SACRED HEART HIGH SCHOOL

MALPRACTIVE & AI POLICY

JANUARY 2026

To be reviewed January 2027

This Policy should be read in conjunction with all other Sacred Heart High School Policies

Contents

			Page
1	**INTRODUCTION**		3
2	**RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS OF SUSPECTED MALPRACTICE**		4
	2.1	Written Report	4
	2.2	The head of centre	4
3	**DEFINITIONS AND EXAMPLES OF MALPRACTICE**		5
	3.1	Centre staff malpractice	5
	3.2	Candidate Malpractice	5
4	**USE AND MANAGEMENT OF 'ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE' (AI)**		6
	4.1	Requirements	6
	4.2	AI Misuse	7
	4.3	Communication with Pupils	7
	4.4	Detection Measures	7
	4.5	Prevention Strategies	8
	4.6	Reporting and Investigation	9
	4.7	Consequences	9
5	**PROCEDURES FOR INFORMING CANDIDATES OF AWARDING BODIES' REGULATIONS**		9
	5.1	Website	9
	5.2	Public areas	9
	5.3	Verbal Announcements	9
	5.4	Throughout the year	10
6	**PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATING ALLEGED MALPRACTICE**		10
	6.1	Investigation by the school into alleged malpractice by candidates	10
	6.2	Investigation by the school into alleged malpractice by members of staff	10
	6.3	Reports	11
7	**Further information**		11
8	**RATIFICATION**		11

1 INTRODUCTION

This policy has been written in line with guidance from JCQ: Suspected Malpractice in Examinations

and Assessments: https://www.jcq.org.uk/exms-office/malpractice and should be read in conjunction with other Sacred Heart High School (SHHS) exam policies.

The school regards malpractice as those actions and practices which threaten the integrity of public examinations, and/or damage the authority of those responsible for conducting them.

JCQ define malpractice as: 'Malpractice', which includes maladministration and non-compliance with the regulations, meaning any act, default or practice which is a breach of the regulations or which:

- 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 body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre.
- Failure by a centre to notify, investigate and report to an awarding body all allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself.
- Also, failure to act as required by an awarding body, as detailed in this document, or to cooperate with an awarding body's investigation, constitutes malpractice.

JCQ also states that instances of malpractice arise for a variety of reasons:

- some incidents are intentional and aim to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment;
- some incidents arise due to ignorance of the regulations, carelessness or forgetfulness in applying the regulations;
- some occur as a direct result of the force of circumstances which are beyond the control of those involved (e.g. a fire alarm sounds and the exam is disrupted).

It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the centre's examinations process to read, understand and implement this policy. Members of staff involved with examinations should be fully conversant with all JCQ regulations and are recommended to consult the relevant documents.

To ensure internally and externally set examinations are carried out in accordance with JCQ Guidelines and meets the statutory responsibilities of registered examination centres, the school has in place the following team, who bear the main responsibility regarding the conduct of examinations (in addition to subject teaching staff and department heads):

- Head teacher (Named Head of Centre for Examinations)
- Assistant head teacher – Assessment and Exams
- Business manager – line manager of exams officer
- Exams officer

- SENDCo (oversight of Health and Care Plans and associated access arrangements)

2 RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS OF SUSPECTED MALPRACTICE

2.1 Written Report

Sacred Heart High School investigates allegations of malpractice swiftly and thoroughly. Such investigation would be led by the head of centre and a full written report of any case then submitted to the relevant examination board including:

- A statement of the facts; a detailed account of the circumstances of the alleged malpractice and detail of any investigation carried out by the centre
- The evidence relevant to the allegation; such as written statement(s) from the invigilator(s),
- assessor, internal verifier(s), or other staff who are involved
- Written statement(s) from the candidate(s)
- Any exculpatory evidence and/or mitigating factors
- Information about the school's procedures for advising candidates of examination board regulations
- Seating plans showing the exact position of candidates in the examination room
- Any unauthorised material found in the examination room
- Any of the candidate's work and associated material, e.g. relevant source material for coursework
- JCQ has its own policies and procedures for dealing with allegations of malpractice and the school adheres to these:

2.2 The head of centre

The head of centre must:

- Notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice. The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate. If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the head of centre must inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate(s)
- Complete Form JCQ/M1 (suspected candidate malpractice) or Form JCQ/M2a (suspected staff malpractice/maladministration) to notify the awarding body/bodies whose qualifications are involved in an incident of malpractice. Each form is available from the JCQ website.
- Supervise personally, and as directed by the awarding body, all investigations resulting from an allegation of malpractice unless the investigation is being led by the awarding body or another party;
- Ensure that if it is necessary to delegate an investigation to a senior member of centre staff, the senior member of centre staff chosen is

independent and not connected to the department or candidate involved in the suspected malpractice. The head of centre should ensure there is no conflict of interest which can otherwise compromise the investigation

