LACON CHILDE SCHOOL
PART OF FOUR STONES GATEWAY

LACON CHILDE SCHOOL

EXAMINATIONS POLICY – MALPRACTICE & MALADMINISTRATION

DATE POLICY WAS APPROVED	16.12.2025
DATE POLICY WILL BE REVIEWED	Autumm 2026
MEMBER OF STAFF WITH RESPONSIBILITY FOR REVIEW	Exam Co-Ordinator

Key Definitions

All policies incorporate the following schools or organisations, unless specified otherwise, within Four Stones Gateway Trust ('the Trust'):

- Clee Hill Community Academy
- Cleobury Mortimer Primary School
- Haybridge High School and Sixth Form
- Haybridge Teaching School Hub
- Haybridge SCITT
- King Charles I School
- Lacon Childe School
- SHaW (Shropshire, Herefordshire, and Wolverhampton) Maths Hub
- Stottesdon CofE Primary School
- TDMS (The De Montfort School)
- Any other schools or organisations that may join the Trust from time to time and not listed above.

The terms Academy, School, Organisation and Trust are considered interchangeable in the context of all Trust policies.

Where appropriate, in this Policy the term:

"CEO" includes the Chief Executive Officer

"CFOO" includes the Chief Financial Officer

"Trust Senior Leadership Team" includes Executive Headteachers, Headteachers, strategic operational leads and Teaching School/SCITT Directors.

"Headteacher" includes the appropriate School Headteacher.

"Trustees or Trust Board" are appointed Trustees who oversee the business of Four Stones Gateway Trust, agreeing the overarching strategic direction and ensuring robust governance.

"Local Academy Boards (LAB)" are appointed Governors at a local level associated with the Trust's Worcestershire Schools. LAB Governors act as advocates for their school's Safeguarding, SEND, Standards and Stakeholder engagement.

"Local Governing Bodies (LGB)" are appointed Governors at a local level associated with the Trust's Shropshire Schools. LGB Governors are advocates for their school's Safeguarding, SEND, Standards and Stakeholder engagement.

"Chair" responsible for leading the board and ensuring its effectiveness.

"Stakeholders" are any individuals or companies who are invested in the welfare and success of the Trust and/or School and its students, including staff members, students, parents, community members, LAB, LGB or Trust members, trade unions, local business leaders etc.

Context
Malpractice refers to any deliberate act or practice which compromises, or threatens to compromise the process and integrity of assessment, and as a result the validity of the result or certificate awarded. Maladministration is essentially any activity or practice which results in non-compliance with the examination body administrative regulations and requirements. Assessment processes and outcomes can also be put at risk through maladministration; whilst malpractice is a deliberate act, maladministration may be accidental or a result of incompetence or a simple mistake.

The purpose of this Policy is to reduce the risk of malpractice and/or maladministration by:
- increasing awareness and understanding of the actions that constitute malpractice and/or maladministration by students, teachers, trainers, and other staff
- reducing the risk of breach of regulations through ignorance
- aiding detection of any irregularities
- explaining how students and staff will be made aware of this Policy
- identifying strategies to be employed to minimize risk of student malpractice
- describing how instances of alleged malpractice will be dealt with

Lacon Childe School will not tolerate actions (or attempted actions) of malpractice by staff or students. The school is committed to investigating all cases of suspected malpractice. Where cases of suspected malpractice are proven, the school is fully committed to take appropriate action, including applying punitive measures and reporting suspected malpractice in order to maintain the integrity of assessment and certification. All staff have a professional duty to ensure that they uphold this Policy. Whilst the Policy sets out general principles in addition staff must also ensure that they abide by the specific assessment requirements for each course as laid down by the awarding organisation for each subject specification.

