



St. Gregory's Catholic High School

Malpractice Policy

Monitoring

The implementation of the policy will be monitored by the Examinations Manager and the Assistant Headteacher Pupil Progress and Assessment.

Evaluation

The policy was reviewed by the Quality Nominee, Examinations Manager, Assistant Headteacher Pupil Progress and Assessment and Senior Leadership Team on 5th November 2025 prior to the submission of the policy to Governors' Standards Committee for scrutiny and recommendation to the Full Governing Board for approval.

Key policy dates:

Ratified by the Full Governing Board: 10th December 2025

Review frequency: Annual

Next policy review commences: Autumn Term 2026

Mission Statement

Every member of St. Gregory's Catholic High School will work together in solidarity for the common good of our diverse community. We have no better inspiration than the teaching of Jesus Christ. We believe every person is unique and made in the image of God and should be treated justly with dignity, love and respect. We will follow Jesus by embracing our God given charisms to carry out our mission to serve. We are one family inspired to learn.

Contents

Purpose of the policy	Page 3
Introduction and types of malpractice	Page 3
General principles	Page 4
Preventing malpractice	Page 4
Informing and advising candidates	Page 4
The use of artificial intelligence in assessments	Page 4
Identification and reporting of malpractice	Page 5
Communicating malpractice decisions	Page 6
Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice	Page 6

References in this policy to **GR** and **SMPP** relate to relevant sections of the current JCQ publications **General Regulations for Approved Centres** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

Purpose of the policy

To confirm St. Gregory's Catholic High 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 are escalated within the centre and reported to the relevant awarding body (GR 5.3)
- acknowledges the use of Artificial intelligence (AI) and that the misuse of AI will be treated as malpractice (GR 5.3)

Introduction and types of malpractice

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 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 is to 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. (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’ 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. (SMPP 2)

General principles

In accordance with the regulations St. Gregory’s Catholic High 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 publication **Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures** and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11)

Preventing malpractice

St. Gregory’s Catholic High 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)
 - 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; 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: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications; A guide to the awarding bodies’ appeals processes* (SMPP 3.3.1)

Informing and advising candidates

Before the examination season begins, candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments. This is done by Senior Leaders, the Head of Year and the Examinations Manager. Candidates will also be advised on the risks of misusing Artificial Intelligence (AI).

The Examinations Manager shares the following JCQ documents with exam pupils prior to the examination season or completion of non-examination assessment:

- *Information for Candidates – Written examinations*
- *Information for Candidates – Non-examination assessments*
- *Information for candidates – On-screen tests* (where applicable)
- *Information for Candidates – Artificial Intelligence*
- *Warning to Candidates*
- *Unauthorised Items Poster*
- *Social Media Infographic*

These documents are also published on the Exam Regulations page of the school's website.

The use of artificial intelligence in assessments

While the range of AI tools and their capabilities has expanded greatly in recent years, misuse of AI tools in assessments at any time constitutes malpractice. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the pupil's own
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the pupil'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

If a pupil uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the pupil and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, pupils should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.

Additionally, where pupils use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. This allows teachers/assessors to review how AI has been used and whether that use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a pupil's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated.

Where a teacher/assessor suspects that a pupil has used AI tools and not appropriately referenced them, they should escalate their concerns as detailed in the next section of the policy.

Identification and reporting of malpractice

Escalating suspected malpractice issues

- Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre can report it to the Examinations Manager, Head of Centre or Senior Leadership team.

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)

- 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)
- 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 (SMPP 5.35)
- 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

St. Gregory's Catholic High 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 publication **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**