King's Academy Binfield
Malpractice Policy

Approved by:	Kerri-Anne Leavy (Executive Principal)	Date:	September 2025
Maintained by:	Sarah Farley (Exams Officer)	Next review due:	September 2026

Contents

1. Key staff involved in the policy

Head of Centre	Kerri-Anne Leavy (Executive Principal)
Senior Leaders	Stephanie Bendall (Vice Principal)
	Laura Taylor (Vice Principal)
	Tom Dean (Assistant Principal)
	Kate West (Assistant Principal)
	Jo Davis (Assistant Principal)
Exams Officer	Sarah Farley
Other key staff	Sarah Symes (Exams Assistant)

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at King's Academy Binfield is managed in accordance with current JCQ requirements and regulations.

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

2. Introduction

What is malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are related concepts, the common theme being that they involve a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This policy uses the term 'malpractice' to cover both malpractice and maladministration and refers to any act, default or practice which:

- is a breach of the Regulations, and/or
- is a breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered, and/or
- is 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 body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body 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 non-examination 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 or volunteer at a centre, or
- an individual appointed in another capacity by a centre such as an invigilator, reader, scribe, prompter, practical assistant, Communication Professional or Language Modifier (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 (SMPP 2).

3. Purpose

To confirm that King's Academy Binfield:

- has in place for inspection a written malpractice policy which is reviewed annually and covers all qualifications delivered by the centre

- details how candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations and assessments

- explains how suspected malpractice issues are escalated within the centre and reported to the relevant awarding body

- explicitly acknowledges the use of artificial intelligence (AI), including what AI is, when it may be used, how it should be acknowledged, the risks of misuse and how AI misuse will be treated as malpractice (GR 5.3)

4. General principles

In accordance with JCQ regulations, King's Academy Binfield will:

- take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of malpractice (including maladministration) before, during and after examinations and assessments (GR 5.11)
- inform the awarding body immediately of any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice or maladministration involving candidates or centre staff (GR 5.11)
- gather evidence of alleged or suspected malpractice in accordance with *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* and provide such information as required by the awarding body (GR 5.11)

5. Preventing malpractice

The centre has robust processes in place to prevent and identify malpractice, in line with section 3 of the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (SMPP 4.3).

All staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations are familiar with the requirements of the following JCQ documents and any additional 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
- Post-Results Services
- A Guide to the Awarding Bodies' Appeals Processes

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

King's Academy Binfield ensures that all candidates are informed and advised about malpractice, including the misuse of artificial intelligence (AI), and the consequences of malpractice.

Candidates are informed:

- at the start of their courses (Year 10 and Year 12) by subject teachers, who explain coursework, controlled assessment and non-examination assessment requirements, including authentication and plagiarism rules
- before each examination series through formal briefings delivered by the Exams Officer, supported by assemblies and written information
- immediately prior to examinations via invigilator announcements and displayed JCQ posters, including *Warning to Candidates* and *Unauthorised Items* notices
- before submitting coursework or NEA, where candidates sign a declaration confirming the work submitted is their own

Information is communicated through assemblies, subject lessons, written guidance, student handbooks, JCQ posters and candidate authentication statements.

Candidates are explicitly informed that malpractice includes plagiarism, collusion, possession of unauthorised materials, and misuse of AI, and that suspected malpractice may be reported to the awarding body and result in sanctions including disqualification.

7. Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in assessments

In accordance with JCQ regulations and guidance, candidates must submit work that is entirely their own.

Definition of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to computer-based tools and technologies that can generate content, provide suggestions, analyse information, or automate tasks that would normally require human intelligence. In an assessment context, this includes (but is not limited to) tools that generate written responses, images, code, calculations, summaries, translations, or feedback based on user prompts.