Examples of Student Malpractice
This list below is not exhaustive and the school at its discretion may consider other instances of malpractice.
- 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 ICT to aid the copying)
- allowing work to be copied e.g. posting written coursework on social media sites prior to examination and assessment
- 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
- 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 (including the internet and artificial intelligence tools)
- bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material, for example: notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited), instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries, reading pens, translators, wordlists, glossaries, iPods, mobile phones, smart glasses, MP3 players, pagers or other similar electronic devices and watches.

- behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination

Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Assessments:
This guidance is in accordance with the JCQ publication AI use in assessments. 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) for General Qualifications, coursework and internal assessments.

As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/ general-regulations), students must submit work for assessments which is their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words and is not copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work. Students are expected to demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding as required for the qualification in question and set out in the qualification specification. This includes demonstrating their performance in relation to the assessment objectives for the subject relevant to the question/s or other tasks students have been set. Any use of AI which means students have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice.

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.

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice).

Examples of Staff Malpractice
This list below is not exhaustive and the school at its discretion may consider other instances of malpractice. A more comprehensive list including examples of maladministration is provided in the Appendix at the back of this Policy.
- improper assistance to candidates
- inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made
- failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure
- assisting students in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves producing work for the student
- producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the student has not generated
- allowing evidence to be included for assessment which is known by the staff member not to be the student's own
- facilitating and allowing impersonation
- misusing the conditions for special student requirements
- falsifying records/certificates, for example alteration, substitution, or by fraud
- fraudulent certificate claims, which is claiming for a certificate prior to the student completing all the requirements of assessment.

Actions to Implement the Policy

Informing Students
The school will communicate to students through the following means:

- Key Stage 4 coursework and controlled assessment pack, including the JCQ document 'Information for Students' issued to students when appropriate.
- Assemblies and tutor time dedicated to informing students on regulations and malpractice
- Teachers have responsibility for ensuring that students are made aware of the Policy and examples of malpractice before undertaking any assessed work which has the potential to contribute to the awarding of a qualification
- Students and centre staff are made aware of the risks of using AI and are made clear on what constitutes malpractice
- Students are taught how to acknowledge sources, quote and reference properly.
    - For books: author, title, place of publication, publisher, and publication year.
    - For articles: author, title of article, title of journal, volume, issue, date, page numbers, and doi or permalink.
    - For web page resources: author, title of page, Web address or URL, and date of access.
    - For AI sources: the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated.
- Teachers and assessors receive training to increase their familiarity with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools.
- Students sign a declaration to say that they have read and understand the appropriate JCQ *Information for Candidates* (*https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents*).
- Students sign an additional declaration to confirm the work they are submitting is their own.

Procedure for Dealing with Suspected Malpractice

Reporting Suspected Malpractice

All staff in school have a responsibility for reporting any suspected incidences of staff or student malpractice through the appropriate channels. Students will be made aware of the procedure for reporting any allegations of suspected malpractice at the start of Year 10. In addition, allegations of suspected malpractice may be made by external moderators, verifiers, examiners and reported to the school via the awarding organisation. Allegations of suspected staff/student malpractice must be made to the head of centre. All staff in school have a responsibility to ensure that any allegations made to them in their professional capacity are taken seriously and reported to the head of centre. The school will consider allegations that are made verbally but will request in all cases that allegations are put in writing with any supporting evidence that is available. The school accepts the responsibility to report any suspicion of student or staff assessment malpractice to the appropriate awarding body. The only exception to this relates to assessment malpractice in coursework or controlled assessment which is discovered prior to the student signing the declaration of authentication. In these circumstances the incident need not be reported to awarding bodies, but will be dealt with in accordance with the school's behaviour Policy and protocols. Any work which is not the students own will not be given credit. In addition, a note will be added to the cover sheet to detail any assistance that has been given. In all other instances of suspected malpractice, the school will submit the fullest details of the case at the earliest opportunity to the relevant awarding body as per Joint Council of Qualification (JCQ) regulations.

Investigation of Suspected Malpractice

The school will investigate any instances of 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.

