St Louis Grammar School

Kilkeel

Examinations Malpractice Policy

Date of Policy: September 2023
Last Reviewed: September 2026
Reviewed by: Mr E McGlue
Date of Review: September 2027

1.0 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 the St Louis Grammar School Examination and BTEC policy. St Louis Grammar School believes malpractice is deemed to be 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, means 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 take action 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: 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 Examination Centres the school has in place the following Team:

- **Headteacher (Mr K Martin)**
- **Vice Principal and Examinations Officer (Mr E McGlue)**
- **Data Manager (Mr T Brown)**
- **SENCo (Mrs C Rogers)**
- **Year Heads**
- **Subject Leaders (responsible for supplying accurate candidate examination entries)**

2.0 Response to allegations of suspected malpractice

St Louis Grammar School investigates allegations of malpractice swiftly and thoroughly. Such investigation would be led by the Head of Centre (Headteacher) 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 our school adheres to these:

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 nonexamination 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 malpractice/maladministration involving centre staff) to notify the awarding body/bodies whose qualifications are involved in an incident of malpractice. Each form is available from the JCQ website http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice Malpractice - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications Notifications in letter format will be accepted providing the information given covers the same points as Form JCQ/M1 or JCQ/M2a;

• 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.

3.0 Definitions of Malpractice:
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.

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 personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited), personal stereos, mobile phones or other similar devices and watches.
• 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.
• Theft of another's work.

• The deliberate destruction of another's work.
• The alteration of any results documents, including certificates.

Procedures for informing candidates of Awarding Bodies' regulations
All candidates receive a copy of the Awarding Bodies' regulations regarding coursework and examinations. 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.

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 that are kept at the front of the exam room until the end of the exam.

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.

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. 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.

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 Centre.
• 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.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a serious offence in the context of examinations. Advice will always be given to pupils that:
• Plagiarism is using others' ideas and words without clearly acknowledging the source of that information. It is very important that you give credit where it is due.
• How can students avoid plagiarism?
• To avoid plagiarism, you must give credit whenever you use: o another person's idea, opinion or theory o any facts, statistics, graphs, drawings – any pieces of information that o are not common knowledge o quotations of another person's actual spoken or written words o paraphrase of another person's spoken or written words. Plagiarism and the World Wide Web

• The World Wide Web has become a more popular source of information for student papers, and many questions have arisen about how to avoid plagiarising these sources. In most cases, the same rules apply as to a printed source: when a writer must refer to ideas or a quote from a website, they must cite that source.
• If a writer wants to use visual information from a website, many of the same rules apply. Copying visual information or graphics from a website (or from a printed source) is very similar to quoting information, and the source of the visual information or graphic must be cited. These rules also apply to other uses of textual or visual information from websites – for example, if a student is constructing a web page as a class project, and copies graphics or visual from other sites, they must also provide details about the source of this information. In this case, it might be a good idea to obtain permission from the website's owner before using the graphics.

Strategies for Avoiding Plagiarism
• Put in quotations everything that comes directly from the text, especially when taking notes.
• Paraphrase, but make sure you are not just rearranging or replacing a few words. Read over what you want to paraphrase carefully: cover up the text with your hand, or close the text so you cannot see any of it (and so are not tempted to use the text as a 'guide'). Write out the idea in your own words without peeking.
• Check your paraphrase against the original text to be sure you have not accidentally used the same phrases or words, and that the information is accurate.
• Using someone else's ideas, but putting them in your own words. This is probably the skill you will use most when incorporating sources into your writing. Although you use your own words to paraphrase, you must still acknowledge the source of the information

Increased focus on meeting deadlines
This year, you'll see there is an increased focus on the importance of meeting awarding body deadlines. Not meeting deadlines puts students at risk of not receiving their results on results day. This can have a significant impact on students and their progression. Therefore, missing deadlines is now highlighted as a specific example of malpractice within the booklet and centres must have robust procedures in place to make sure they're met.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use in Assessments
While the potential for student artificial intelligence (AI) misuse is new, most of the ways to prevent its misuse and mitigate the associated risks are not; centres will already have established measures in place to ensure that students are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice.
The JCQ guidance reminds teachers and assessors of best practice in this area, applying it in the context of AI use.
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, all work submitted for qualification assessments must be the students' own;
• Students who misuse Artificial Intelligence (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:

• Students and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice: • Students 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 student 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 contained in the guidance here);
• Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the students' 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 student 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.

