MALPRACTICE POLICY (EXAMS)

The Kimberley School

MALPRACTICE POLICY (EXAMS)

Centre name	The Kimberley School
Centre number	28220
Date policy first created	18/11/2024
Current policy approved by	Andrew Park
Current policy reviewed by	Andrew Park
Date of review	01/10/2025
Date of next review	01/10/2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name
Head of centre	Andrew Park
Senior leader(s)	Andrew Park, Jonathan Saunders, Claire Bruce, Danny Knapczyk, James Clegg, Ann Lawrence, Jo Clemmet
Exams officer	Helen Bullock
Other staff (if applicable)	Paul Thomas

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at The Kimberley School 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 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 body 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 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 (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 The Kimberley School:

This policy covers all qualifications delivered by the school and its purpose is to ensure that all staff and students:

- are aware of what constitutes malpractice;

- understand how to prevent it occurring so that they can actively take steps to prevent it
- where malpractice does occur, take prompt action to report it.
- This policy outlines how students are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments, and how suspected malpractice issues should be escalated within the school and reported to the relevant awarding body.
- It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the exam processes to read, understand and implement the policy.
- The Malpractice Policy will be reviewed annually by the Head of Centre, Deputy Headteacher in charge of examinations and the Exams Officer.
- This policy covers all forms of assessment, including exams and non-exam assessment taken as part of students' GCSE, A-level and vocational qualifications.

General principles

In accordance with the regulations The Kimberley 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

The Kimberley 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 JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance:
- General Regulations for Approved Centres 2025-2026
- Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2025-2026
- Instructions for conducting coursework 2025-2026
- Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2025-2026
- Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2025-2026
- A guide to the special consideration process 2025-2026
- Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2025-2026 (this document)
- Plagiarism in Assessments
- AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications

- Post Results Services June 2025 and November 2025
- A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2025-2026
- Guidance for centres on cyber security

(SMPP 3.2)

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

Students are informed about malpractice, how to avoid committing malpractice (including plagiarism and misuse of Artificial Intelligence) and what steps to take if they suspect malpractice has been committed through an annual Year 11/13 assembly; and are also provided with an electronic copy of the current JCQ document *Information for candidates: Non-examination assessments* . (Parents/Carers are also sent this)

Reminders are sent to students in Year groups undertaking NEA / coursework again in January with an explicit reference to the fact they will need to sign a declaration that the work is their own and has not been plagiarised or created with the use of AI that hasn't been appropriately referenced.

A staff briefing for subject leaders providing information about NEA malpractice (including plagiarism and misuse of Artificial Intelligence) is held in the autumn term and staff are made aware of the importance of being able to authenticate students' work and the need to report any cases of suspected malpractice to SLT. Staff are also given time to read the Malpractice Policy during the autumn term and reminded of their responsibility for knowing the specific regulations relating to internal assessment for the qualifications in their subject(s) as well as general regulations about malpractice and plagiarism (including misuse of Artificial Intelligence). Staff are reminded that they must follow the guidance in the relevant JCQ documents pertinent to their NEA or coursework and any additional information in awarding body specifications.

Staff are reminded when marking the NEA / coursework, teachers must not give credit to any additional assistance given to candidates beyond that which is described in the awarding body's specification. Teachers must give details of any additional assistance on the appropriate record form(s). Examples would include:

- having reviewed the candidate's coursework, giving detailed advice and suggestions (either to individual candidates or to groups) as to how the work may be improved in order to meet the assessment criteria;
- giving detailed indications of errors or omissions which leave the candidate no opportunity for individual initiative;
- giving advice on specific improvements needed to meet the assessment criteria;
- providing writing frames specific to the coursework task (e.g. outlines, paragraph headings or section headings);
- intervening personally to improve the presentation or content of the coursework.

Before giving additional assistance beyond that which is described in the specification, teachers should ensure that there is provision to record this assistance and take account of it in the marking.

AI use in assessments

Use of AI Tools at The Kimberley School

AI tools, like ChatGPT, Google Bard/CoPilot and Snapchat My AI, are easy to access and many staff, students, and parents are familiar with them. The Kimberley School acknowledges that AI can be useful for learning, but it can also be misused for cheating and plagiarism.

Students are **not allowed** to use AI tools:

- During any type of assessment, including tests, exams, and coursework

- To complete homework or class assignments if they present the AI-generated text as their own work

Students are allowed to use AI tools:

- When specifically studying and discussing AI in lessons, such as in IT classes or art projects involving AI- generated images.
- All AI-generated content must be properly credited
- If candidates use an AI tool, they must keep a copy of the questions asked and the AI-generated responses, and submit this with their work

Staff should:

- Be aware that AI tools are still developing and may provide incorrect, inappropriate, or biased information
- Inform students about the risks of using AI tools and the importance of properly referencing AI to maintain the integrity of their work

Identifying misuse of AI in Assessments

Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques teachers are already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own. There are also some tools that may be used. These different methods are explored below:

Comparison with previous work

When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the student. Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions. Where the work is made up of writing, it is possible to make note of the following characteristics:

- Spelling and punctuation
- Grammatical usage
- Writing style and tone
- Vocabulary
- Complexity and coherency
- General understanding and working level
- The mode of production (i.e. whether handwritten or word-processed)

Potential indicators of AI misuse

If the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication the student has misused AI:

a) A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations.

b) A default use of language or vocabulary which may not accord with the qualification level (though be aware AI tools may be instructed to employ different languages, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content).

c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected (though some AI tools will produce quotations and references).

d) Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors).

e) A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which may be notable for some subjects.

f) Instances of incorrect and/or inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.

g) A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work.

h) A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended it.

i) A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected.

j) A lack of specific local or topical knowledge.

k) Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themself, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected.

l) The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output.

m) The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten.

n) 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 and variety or to overcome its output limit.

o) The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content.

p) Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.

