# Malpractice Policy 2026/27

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Effective from 1 September 2026

| | |
|---|---|
| **Approved/reviewed by** | C. Walker |
| **Date of next review** | September 2027 |

## Key staff involved in the exams policy

| Role | Name(s) |
|---|---|
| Governors | |
| Head of centre | **Gary Kynaston** |
| Exams officer line manager (Senior Leader) | **Connie Walkers / Tim Bridle** |
| Exams officer (EO) | **Lucie Hrabankova** |
| ALS lead/SENCo | **Paulina Wajler** |
| SLT member(s) | **Chris Wilson, Hodo Isse, Jessica Adolphus, Shaun Flitton** |
| IT Staff | **Bekim Kastrati, D'mello Anthony** |
| Site Staff | **Anthony Raftery, Julio Pena Vera, Kamel Meziane** |

## 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 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
- a breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered
- a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification which:
- gives rise to prejudice to candidates
- compromises public confidence in qualifications
- compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate
- 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' means 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 writing of any examination paper. (SMPP2)

**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)

**Suspected malpractice**

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice. (SMPP 2)

## Purpose of the policy

To confirm Hammersmith Academy:

- 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 Hammersmith Academy 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

Hammersmith Academy 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 all 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 2026-2027
    - Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2026-2027
    - Instructions for conducting coursework 2026-2027
    - Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2026-2027
    - Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2026-2027
    - A guide to the special consideration process 2026-2027
    - Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2026-2027 (this document)
    - Plagiarism in Assessments
    - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications
    - Post Results Services June 2027 and November 2027
    - A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2026-2027
    - Guidance for centres on cyber security (SMPP 3.2)

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

Candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments, including the use of AI, as per the JCQ document 'Teachers & Assessors - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications', at the start of the year using email by the exams officer.

## Artificial Intelligence (AI)

**AI - Use in Assessments**

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 still being developed and there are often 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
- Malpractice Policy 4
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or format

**What is AI Misuse**

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.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

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

**Acknowledging AI Use**

**Teaching Staff should:**

- Be aware that AI tools are still being developed and should use such tools with caution as they may provide inaccurate, inappropriate or biased content

- Make students aware of the risks of using AI tools and that they need to appropriately reference AI as a source of information to maintain the integrity of assessments For more information on AI misuse, see JCQ's 'AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications'. Any misuse of AI tools may be treated as malpractice.

- A candidate briefing is held at the start of each academic year and, again, before the start of the summer exam season. This briefing will highlight best practice and also covers examples of learner malpractice.

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 should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.

In addition to the above, where students use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. This allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether that use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/ blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2023. The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication Malpractice Policy 5 purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.

This must be submitted with the work so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own

See https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/ for further information.

## 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)
- Suspected malpractice should be reported to the Exams Officer and/or Head of Centre
- Concerns regarding the Exams Officer should 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 who is a child/vulnerable adult 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 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 information obtained and

actions taken to the relevant awarding body, 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

Hammersmith Academy 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**

## Appendix A – Examples of Staff Malpractice

The following are examples of staff malpractice. This is not an exhaustive list. Other instances of malpractice may be identified and considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion.

**Breach of security**

Any act which breaks the confidentiality of question papers or materials, and their electronic equivalents, or the confidentiality of candidates' scripts or their electronic equivalents.

It could involve:

- failing to keep examination material secure prior to an examination;
- discussing or otherwise revealing secure information in public, e.g. internet forums;
- moving the time or date of a fixed examination beyond the arrangements permitted within the JCQ document Instructions for conducting examinations.
- Conducting an examination before the published date constitutes centre staff malpractice and a clear breach of security;
- failing to supervise adequately candidates who have been affected by a timetable variation; (This would apply to candidates subject to overnight supervision by centre personnel or where an examination is to be sat in an earlier or later session on the scheduled day.)
- permitting, facilitating or obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination;

- failing to retain and secure examination question papers after an examination in cases where the life of the paper extends beyond the particular session. For example, where an examination is to be sat in a later session by one or more candidates due to a timetable variation;
- tampering with candidate scripts or controlled assessments or coursework after collection and before despatch to the awarding body/examiner/moderator; (This would additionally include reading candidates' scripts or photocopying candidates' scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body/examiner. The only instance where photocopying a candidate's script is permissible is where he/she has been granted the use of a transcript.)
- failing to keep candidates' computer files secure which contain controlled assessments or coursework.

**Deception**

Any act of dishonesty in relation to an examination or assessment, but not limited to:

- inventing or changing marks for internally assessed components (e.g. coursework) where there is no actual evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks awarded;
- manufacturing evidence of competence against national standards;
- fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements;
- entering fictitious candidates for examinations or assessments, or otherwise subverting the assessment or certification process with the intention of financial gain (fraud);
- substituting one candidate's controlled assessment or coursework for another.

**Improper assistance to candidates**

Any act where assistance is given beyond that permitted by the specification or regulations to a candidate or group of candidates, which results in a potential or actual advantage in an examination or assessment.

- For example: assisting candidates in the production of controlled assessments or coursework, or evidence of achievement, beyond that permitted by the regulations;
- sharing or lending candidates' controlled assessments or coursework with other candidates in a way which allows malpractice to take place;
- assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers;
- permitting candidates in an examination to access prohibited materials (dictionaries, calculators etc.);
- prompting candidates in an examination/assessment by means of signs, or verbal or written prompts;
- assisting candidates granted the use of an Oral Language Modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader, a scribe or a Sign Language Interpreter beyond that permitted by the regulations. Failure to co-operate with an investigation
- failure to make available information reasonably requested by an awarding body in the course of an investigation, or in the course of deciding whether an investigation is necessary; and/or
- failure to investigate on request in accordance with the awarding body's instructions or advice; and/or
- failure to investigate or provide information according to agreed deadlines; and/or
- failure to report all suspicions of malpractice.

