Instructions for conducting examinations document).

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). 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.

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

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, & may attract severe sanctions.
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.

Students are informed about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and how to do this. Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments. If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students must ensure they independently verify the AI-generated content – and reference the sources they have used.

Students acknowledging the use of AI and showing clearly how they have used it allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether the use

was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment.
Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, student acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated. For example:
ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/ blog/chatgpt/), 25/09/2026.

The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.
This must be included with the work the student submits for assessment, so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used.

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 for use of AI in assessments:

- Preventing AI Misue in Assessments - A summary for teachers;
- AI and Assessments - A quick guide (poster) for students,
- Senior leader presentation - Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments - A summary for teachers;
- Teacher presentation - AI and Assessments - A quick guide for students.

**Prior** to beginning their work, candidates are issued with the JCQ **Information for candidates** documents: **AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)**, (as applicable to any of their qualifications) **Coursework assessments**, **Non-examination assessments** and **Social media** (GR 5.8)

Relevant subject staff ensure that all candidates have read the **Notice to candidates** within the relevant awarding body's **Candidate declaration form** (Authentication form) prior to beginning their work.

Candidates will not sign the declaration until they have completed their work and handed it in for final assessment.

**Authenticating Candidates' Work**

Subject teacher role and responsibilities:

Where required by the awarding body's specification:

- ensure candidates sign a declaration confirming the work they submit for final assessment is their own unaided work and ensures that this takes place as soon as the candidate has completed the assessment
- sign the teacher declaration of authentication confirming the requirements have been met (Electronic signatures are acceptable. Typed names will be taken as being as binding as a handwritten signature)
- Keep signed candidate declarations on file until the deadline for requesting reviews of results has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later
- Provide signed candidate declarations where these may be requested by a JCQ Centre Inspector

**Rejecting a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice**

Where a candidate's work may be rejected on the grounds of malpractice there is an internal process in place so that candidates can request an internal appeal against this decision.

## Identification and reporting of malpractice

All staff at The Crypt School have a responsibility for reporting any potential malpractice that they may identify.

**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 staff have a responsibility and duty to report any potential malpractice that they may identify. Students and staff are advised to report any suspected malpractice promptly. All reports should be made to the Exams Officer or a member of the Senior Leadership Team.

**Investigation and Sanctions**

a. An investigation will be conducted when malpractice is reported. The investigation may involve interviews with students and staff, review of evidence, and consultation with JCQ regulations.

b. Sanctions for malpractice may include disqualification from the examination, the module, or the entire qualification, depending on the severity of the malpractice.

c. In cases of serious or repeated malpractice, the school may refer the matter to the JCQ or relevant awarding body

**Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding organisation**

- The head of centre will notify the appropriate awarding organisation immediately of all* alleged, suspected or actual incidents of (staff, centre and candidate) 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)

  (*The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments where the offence relates to the content of candidate work (e.g. copying/collusion, plagiarism and/or AI misuse and the authentication forms have not been signed by the candidate)

- 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)

- Form JCQ/M1 will be used to notify an awarding organisation of an incident of suspected candidate malpractice. Form JCQ/M2 will be used (**before** an investigation commences) to notify an awarding organisation 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 organisation. 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 organisation. 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 information gatherer, 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 informed of their rights and responsibilities as the accused individual, prior to the submission of the report to the awarding organisation (SMPP 5.35-36, 40)

- Where it is identified that there is a need to exercise discretion in the light of the circumstances of the case in terms of how the evidence is presented to the accused individual (for example, if there are concerns about revealing the identity of a third party mentioned in the documentation), this will be discussed with the awarding organisation.

  If the accused individual is provided with a reduced or redacted set of case documentation by the information

gatherer, then the awarding organisation will be provided with the same information as provided to the individual. Where there are multiple individuals involved in the same incident, copies of the redacted documents for each individual will be provided to the awarding organisation. (SMPP 5.36)

- Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed information gatherer) will submit a written report to the relevant awarding organisation summarising the information obtained and actions taken, accompanied by the information obtained during the course of their enquiries (SMPP 5.37)
- Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used (SMPP 5.39)
- The awarding organisation 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 5.42)

Additional information:

The internal procedures referred to above where candidate malpractice offences relating to the content of work are discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication are detailed in The Crypt School's Exams Internal Appeals Policy, which is updated every year.

A summary of these points is below:

If there are doubts about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or irregularities are identified in a candidate's
work before the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication/authentication statement (where required)
and malpractice is suspected, The Crypt School will follow the authentication procedures and/or malpractice instructions in the relevant JCQ document
(Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments/Instructions for conducting coursework) and any supplementary guidance that may be provided by the awarding body. Where this may lead to the decision to not accept the candidate's work for assessment or to reject a candidate's coursework on the grounds of malpractice, the affected candidate will be informed of the decision.

If a candidate who is the subject of the decision disagrees with the decision an internal appeals form should be completed and submitted within 2 working days of the decision being
made know to the appellant. The appeals form should set out as clearly and concisely as possible the grounds for the appeal including any further evidence relevant to supporting the appeal.

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 3 working days of the appeal being received and
logged by the centre.

## Communicating malpractice decisions

Once a decision has been made by the awarding organisation, 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:

N/A

## Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

The Crypt 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 organisations' appeals processes**

Additional information:

All awarding organisations have established procedures for considering appeals against sanctions arising from malpractice decisions.

The following individuals have a right to appeal against decisions of the Malpractice Committee or officers acting on its behalf (SMPP 12.1)

- heads of centre, who may appeal against sanctions imposed on the centre or on centre staff, as well as on behalf of candidates entered or registered through the centre;
- members of centre staff, including those who may be under contract to fulfil assessment-related functions, as detailed on page 4 of this document, who may appeal against sanctions imposed on them personally;
- private (external) candidates;
- third parties who have been barred from taking or delivering the awarding organisation’s examinations or assessments.

Information on the process for submitting an appeal will be sent to all centres involved in malpractice decisions. Appeals must normally be made within 14 days of receiving the malpractice outcome decision.

Further information about the awarding organisations’ appeals process may be found in the JCQ document A guide to the awarding organisations’ appeals processes:
http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/appeals

## Changes effective from September 2026

(Updated)

- Wording updated under heading **Purpose of the policy**
- JCQ documents updated under heading **Preventing malpractice**
- Wording in certain bullet points updated under various headings
- Insert prompts updated in various *Additional information* sections
- Updated various SMPP section references
- References to awarding 'body' in the SMPP document updated to 'organisation'

(Amended)

- Heading **AI use in assessments** amended to **AI use in assessments (and preventing AI misuse)**
- Bullet point referring to *Information for candidates* documents amended

(Added)

- New insert sections added under various headings
- New bullet point added under heading **AI use in**... referring to the *Candidate declaration form*
- Under heading **Identification and reporting of**... added a sentence with reference to all staff responsibility

## Centre-specific changes

Upon review in October 2026, under **Other staff involved in the policy** Karen Newman, exams assistant was added.

Under **AI use in assessments (and preventing AI misuse)** details on **Authenticating candidates' work** and **Rejecting a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice** were added**.**