URSULINE HIGH SCHOOL
Wimbledon

Malpractice Policy (General Examinations, T-level & Vocational)

September 2026

Malpractice

Centre name	Ursuline High School
Centre number	14527
Date policy first created	02/10/2023
Current policy approved by	Michelle Alexander
Current policy reviewed by	Tom Glavina
Date of review	24/09/2026
Date of next review	24/09/2027

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	**Name**
Head of centre	Eoin Kelly
Senior leader(s)	Tom Glavina Michelle Alexander Didier Adam
Exam Officer	Nick Creasey
Other staff (if applicable)	

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Ursuline High 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 nonexamination 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 Ursuline High 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 Ursuline High 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

Ursuline High 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:

.

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

Candidates have been informed via the student handbook emailed out in September and again in February after all entries are made. All the links to the JCQ information to candidates have been added to the student handbook.

.

AI use in assessments (and preventing AI misuse) appendix 1

Full JCQ AI use in assessments guidance is - AI-Use-in-Assessments_Sep26_v5.pdf.pdf

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.

Identification and reporting of malpractice appendix 2

All staff at Ursuline High 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)

.

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 (found in the UHS examination policy.

  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:

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:

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Ursuline 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 document **A guide to the awarding organisations' appeals processes** Additional information can be found in the UHS examinations policy.

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

This Policy is to be used in conjunction with the UHS examination policy.

Appendix 1

3. What is AI misuse by students?

In accordance with paragraph 5.3(k) 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 applies to both internal and private candidates.

Student work submitted for assessment must be in their own words and not copied or paraphrased from another source, such as an AI tool, and must reflect their own independent work. Students must 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.

The requirements for students are set out in the documents:

- ***JCQ Information for candidates – Non-examination assessments***
- ***JCQ Information for candidate – Coursework assessments***
- ***JCQ Information for candidates AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)***

Although AI is increasingly used in the workplace, students must develop and demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding when completing qualification assessments, rather than relying on AI.

Students must be able to demonstrate the final submission is the product of their own independent work and critical thinking.

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 AI-generated content such 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 fully acknowledge use of AI tools, including when they have been used in the preparation and production of work, as a source of information, guidance, planning or to structure the work.
- Failing to appropriately acknowledge the use of AI tools for spelling, punctuation and grammar.
- Using translation tools to translate work initially produced in a different language into English.

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 they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations may be found in 'Appendix A: AI misuse examples' at the end of this document.

Appendix 2

5. Acknowledging AI use

It is essential students are clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment and that they know how to do this. Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is also 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.

When students acknowledge their use of AI and explain clearly how they have used it, teachers and assessors can decide whether that use was appropriate in the context of the assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

It is important to note that not all use of AI tools produces output that is submitted as assessment content. Where a student has used AI to plan, structure or otherwise assist them in producing their content, they are expected to provide evidence of what AI outputs have been used in the production of submitted material (i.e. students will need to retain copies of the prompts they have given the AI tool and of what is has produced. See the excerpts from the *Instructions for Conducting Non Examination Assessment (vocational and technical qualifications)* below).

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information or guidance, student acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated. For example:

- GPT 5.5 (https://chatGPT.com) 01/07/2026
- Claude Opus 4.8 (Claude Desktop) 01/07/2026
- Grammarly (Microsoft Word) 01/07/2026

The student must retain a copy of the prompt(s) used and the AI-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. Where AI tools or agents modify student work directly, the student must also retain copies of the original work prior to any modification.

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. If this is not submitted, but 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 must take action to assure themselves the work is the student's own. Where the teacher/assessor cannot assure themselves, they must follow their centre's internal procedures and the published guidance for assessment.

Further guidance is set out in the *JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments* document (see link below).

- *Instructions for conducting coursework* **Coursework assessments – 2026-2027 – Joint Council for Qualifications)**
- *The Information for Candidates documents* **Non-examination assessments 2026-2027 – Joint Council for Qualifications**
- ***Information for candidates AI (Artifical Intelligence and assessments)***

The JCQ guidance for teachers on referencing may be found in the following:

- *Plagiarism in Assessments* (**https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/**)

Other actions which should be considered in relation to acknowledging AI use are:

a) Students are reminded that referencing, poor acknowledgement, paraphrasing or copying sections of text **from any source** may constitute malpractice and could attract severe sanctions, including disqualification. In the context of AI use, students must be clear what is and what is not acceptable in respect of acknowledging AI content and the use of AI sources. For example, it would be unacceptable to simply reference 'AI' or 'ChatGPT', just as it would be unacceptable to state 'Google' rather than the specific website and webpages which have been consulted;

b) Students are also reminded that, if they use AI and they have not independently met the marking criteria, they will not be rewarded. Examples of how to implement this can be found in 'Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work' at the end of this document.