- Respond speedily and openly to all requests for an investigation into an allegation of malpractice. This will be in the best interests of centre staff, candidates and any others involved
- Speedily and openly make available information as requested by an awarding body
- Co-operate and ensure their staff do so with an enquiry into an allegation of malpractice, whether the centre is directly involved in the case or not
- Inform staff members and candidates of their individual responsibilities and rights as set out in these guidelines
- Forward any awarding body correspondence and evidence to centre staff and/or provide staff contact information to enable the awarding body to do so
- Pass on to the individuals concerned any warnings or notifications of penalties, and ensure compliance with any requests made by the awarding body as a result of a malpractice case

3 DEFINITIONS AND EXAMPLES OF MALPRACTICE

3.1 Centre staff malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice by centre staff. The list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered and acted upon.

- Moving the time or date of a fixed examination (beyond that permitted) without notifying the relevant awarding body.
- Failing to keep examination papers secure prior to the examination.
- Obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination.
- Assisting candidates in the production of coursework, beyond that permitted by the regulations.
- Allowing candidates unsupervised access to coursework exemplar material, whether this is the work of former students or that provided by the awarding body.
- Failing to keep student computer files secure.
- Assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers.

3.2 Candidate Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates. The list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered and acted upon.

- Misuse of examination material.
- Behaving in such a way as to undermine the integrity of the examination.

- Failing to abide by the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor or the awarding body in relation to the examination rules and regulations.
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations.
- Disruptive behaviour in the examination room (including the use of offensive language).
- Introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room e.g. notes, study guides and electronic communication or data storage devices, watches, own blank paper, calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited), mobile phones or other similar devices.
- Introducing into the examination room notes in the wrong format (when notes are permitted) or incorrectly annotated texts (in open book examinations).
- Obtaining, receiving, exchanging or passing on information which could be examination related (or the attempt to) by means of talking or written paper/notes.
- Personation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another to take one's place in an examination.
- The inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts or coursework.
- Copying from another candidate (including the misuse of ICT to do so).
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates.
- Plagiarism: the failure to acknowledge sources properly and/or the submission of another person's work as if it were the candidate's own, including the use of AI without proper acknowledgement.
- Theft of another's work.
- The deliberate destruction of another's work.
- The alteration of any results documents, including certificates.

4 USE AND MANAGEMENT OF 'ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE' (AI)

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. This document is primarily intended to provide guidance in relation to these assessments.

4.1 Requirements

The guidance emphasises the following requirements:

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/examsoffice/general-regulations/), all work submitted for qualification assessments must be the pupil's own;

- Pupils who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations, and may attract severe sanctions;
- Pupils and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice;
- Pupils 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 pupil and they must understand that this will not allow them to demonstrate that they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded (please see the Acknowledging AI Use section below);
- Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the pupil's own (in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres); and where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of pupil 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.

4.2 AI Misuse

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 pupil'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 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.

4.3 Communication with Pupils

SHHS will clearly communicate the policy to pupils through course materials, exam instructions and regular class \ assembly briefings. We will emphasize the consequences of using unauthorised AI, such as disqualification, failure, or disciplinary action.

4.4 Detection Measures

Potential indicators of AI use

If you see the following in pupils' work, it may be an indication that they have misused AI:

- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations*
- A default use of language or vocabulary which might not appropriate to the qualification level*

- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected. Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
- A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects
- Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered
- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a pupil in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a pupil has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
- A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
- A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the pupil themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
- The inadvertent inclusion by pupils of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability.
- The submission of pupil work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
- The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth, variety or to overcome its output limit
- The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
- Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the pupil's usual style. Please be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages and levels of proficiency when generating content. However, some AI tools will produce quotations and references.

4.5 Prevention Strategies

Outline strategies for preventing unauthorised AI use, including:

- Invigilation during exams.
- Randomised question pools to discourage sharing.
- Automated detection from online programs such as 'Turnitin'
- Use of secure exam platforms with AI detection capabilities.
- Designing coursework assignments that require critical thinking and personalised responses.

4.6 Reporting and Investigation

If your suspicions are confirmed and the pupil has not signed the declaration of authentication, the centre doesn't need to report the malpractice to the appropriate awarding organisation. We can resolve the matter prior to the signing of the declarations.

Teachers must not accept work which is not the pupil's own. Ultimately the Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring that pupils do not submit inauthentic work.

If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation. The procedure is detailed in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/).