## Appendix B – Examples of Learner Malpractice

The following are examples of learner malpractice. This is not an exhaustive list. Other instances of malpractice may be identified and considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion. For example:

- 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;
- failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments;
- collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates, beyond what is permitted;
- copying from another candidate (including the use of IT to aid the copying);
- allowing work to be copied e.g. posting written coursework 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);
- exchanging, obtaining, receiving, passing on information (or the attempt to) which could be examination related by means of talking, electronic, written or non-verbal communication;
- making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of controlled assessments, coursework or the contents of a portfolio;
- allowing others to assist in the production of controlled assessments, coursework or assisting others in the production of controlled assessments or coursework;
- the misuse, or the attempted misuse, of examination and assessment materials and resources (e.g. exemplar materials);
- being in possession of confidential material in advance of the examination;
- 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 inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or portfolios;
- impersonation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one's place in an examination or an assessment;
- plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from published sources or incomplete referencing;
- theft of another candidate's work; For further information see Appendix E Plagiarism
- bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material, for example: notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators (when prohibited), dictionaries (when prohibited), instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries (when prohibited), translators, wordlists, glossaries, iPods, mobile phones, earphones/earbuds, Airpods, watches or other similar electronic devices;
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick or similar device where a candidate uses a word processor;
- behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.
- Improper use of AI

## Appendix C – Examples of Maladministration

The following are examples of maladministration. This is not an exhaustive list. Other instances of maladministration may be identified and considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion.

Failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of controlled assessments, coursework and examinations or malpractice in the conduct of the examinations/assessments and/or the handling of examination question papers, candidate scripts, mark sheets, cumulative assessment records, results and certificate claim forms, etc.

For example:

- failing to ensure that candidates' coursework or work to be completed under controlled conditions is adequately monitored and supervised;
- inappropriate members of staff assessing candidates for access arrangements who do not meet the criteria as detailed within Chapter 7 of the JCQ document Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments;
- failure to use current assignments for assessments;
- failure to train invigilators adequately, leading to non-compliance with the JCQ document Instructions for conducting examinations;
- failing to issue to candidates the appropriate notices and warnings, e.g. JCQ Information for candidates documents;
- failure to inform the JCQ Centre Inspection Service of alternative sites for examinations;
- failing to post notices relating to the examination or assessment outside all rooms (including Music and Art rooms) where examinations and assessments are held;
- not ensuring that the examination venue conforms to the requirements as stipulated in the JCQ document Instructions for conducting examinations;
- the introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room, either prior to or during the examination; (N.B. this precludes the use of the examination room to coach candidates or give subject-specific presentations, including power-point presentations, prior to the start of the examination).

# HAMMERSMITH ACADEMY

# SUSPECTED MALPRACTICE: CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION FORM

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Date | | Candidate Name | |

This notification is to inform you/confirm to you that an alleged, suspected or actual report of malpractice has been made against you.

Details of the allegation / incident

| |
|---|
| |

Type of offence

| |
|---|
| |

As an approved examination centre, Hammersmith Academy is required to follow the policies and procedures in the JCQ **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** document available here www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice.

As stated in this document (section 4.1), the head of centre **must** notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice.

Enclosed you are provided with:

- a copy of the form **JCQ/M1** which will be used to report the allegation/incident to the awarding body supported by copies of any supporting evidence, where relevant
- details of (section 5.33) **Rights of the accused individuals** taken from the document referenced above

As further stated in this document (sections 7, 10), awarding bodies will impose sanctions on individuals found guilty of malpractice where appropriate. You may therefore also want to refer to Appendix 6 (**Indicative sanctions against candidates**) of this document.

The awarding body will not communicate with you directly unless particular circumstances warrant this. Once a decision has been made, it will be communicated in writing to the head of centre as soon as possible (section 11).

On receiving communication from the awarding body, the head of centre will communicate the decision to you and pass on details of any sanction(s) and action imposed on you, together with information on the process for submitting an appeal, where relevant.

It should be noted that awarding bodies may share information relating to a serious case of malpractice with the regulators, other awarding bodies, and other appropriate bodies in accordance with sections 11.2-3 of the JCQ document referenced above.

Please read through all the information provided to you. If anything is unclear, please contact the Exams Officer Ms L Hrabankova.

**Rights of the accused individuals – information gathering**

**5.33** 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) must:

- be informed (preferably in writing) of the allegation made against them;
- be provided with a copy of the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice*: *Policies and Procedures*: http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice;
- be made aware of all evidence that has been obtained during the investigation which supports the allegation;
- know the possible consequences should malpractice be proven (as set out in appendices 4–6);
- have the opportunity and sufficient time to consider their response to the allegations;
- be given an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the allegations;
- be provided with a complete set of case documentation, in the event of the case being referred to the awarding body's Malpractice Committee;
- be informed that in the event that the case is referred to the awarding body's Malpractice Committee, they will:
    - be provided with a complete set of case documentation
    - have the opportunity to read, and make a statement in response to, the case documentation
    - have the opportunity to seek professional advice and to provide a supplementary statement;
- be made aware of their right to appeal should a sanction be applied to them (as set out in the JCQ document *A Guide to the Awarding Bodies' Appeals Processes*): http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/appeals