



Malpractice, Maladministration and Plagiarism Policy



Policy	Malpractice, Maladministration and Plagiarism Policy
Date of review	December 2025
Date of next review	December 2026
Lead professional	The Exams Officer
Status	Non-Statutory

Note: This policy is part of a suite of policies which include the:

1. Examination Policy, which includes emergency evacuation protocols
2. Non-Examination Policy
3. Examination Contingency Plan
4. Malpractice, Maladministration and Plagiarism Policy

1. Purpose of policy and guiding principles

- 1.1. Trinity Multi- Academy Trust is committed to consistent, valid and reliable assessment that meets the requirements of regulatory bodies such as Ofqual and awarding organisations.

2. Summary

- 2.1. This Malpractice, Maladministration and Plagiarism Policy covers the assessment of all learners, whether assessed internally or by examinations and is derived from regulatory body requirements. Malpractice and maladministration can involve both learners and members of staff.
- 2.2. Further information on malpractice can be access in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures - https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/Malpractice_Sep25_FINAL.pdf
- 2.3. The Principal in each academy will:
 - Ensure all staff members know and follow this policy and associated guidance
 - Include statements on malpractice and maladministration through the student and/or staff disciplinary procedures
 - Tell candidates about the Malpractice and Maladministration Policy, making clear that plagiarism is regarded as malpractice and will be dealt with accordingly
 - Explain to candidates what plagiarism and collusion are, at the start of each course
 - Teach candidates how to avoid plagiarism, for example, citation, referencing etc
 - Ensure staff make clear the extent to which learners can collaborate on assessed work.

3. Centre staff malpractice

- 3.1. 'Centre staff malpractice' means:
 - Malpractice committed by a member of staff or contractor (whether employed under a contract of employment or a contract for services) at a centre; or
 - An individual appointed in another capacity by a centre such as an invigilator, an oral language modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader, a scribe or a Sign Language interpreter.
- 3.2. Examples of centre staff malpractice are set out below. These examples are not an exhaustive list and as such do not limit the scope of the definitions set out in this document. Other instances of malpractice may be identified and considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion.
- 3.3. 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 which contain controlled assessments or coursework secure.

3.4. Deception

Any act of dishonesty in relation to an examination or assessment, but not limited to:

- 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.

3.5. 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.

4. Candidate malpractice

- 4.1. 'Candidate malpractice' means malpractice by a candidate in the course of any examination or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments or coursework, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the writing of any examination paper.
- 4.2. Examples of candidate malpractice are set out below. These examples are not an exhaustive list and as such do not limit the scope of the definitions set out in this document. Other instances of malpractice may be considered by the awarding bodies at their discretion.
- 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
 - 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, MP3/4 players, pagers or other similar electronic devices, wrist watches.
 - The unauthorised use of a memory stick where a candidate uses a word processor
 - Behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination.
- 4.3. Malpractice by a candidate in a coursework or controlled assessment component of a specification discovered prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication need not be reported to the awarding body, but must be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures.
- 4.4. If a candidate's work is rejected by a staff member on the grounds of malpractice, details on how this can be appealed are included in the NEA policy.
- 4.5. If irregularities in coursework are identified by a centre after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, the Head of Centre must submit full details of the case to the relevant awarding body at the earliest opportunity.

- 4.6. Centres should not normally give credit for any work submitted which is not the candidate's own work. If any assistance has been given, a note must be made of this on the cover sheet of the candidate's work or other appropriate place.
- 4.7. Informing and advising candidates how to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments:
 - JCQ Information for Candidates and other associated documents are posted on the academy website and the link (as well as the document itself) is emailed to all candidates, advising that they must read the documents.
 - JCQ *Warning to Candidates* and *Unauthorised Items* posters are displayed outside each exam room.
 - JCQ regulations are followed during all trial examinations. Instances of student malpractice are reported during trial examinations as they would during an external examination season. Students are spoken to individually to advise of the implications and parents/carers are also informed of student malpractice and the implications.
 - Students are given information on malpractice during whole school assemblies.

5. Reporting Malpractice

- 5.1. All staff have a responsibility for reporting any potential malpractice that they may identify.
- 5.2. Any incidents of malpractice should be reported to the Exams Officer, as soon as the suspected malpractice is identified, who will then speak to the Head of Centre to make appropriate investigations.
- 5.3. Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body
 - The head of centre will notify the appropriate awarding body as soon as possible of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice (both candidate malpractice and suspected staff or centre 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.
 - 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.
 - Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication does 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.

- If, in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence to implicate an individual in malpractice, that individual (the candidate or the member of staff) will be informed of the rights of accused individuals.
- Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed informationgatherer) 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.
- 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.

6. Plagiarism

6.1. Plagiarism involves taking someone else's words, thoughts or ideas and trying to pass them off as your own. It is a form of cheating which is taken very seriously. There are many ways to detect plagiarism.

- Markers can spot changes in the style of writing and use of language
- Markers are highly experienced subject specialists who are very familiar with work on the topic concerned - they may have read the source you are using (or even marked the essay you have copied from)
- Internet search engines and specialised computer software can be used to match phrases or pieces of text with original sources and to detect changes in the grammar and style of writing or punctuation.
- Teachers receive guidance and CPD to assist them in assuring the work they accept for assessment is authentically the students' own work.

6.2. Dealing with Plagiarism

Where this is suspected, an initial informal discussion should be held with the candidate. It may be that the candidate has misunderstood the brief and acted in error, for example, failing to reference the sources appropriately. In such cases the assessor should:

- Make sure the candidate is aware of the serious consequences of plagiarism
- Arrange for the candidate to re-submit the assessment following an appropriate revision of referencing etc
- Record the outcomes of the discussion in the student file.

If the initial discussion fails to lead to a satisfactory outcome, the case must be investigated and dealt with through the disciplinary process.

7. AI Misuse and Malpractice

- 7.1. AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications.
- 7.2. 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/exams-office/general-regulations/>), all work submitted for qualification assessments must be the students' own.
- 7.3. Students are made aware of appropriate use of AI and AI misuse through a range of means, including sharing key JCQ information sheets.
- 7.4. AI tools must only be used when the conditions of the assessment permit the use of the internet and where the student is able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.
- 7.5. Students who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment (primarily in relation to Non-Examined Assessments - NEAs - for General Qualifications, coursework and internal assessments) is not their own will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations, and may attract severe sanctions;
- 7.6. Students and academy staff should be aware of the risks of using AI and are clear on what constitutes malpractice;
- 7.7. 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.
- 7.8. Students should be clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and that they know how to do this. Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments. If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.
- 7.9. Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2023. The student 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 it has been used. This must be submitted with the work so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used.

- 7.10. 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).
- 7.11. 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. There is a list of potential indicators of AI use referenced in the *Identifying Misuse* section of the JCQ Guidance entitled *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*.
- 7.12. Teachers, assessors and other appropriate centre staff are made aware of appropriate use of AI and their role in managing the risk of AI misuse by an annual dissemination of the key guidance, including the JCQ AI information sheet for teachers and JCQ AI senior leader presentation for teachers.
- 7.13. For more detailed guidance on the use of AI in assessments, please reference the JCQ Guidance for Teachers & Assessors *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*.