4.7 Consequences

If AI misuse is suspected by a teacher, or if it has been reported by a pupil or member of the public, it must be reported immediately. The relevant awarding body will liaise with the Head of Centre regarding the next steps of the investigation and how appropriate evidence will be obtained.

The awarding body will then consider the case and, if necessary, impose a sanction in line with JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (https://www.jcq. org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/). The sanctions applied to a pupil committing plagiarism and making a false declaration of authenticity range from a warning regarding future conduct to disqualification and the pupil being barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time.

Awarding organisations will also take action, which can include the imposition of sanctions, where centre staff are knowingly accepting, or failing to check, inauthentic work for qualification assessments.

5 PROCEDURES FOR INFORMING CANDIDATES OF AWARDING BODIES' REGULATIONS

5.1 Website

A copy of the JCQ and awarding bodies' regulations, as well as the school's guide for parents and candidates are available on the school website, and parents and candidates are directed to read these.

5.2 Public areas

During the course of the examination period, notices are displayed both in the area immediately outside the examination room and on display in the examination area.

5.3 Verbal Announcements

Before the beginning of every exam, candidates are given a verbal reinforcement of the awarding body's regulations. In addition, candidates are given the opportunity to hand in mobile phones and other prohibited items before the start of every exam. These are kept securely in a cupboard away from the exam room itself.

5.4 Throughout the year

Assemblies and registration periods are used to publicise exam body regulations, and teachers supervising NEAs specifically make pupils aware of regulations and issues around the use of AI.

6 PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATING ALLEGED MALPRACTICE

All cases of malpractice are reported to the examinations officer who will inform the head teacher/head of centre. The examinations officer will obtain written statements from those concerned, whether the malpractice is by members of staff or candidates.

6.1 Investigation by the school into alleged malpractice by candidates

The examinations officer will conduct a full enquiry into the malpractice in conjunction with the head teacher. If malpractice is deemed to have taken place then a full written report (using Form JCGQ/M/01 where appropriate) is submitted to the awarding body with supporting evidence.

- Candidates accused of malpractice are made fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice, and of the possible consequences should be malpractice be proven. The parents/guardians of the candidates are also notified - preferably in writing - of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences.
- Candidates accused of malpractice must be given the opportunity to respond (preferably in writing) to allegations made.
- Candidates accused of malpractice should be made aware of the avenues for appealing should a judgement be made against him or her. Full details of an awarding body's appeals procedure will be sent to the candidate and parents/guardians if the judgement goes against the candidate.
- The candidate and parents/guardians will be informed in writing of the outcome of the awarding body's decision.

6.2 Investigation by the school into alleged malpractice by members of staff

- Investigations into any case of malpractice or irregularities against a member of staff must normally be carried out in the first instance by the head teacher of the school, in conjunction with the awarding body.
- Investigations into alleged malpractice or irregularities against the head teacher must be carried out by the chair of the school's governing body, or the responsible employer, and reported to the awarding body when completed.
- Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must be made fully aware (preferably in writing) at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice, and the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.
- Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must have the opportunity to respond (preferably in writing) to allegations made.

- Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must be made aware of the avenues for appealing should a judgement go against him or her.
- When investigating serious cases or alleged staff malpractice, it may be necessary for a member of the awarding body staff to be present at an interview with the staff member concerned. The member of staff being interviewed may be accompanied by a friend or union representative.
- In accordance with the requirements of the Code of Practice and the Arrangements for the Statutory Regulation of External Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, a report on cases where members of staff are found to have committed malpractice, together with details of the action taken by the head teacher, the governing body or the responsible employer must be forwarded to the regulatory authorities and may be made available to other awarding bodies if the awarding body decides that the circumstances of the case are sufficiently serious to warrant such reports being made.

6.3 Reports

It is the responsibility of the head teacher, acting on behalf of the awarding body, to submit a full written report of an investigation and to provide the following where appropriate:

- A statement of the facts, a detailed account of the circumstances and details of any investigations carried out by the school.
- Written statement(s) from the invigilators or other staff concerned.
- Written statements from the candidate(s) concerned.
- Any mitigating factors (e.g. relevant medical reports).
- Information about the school's procedures for advising candidates of the awarding bodies' regulations.
- Seating plans.
- Unauthorised material found in the examination room.
- Any work of the candidate and any associated material (e.g. source material for coursework) which is relevant to the investigation.
- The form JCGQ/M/01 should be used as the basis of the report.

7 Further information

The JCQ website, and those of the awarding bodies, have further extensive advice and guidance on definitions of malpractice, and actions to take in suspected cases.

8 RATIFICATION

This policy has been approved and ratified by the Headteacher in January 2025. The policy will be reviewed for January 2026.

Mrs S O'Donovan
Headteacher