AI tools must only be used when the conditions of the assessment permit the use of the internet and where the learner is able to demonstrate that the work is their own.
According to JCQ (2023) some examples of AI misuse include:
• copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work 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.
How can we support learners to use AI effectively and appropriately?
• Effective Referencing – Acknowledging the use of AI is crucially important in upholding the integrity of the qualification and assessment. For guidance to share with learners please see page 5 of the JCQ Guidance for Teachers and Assessors found here. This would be a useful addition to explore during the learner induction and throughout the learner's study programme.
• AI could be selectively integrated so that students are able to reflect on appropriate uses and connect their reflections to learning competencies.
• Ensure student understanding in how they will be graded – Inviting students to collaboratively establish learning goals and criteria for the task, whilst considering the role of AI, will help students to evaluate the appropriate contexts with which AI could be used as a learning tool. Some examples of this can be found below: o Assessing Student Proficiency – AI can provide diagnostic assessments to help determine strengths and developments in a learner's knowledge base. As a result, AI can then prompt learners to focus on specific learning materials best suited for their skills level and gaps in knowledge. o Adaptive Learning Pathways – AI algorithms can help to create personalised learning pathways i.e., to develop a well-rounded learning pathway, and AI system could recommend learning tools that are visual in nature (infographics, videos) as well as text-based learning tools (article reviews).

o Real Time Feedback – AI can provide real time feedback on student performance. Thus, allowing learners to understand where they are making mistakes and provide support in how to correct them.

o Collaborative Learning Environments – AI can be used to create collaborative digital environments, meaning students can work together. AI can then act as a moderator, suggesting resources that are required, assisting with project management, and evaluating performance. Students can then understand how AI can facilitate developments in their own collaborative learning environments.
• Reconsider the contexts of assessment – Good assessment practice will invite students to present their work in different formats (discussion, presentations, video articulation etc). A question to consider here: Are there other authentic ways of assessing student learning? # The most important thing you can do is contribute to a culture in which learners do not consider plagiarism an option.

You should:
• develop clear policies and procedures re plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct.
• explain at induction what is meant by 'plagiarism' and how it will be monitored and policed.
• explain, at an early stage of the course, the concepts of individual ownership of ideas and words, the ownership of electronic material and the difference between 'intellectual property' and 'common knowledge'.
• provide instruction in study skills, research skills, writing skills, time management skills and the use of a suitable referencing system to record and cite sources correctly.
• insist upon the use of referencing bibliographies from day one.
• act as a team, with every Assessor rigorously applying centre policies on referencing and bibliographies.
• avoid the use of highly generic assignments and, instead, produce contextualised tasks that require the learner to research in depth and individually analyse and evaluate their findings.
• include an authenticity statement with every assignment: learners must sign and date the authenticity statement to acknowledge that the work produced is their own and that they understand the penalties that will be imposed on learners who do submit plagiarised work.
• provide learners with opportunities to discuss any problems they may encounter, support them at each step and provide them with the resources they need to do the work properly.
• ensure that learners are not overloaded by providing them with an assessment schedule, agreed by all the course team, and then ensure that the team adheres to the schedule. # The expertise of individual Assessors is the best safeguard against plagiarism, supported by appropriate technology where available.

Check learner work for:
• the use of unfamiliar words
• grammar and syntax of a standard far higher than that demonstrated previously. • a discontinuous rise in the quality and accuracy of the learner's work
• the use of texts familiar to the Assessor, but without appropriate referencing
• the use of American spellings and unfamiliar product names.

You might also:
• build a spoken element into the assessment process, wherever appropriate, to check on understanding (e.g., viva voce, presentation with questions)
• ask learners to elaborate on suspect passages within their work.
• type a few selected phrases into a search engine such as Google: simple but effective.

• employ a sophisticated electronic plagiarism detection device such as 'Turnitin' or through 'Google Classroom Originality Reports' or other platforms you may use.
• familiarise yourself with the more widely used 'essay banks/ghost writing services' to be found on the internet.
• pay particular attention to those learners who perform well in coursework but much less well in examinations and tests.
• share concerns with colleagues. If everyone has the same suspicions about a particular learner, it will seem appropriate to apply rigorous checks to all their work.

From Exam Policy:
St Louis follows the guidance from JCQ:

Summary of the document for heads of centre:

- Ensure policies and procedures are in place to monitor and authenticate students' work, addressing AI misuse.
- Maintain a malpractice policy that covers AI use, including guidelines on when AI may be used and how it should be acknowledged.
- Regularly review and update policies to reflect AI developments and associated risks.
- Ensure staff are trained to identify AI misuse.
- Communicate with parents about AI-related risks and the importance of students' work being their own.
- Ensure students are aware of the consequences of AI misuse, including potential disqualification.
- Ensure students understand their declaration of authenticity and the penalties for false declarations.
- Have a process for addressing AI misuse within the centre before declarations of authenticity are made.
- Ensure teachers do not rely solely on AI tools for marking student work.
- Ensure students using computers for assessments cannot access AI tools if prohibited.

JCQ updated **updated document** is followed at all times.