Appendix

Examples of Malpractice[1]

This more detailed list of examples of malpractice by staff and students has been drawn from the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments*. These lists are not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by the school at its discretion.

Candidate Malpractice

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 or supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments
- collusion: working collaboratively with the other candidates, beyond what is permitted
- copying from another candidate (including the use of ICT to aid the copying)
- allowing work to be copied e.g. posting written coursework on social media sites prior to an examination/assessment
- the deliberate destruction in the examination room or during an assessment session (including the use of offensive language)
- 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 attempting 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, 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 the published sources or incomplete referencing (including the internet and artificial intelligence tools)
- theft of another candidates' work
- bringing unauthorised material into the examination room either prior to or during the examination. Examples of unauthorised materials are: 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, watches, iPod, iwatches, mobile phones, smart glasses, MP3/4 players, pagers or other similar electronic devices
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick, 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

Staff Malpractice - 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 include:

[1] JCQ Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policy and Procedures

- 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 publication instructions for conducting examinations
- 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)
- releasing candidates early from a timetabled assessment (e.g. before 10 am for a morning examination)
- 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 e.g. 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 dispatching to the awarding body/examiner/moderator (this would additionally include reading a candidates' script or photocopying a candidates' scripts prior to dispatch to the awarding body/examiner. The only instance where photocopying a candidates' script is permissible is where he/she has been granted a transcript)
- failing to keep a candidates' computer file which contain controlled assessments or coursework secure ▪ 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 standard
- 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)
- breaching the published arrangements for the release of examination results;
- substituting one candidate's-controlled assessment or coursework for another
- providing misleading or inaccurate information to an awarding body, candidates and/or parents. ▪ not declaring conflict of interests.

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 promoting 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, 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

Maladministration

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 a candidates' coursework or work to be completed under controlled conditions is adequately monitored and supervised
- failure, on the part of the head of centre, to adhere to awarding body specification requirements in the delivery of non-examination assessments, Endorsements and other projects required as part of qualification. These include the GCSE Computer Science Programming Project, GCSE English

Language Spoken Language Endorsement and/or the GCE A-level Biology, Chemistry, Geology and Physics Practical skills endorsement.

- inappropriate members of staff assessing candidates for access arrangements who do not meet the criteria as detailed within JCQ publication 'Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments' ▪ failure to use current assignments for assessments
- failure to train invigilators adequately, leading to non-compliance with JCQ publication 'Instructions for Conducting Examinations'
- failing to issue to candidates the appropriate notices or warnings, e.g. JCQ Information for Candidates documents
- failure to inform 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 publication '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)
- failing to remind candidates that any mobile phone or other unauthorised items found in their possession must be handed to the invigilator prior to the examination starting
- failure to invigilate examinations in accordance with the JCQ publication 'Instructions for Conducting Examinations'
- failure to keep accurate records in relation to very late arrivals and overnight supervision arrangements
- failure to keep accurate and up to date records in respect of access arrangements and granting access arrangements to candidates who do not meet the requirements of the JCQ publication 'Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments."
- granting access arrangements to candidates where prior approval has not been obtained
- failure to effectively supervise the printing of computer-based assignments when this is required
- failing to retain candidates'-controlled assessments or coursework in secure conditions after the authentication statements have been signed or the work has been marked
- failing to maintain the security of candidate scripts prior to dispatch to the awarding body or examiner;
- failing to dispatch candidate scripts/controlled assessments/coursework to the awarding bodies, examiners or moderators in a timely way
- failing to notify the appropriate awarding body of an instance of suspected malpractice in examinations or assessments as soon as possible after such an instance occurs or is discovered
- failing to conduct a thorough investigation into suspected examination or assessment malpractice when asked to do so by an awarding body
- breaching the published arrangements for the release of examination results
- the inappropriate retention or destruction of certificates
- failing to recruit learners with integrity, including the recruitment of learners who have not met the qualification's minimum entry requirements whatever stipulated and/or the recruitment of learners who are unable or otherwise unlikely to complete the qualification.