Where there is suspected use of AI, the Centre may also use AI identifying programs / software to confirm this suspicion as part of a malpractice investigation.

For more information on the misuse of AI, refer to JCQ's *'AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications'*. Misuse of AI tools may be considered malpractice.

Candidates are also sent JCQ *Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and Assessments)*

Identification and reporting of malpractice

The JCQ Information for candidates documents (Coursework, Non-examination assessments, Social media) which are distributed to all candidates prior to relevant assessments taking place, inform candidates of the things they must and must not do when they are completing their work.

The JCQ *Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)* or similar centre document is issued to candidates prior to assessments taking place (and prior to a candidate signing the declaration of authentication which relates to their work).

The Kimberley School ensures that staff delivering/assessing coursework, internal assessments and/or non-examination assessments are aware of centre procedures relating to the authentication of learner work and have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting plagiarism (including AI misuse) and other potential candidate malpractice.

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 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.

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 to the awarding body.

If there are doubts about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or irregularities are identified in a candidate's work ***before*** the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication/authentication statement (where required) and malpractice is suspected, The Kimberley School will:

- follow the authentication procedures and/or malpractice instructions in the relevant JCQ document (*Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments*/ *Instructions for conducting coursework*) and any supplementary guidance that may be provided by the awarding body. Where this may lead to the decision to **not** accept the candidate's work for assessment or to reject a candidate's coursework on the grounds of malpractice, the affected candidate will be informed of the decision.

- When marking the NEA coursework, teachers must not give credit to any additional assistance given to candidates beyond that which is described in the awarding body's specification. Teachers must give details of any additional assistance on the appropriate record form(s). Examples would include:
- having reviewed the candidate's coursework, giving detailed advice and suggestions (either to individual candidates or to groups) as to how the work may be improved in order to meet the assessment criteria;
- giving detailed indications of errors or omissions which leave the candidate no opportunity for individual initiative;
- giving advice on specific improvements needed to meet the assessment criteria;
- providing writing frames specific to the coursework task (e.g. outlines, paragraph headings or section headings);

- intervening personally to improve the presentation or content of the coursework.

Before giving additional assistance beyond that which is described in the specification, teachers should **ensure that there is provision to record this assistance and take account of it in the marking.**

Appeals against the centre's internal decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice

If a candidate who is the subject of the decision disagrees with the decision:

- a written request, setting out as clearly and concisely as possible the grounds for the appeal including any further evidence relevant to supporting the appeal, should be submitted
- an **internal appeals form** should be completed and submitted within 5 calendar/working days of the decision being made know to the appellant

The appellant will be informed of the outcome of the appeal within 5 calendar/working days of the appeal being received and logged by the centre. The full details of how to request an appeal can be found in the centre's *25-26 Exams Internal Appeals Procedure Policy* on the school website.

Escalating suspected malpractice issues

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

- Suspected malpractice should be reported to the Exams Officer and/or Head of Centre
- Concerns regarding the Exams Officer should be reported to the Head of Centre
- Concerns about the Head of Centre should be reported to the Trust CEO.

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 document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (SMPP 4.1.3)
- 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 4.1.3)
- 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)
- 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 body. Instead, they will be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures.

  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 body. 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 investigator, 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 the accused individual informed of their rights and responsibilities (SMPP 5.33- 3.4)

- Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed information-gatherer) will submit a written report to the relevant awarding body summarising the information obtained and actions taken, accompanied by the information obtained during the course of their enquiries (5.35)
- Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used (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

The Kimberley 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 bodies' appeals processes**

Appendix A: Information for candidates: Non-examination assessments (Joint Council for Qualifications) https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/IFC-NE_Assessments_2025_FINAL.pdf

This document tells you about some things that you must and must not do when you are completing your work. When you submit your work for marking, the awarding body will normally require you to sign an authentication statement confirming that you have read and followed the regulations. If there is something that you do not understand, you must ask your teacher.

