Examination Malpractice and Maladministration Policy 2026 - 2027

Centre Name	**Leigh Academy Tonbridge**
Centre Number	61663
Date policy first created	08/09/2026 (To be updated when ICE's finalised in Oct 2026)
Current policy approved by	Head of Centre
Current policy reviewed by	Head of Centre
Date of next review	28/09/2027

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	**Name**
Head of Centre	Michael Crow
Senior leader(s)	Jenny Gray,Patrick Bidder, Alison Jolliffe
Exams officer	Yue Xiu Wang
IBCP Coordinator	Ben Racher

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Leigh Academy Tonbridge is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

Reference in the 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**.

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 use 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. (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)

For International Baccalaureate Career-related Programme (IBCP)

All suspected malpractice within the IBCP framework must follow the strict reporting workflows dictated by the IBO Academic Honesty policy via IBIS.

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 Leigh Academy Tonbridge:

- 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 should be escalated within the centre and reported to the relevant awarding body (GR 5.3)

General principles

In accordance with the regulations Leigh Academy Tonbridge 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

Leigh Academy Tonbridge 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 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*;
- *Plagiarism in Assessments*;
- *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*;
- *A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2026-2027* (SMPP 3.3.1)

Informing and advising candidates

Before beginning a course, teachers advise students of what constitutes malpractice and its consequences.

AI

AI stands for Artificial Intelligence and its technology is rapidly evolving. Using it is like having a computer that thinks. AI tools like ChatGPT or Snapchat My AI can write text, make art and create music by learning from data from the internet.

AI is sometimes allowed in certain qualifications but it must be referenced stating the AI tool used, the date the content was generated and an explanation of how it was used.

AI can make things up and be biased.

If the declaration has been signed with AI used and it has not been referenced, this is malpractice.

As has always been the case, and in accordance with section **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 means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words, and isn't copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work.

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 sections of AI-generated content so 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 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/).** 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 malpractice

Definition of Malpractice by Centre Staff

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by the Academy at its discretion:

- Improper assistance to students.
- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made.
- Failure to keep candidate work/portfolios of evidence secure.
- Fraudulent claims for certificates.
- Assisting students in the production of work for the assessment where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment for example, where the assistance involves centre staff producing work for the learner.
- Allowing evidence which is known by the staff member not to be the student's own.
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation
- failing to provide reasonable adjustments where these have been approved such as having a scribe or a reader
- Falsifying records/certificates.
- Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the student completing all the requirements of assessment.

Definition of Malpractice by Students

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by the Academy at its discretion:

- Plagiarism of any nature.
- Collusion by working collaboratively with other students to produce work that is submitted as individual student work
- Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying).
- Using AI tools (without referencing)
- Deliberate destruction of another's work.
- Fabrication of results or evidence.
- False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework.
- Impersonation by pretending to be someone else to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination test

Possible consequences of malpractice

For centre staff and depending on the nature of the malpractice, this ranges from a warning to suspension.

For students and depending on the nature of the malpractice, this ranges from a warning to loss of certification.

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)

Any member of staff suspecting malpractice will report this to their Line Manager who will take this to a member of the Leadership Team who will then report it to the Head of Centre. If the malpractice is in regard to their immediate line manager, they can report this to the next in command. If it is the Head of Centre, they will report this to the Chair of Governors.

- Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre can report it using the appropriate channels (SMPP 4.3)

Any member of staff suspecting malpractice will report this to their Line Manager who will take this to a member of the Leadership Team who will then report it to the Head of Centre. If the malpractice is in regard to their immediate line manager, they can report this to the next in command. If it is the Head of Centre, they will report this to the Chair of Governors.

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)
- **For all International Baccalaureate Career-related Programme (IBCP) components (including DP course assessments and the Reflective Project), any suspected candidate or staff malpractice must be handled in strict accordance with the IBO Academic Integrity Policy. The IBCP Coordinator (Ben Racher) must immediately escalate all allegations via the IB Information System (IBIS), bypassing standard JCQ internal limits where the IBO mandate dictates.**
- 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)
- Once the information gathering has concluded, form JCQ/M2 must be used for both the initial notification and the submission of the final cross-examined centre report regarding staff investigations (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

Leigh Academy Tonbridge 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**