AI tools may only be used where:

- the conditions of the assessment explicitly permit internet use, and
- the candidate can demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and thinking

AI Misuse

AI misuse occurs when a candidate uses AI in a way that undermines the integrity of an assessment. This includes, but is not limited to:

• submitting AI-generated or AI-assisted content as their own work
• copying, paraphrasing or adapting AI-generated material without clear acknowledgement where permitted
• using AI to complete all or part of an assessment where its use is not explicitly allowed
• using AI in a way that replaces the candidate's own independent thinking, analysis or creativity

Any such use will be treated as malpractice and investigated in accordance with JCQ *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*.

Candidates are informed that:

- AI-generated content must not be copied, paraphrased or submitted as their own work
- any permitted use of AI must be clearly acknowledged where required by the awarding body or subject specification
- failure to acknowledge AI use, or reliance on AI that replaces independent work, will be treated as malpractice
- misuse of AI may compromise the validity of their assessment and result in sanctions up to and including disqualification.

Suspected AI misuse will be investigated in the same way as plagiarism and may be reported to the awarding body using Form JCQ/M1.

Staff awareness and responsibilities regarding AI

Teachers, assessors and other relevant centre staff are made aware of the appropriate use of AI and their role in managing the risk of AI misuse through:

• annual safeguarding and assessment compliance training
• regular updates from the Exams Officer on JCQ guidance relating to AI
• staff briefings prior to coursework and non-examination assessment windows
• access to current JCQ documentation, including *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*

Staff are responsible for:

• understanding when AI use is permitted or prohibited within their subject specifications
• advising candidates on acceptable use of AI
• remaining vigilant to indicators of AI misuse
• reporting any suspected AI misuse in line with this malpractice policy

8. Identification and internal handling of suspected malpractice

Any member of staff who becomes aware of suspected malpractice must report it immediately to the Exams Officer.

The Exams Officer will:

- secure and retain relevant evidence
- obtain written statements from staff and candidates where appropriate
- maintain a clear written record of the investigation

The Head of Centre (Kerri-Anne Leavy) will review all evidence and determine whether the suspected malpractice must be reported to the awarding body.

Where malpractice is identified prior to authentication of coursework or NEA, the matter may be dealt with internally in line with centre procedures. Any breach of confidential awarding body material will be reported immediately.

Recording improper assistance

Where improper assistance is identified, the centre will ensure that assessment records are updated to reflect the nature of the assistance provided and the action taken.

Records may include:

• annotations on candidate work
• internal investigation notes
• authentication records
• correspondence with the awarding body

All records will be retained securely in accordance with JCQ requirements and awarding body instructions, and will be made available for inspection if requested.

9. 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 JCQ documentation:

- Form JCQ/M1 – Candidate malpractice
- Form JCQ/M2 – Notification of suspected centre staff malpractice
- Form JCQ/M3 – Centre staff malpractice report

All investigations will be conducted in accordance with *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*. The centre will cooperate fully and provide all requested evidence.

Where a candidate involved is a child or an adult at risk, the parent/carer or appropriate adult will be kept informed of the progress of the investigation.

10. Communicating malpractice decisions

Once a decision has been made, the awarding body will inform the Head of Centre in writing. The Head of Centre will communicate the decision to the individuals concerned and advise them of any sanctions applied and their right to appeal.

11. Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

King's Academy Binfield will:

- provide individuals with information about the appeals process and relevant timescales
- follow the procedures outlined in the JCQ document *A Guide to the Awarding Bodies' Appeals Processes*

Internal appeals against centre decisions

Where a candidate's work has been rejected by the centre on the grounds of suspected malpractice prior to submission to the awarding body, the candidate has the right to appeal the decision internally.

Internal appeals must be submitted in writing to the Head of Centre within a reasonable timescale following notification of the decision.

The appeal will be reviewed by the Head of Centre, or a senior leader not previously involved in the decision, to ensure that the centre's procedures have been applied correctly and fairly.

The outcome of the internal appeal will be communicated in writing to the candidate.

Where malpractice has been reported to the awarding body, the awarding body's appeals process will apply, and the centre will follow the procedures outlined in the JCQ document *A Guide to the Awarding Bodies' Appeals Processes*.

12. Policy review

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure continued compliance with JCQ regulations and awarding body requirements.