Preparing your work – good practice:

- If you receive help and guidance from someone other than your teacher, you must tell your teacher. They will then record the assistance given to you.
- If you worked as part of a group on an assignment, for example undertaking field research, you **must** write up your **own account** of the assignment. Even if the information you have is the same, you **must** describe in your own words how that information was obtained. **You must draw your own conclusions from the data.**
- You must meet the deadlines that your teacher gives you. Remember – your teachers are there to guide you. Although they cannot give you direct assistance, they can help you to sort out any problems before it is too late.
- Take care of your work and keep it safe. **Do not** leave it lying around where your classmates can find it. **Do not** share it with anyone, including posting it on social media.
- You must always keep your work secure and confidential. If it is stored on the computer network, keep your password secure. Collect all copies from the printer and destroy those you do not need.
- **Do not be tempted to use any prepared or generated online solutions and try to pass them off as your own work – this is cheating.** Electronic tools used by awarding bodies can detect this sort of copying.
- You **must not** write inappropriate, offensive or obscene material.

Research and using references:

- In some subjects you will have an opportunity to do some independent research into a topic.
- The research you do may involve looking for information in published sources, such as textbooks, encyclopedias, journals, TV, radio and on the internet.
- You can demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of a subject by using information from sources, or generated from sources, which may include the internet and AI. Remember, though, information from these sources may be incorrect or biased. You **must** take care how you use this material - you cannot copy it and claim it as your own work.
- Using information from published sources (including the internet) as the basis for your assignment is a good way to demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of a subject. You **must** take care how you use this material though – you **cannot copy it** and claim it as your own work.
- **The regulations state that: 'the work which you submit for assessment must be your own'; and 'you must not copy from someone else or allow another candidate to copy from you'.**
- When producing a piece of work, if you use the same wording as a published source, you must place quotation marks around the passage and state where it came from. This is known as referencing. You must make sure that you give detailed references for everything in your work which is not in your own words. A reference

from a printed book or journal should show the name of the author, the year of publication and the page number. For example: Morrison, 2000, p29.

- For material taken from the internet, your reference should show the date when the material was downloaded and **must** show the precise web page, not the search engine used to locate it. This can be copied from the address line. For example: http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/october/28/newsid_2621000/2621915.stm, downloaded 5th February 2026.
- Where computer-generated content has been used (such as an AI chatbot), your reference **must** show the name of the AI tool used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2026. You should also reference the sources used by the AI tool in generating the content.
- You must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how you used it. This must be submitted with your work for final assessment so that your teacher can review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used.
- You may be required to include a bibliography at the end of your piece of written work. Your teacher will tell you whether this is necessary. Where required, your bibliography **must** list the full details of publications you have used in your research, even where these are not directly referred to. For example: Curran, J. Mass Media and Society (Hodder Arnold, 2005)
- **If you copy the words, ideas or outputs of others and do not show your sources in references and a bibliography, this will be considered as cheating.**

Plagiarism:

Plagiarism involves taking someone else's words, thoughts, ideas or outputs and trying to pass them off as your own. It could also include AI-produced material. **Plagiarism is a form of cheating which is taken very seriously**.

Appendix B – Examples of Staff Malpractice

The following are examples of staff malpractice. This is not an exhaustive list. Other instances of malpractice may be identified and considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion.

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 involve:

- 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.
- Conducting an examination before the published date constitutes centre staff malpractice and a clear breach of security;
- 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.)
- 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 example, 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 despatch to the awarding body/examiner/moderator;
- (This would additionally include reading candidates' scripts or photocopying candidates' scripts prior to despatch to the awarding body/examiner. The only instance where photocopying a candidate's script is permissible is where he/she has been granted the use of a transcript.)
- failing to keep candidates' computer files secure which contain controlled assessments or coursework.

Deception

Any act of dishonesty in relation to an examination or assessment, but not limited to:
o 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 standards;
- 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);
- substituting one candidate's controlled assessment or coursework for another.

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 prompting 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, or

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. Failure to co-operate with an investigation
- failure to make available information reasonably requested by an awarding body in the course of an investigation, or in the course of deciding whether an investigation is necessary; and/or
- failure to investigate on request in accordance with the awarding body's instructions or advice; and/or
- failure to investigate or provide information according to agreed deadlines; and/or
- failure to report all suspicions of malpractice.

Appendix C – Examples of Learner Malpractice

The following are examples of learner malpractice. This is not an exhaustive list. Other instances of malpractice may be identified and considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion. 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 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 IT to aid the copying);
- allowing work to be copied e.g. posting written coursework on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment;
- the deliberate destruction of another candidate's work;
- 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;
- the misuse, or the attempted misuse, of examination and 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 published sources or incomplete referencing;
- theft of another candidate's work; For further information see Appendix E Plagiarism
- bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material, for example: 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, iPods, mobile phones, earphones/earbuds, Airpods, watches or other similar electronic devices;
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick or similar device where a candidate uses a word processor;
- behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.
- Improper use of AI

Appendix D – Examples of Maladministration

The following are examples of maladministration. This is not an exhaustive list. Other instances of maladministration may be identified and considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion.
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 candidates' coursework or work to be completed under controlled conditions is adequately monitored and supervised;
- inappropriate members of staff assessing candidates for access arrangements who do not meet the criteria as detailed within Chapter 7 of the JCQ publication Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments;
- failure to use current assignments for assessments;
- failure to train invigilators adequately, leading to non-compliance with the JCQ publication Instructions for conducting examinations;
- failing to issue to candidates the appropriate notices and warnings, e.g. JCQ Information for candidates documents;
- failure to inform the 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).