



PARTNER OF THE EVERYONE MATTERS SCHOOLS TRUST

Rainford High Assessment Malpractice Policy

Everyone Matters

We expect our community to be polite and respectful

Everyone Helps

We expect our community to make sensible choices

Everyone Succeeds

We expect our community to work hard

Policy Owner	Vice-Principal
Scope of the Policy	This policy applies to all teachers and students at Rainford High School
Last reviewed by trustees	June 2025
Next review due	June 2026
Summary of key changes	References to AI in accordance with JCQ update https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/



ASSESSMENT MALPRACTICE POLICY

1. Policy Statement

Malpractice consists of those acts which undermine the integrity and validity of assessment, the certification of qualifications and/or damage the authority of those responsible for conducting the assessment and certification. This refers to acts and omissions made by staff or students involved with the assessment process.

2. Scope

This policy and procedure relates to school staff malpractice and applies to all internal assessments, and internal and external examinations. Where awarding bodies have their own published procedures these will take precedent over the school policy.

3. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to set out the procedures to be followed in identifying and reporting malpractice by staff and/or candidates in relation to the internal or external assessment of any qualifications and the quality assurance of the assessment process conducted by approved JCQ Centres. The policy also explains the actions the school may take when allegations of malpractice are received.

Legislation

The Human Rights Act 1998 applies to the operation of this policy.

4. Responsibilities

All staff have a responsibility to give full and active support for the policy by ensuring:
The policy is known, understood and implemented.

5. Actions to Implement and Develop Policy

Curriculum leaders should, at the appropriate time, introduce new members of staff to this policy. Curriculum leaders should ensure there are robust internal moderation/verification procedures. Teaching staff should use the induction period, or other appropriate time, to introduce students to this policy.

6. Definitions and Examples

6.1 School staff malpractice:

Any deliberate action by a member of staff that has the potential to undermine the integrity of the assessment process.

The following are examples of malpractice by staff; this list is not exhaustive and other examples of malpractice may be considered by the school at its discretion:-

- Improper assistance to candidates.
- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (course work or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made.
- Fraudulent submissions that could lead to false claims for certificates.
- Inappropriate retention of certificates.
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the student has not generated.
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the student's own, to be included in a student's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework.
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation.
- Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements, for example where students are

- permitted support, such as amanuensis. This is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment.
- Failing to keep assessment/examination/test papers secure prior to the assessment/examination test.
- Falsifying records/certificates; for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud.

6.2 Student malpractice:

Any action by the student that has the potential to undermine the integrity and validity of the assessment of the student's work.

The following are examples of malpractice by students; this list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by the school at its discretion:

- Plagiarism of any nature; in which case reference should be made to the Plagiarism Statement.
- Using notes or work in controlled conditions or examinations in such a way as not permitted eg taking in pre-prepared answers, notes or crib sheets to use in supporting answers and therefore gaining an unfair advantage.
- Using phones, smartwatches or other devices to gain an unfair advantage while taking controlled assessment or examinations.
- Collusion by working collaboratively with other students to produce work that is submitted as individual student work.
- Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying).
- Deliberate destruction of another's work.
- Fabrication of results or evidence.
- False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework
- Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination.

Artificial Intelligence – from [AI-Use-in-Assessments Apr25 FINAL.pdf](#)

- AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>)
- Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.
- Rainford High staff will use Brisk Teaching to help identify AI in work that is submitted

What it is

- 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
- They have been developed to produce responses based upon the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response and so the responses cannot be relied upon.

The risks of using it

- The use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments.
- Some AI chatbots have been identified as providing dangerous and harmful answers to questions
- AI chatbots often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information.
- Some AI chatbots have been identified as providing dangerous and harmful answers to questions

What AI misuse is

- 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/>), students must submit work for assessments which is their own.
- Any use of AI which means students have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice.
- 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.

How this will be treated as malpractice

- Students who misuse 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
- 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.

When it may be used and how it should be acknowledged)

- 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. If suspicions are confirmed and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, your centre doesn't need to report the malpractice to the appropriate awarding organisation. You can resolve the matter prior to the signing of the declarations.
- Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own. Ultimately the Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring that students do not submit inauthentic work.
- If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation. The procedure is detailed in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>)

6.3 Conflict of Interest

The conflict of interest process is designed to protect the integrity of the exams system, and also helps to ensure that staff members are protected if there is an allegation of malpractice due to a perceived, or real, personal interest.

The JCQ regulations on conflict of interest can be found in the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres Booklet on page 11, section 5.3 (d).

Responsibility

The Head of Centre is responsible for managing the conflict of interest process, and must determine how they do so. The JCQ regulations explain what must be reported to the awarding bodies, and what information must be kept on record at the school/college.

Reporting

Awarding bodies must be informed about conflict of interest before the published deadline for entries.

This relates to members of the school who are:

- taking qualifications which include internally assessed components/units at their own school/college
- teaching and preparing members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (eg, children) for qualifications which include internally assessed components/units.
- Entering members of staff for qualifications at their own school/college should be a last resort, when the individual has been unable to find an alternative. In this case the Head of Centre must ensure that:
 - the usual protocols are in place to prevent the staff member from accessing exam materials prior to the exam and/or that they understand the importance of maintaining the integrity and confidentiality of the exam materials
 - the member of staff does not receive any preferential treatment.

School will inform the appropriate examination Boards about one of the conflicts of interest described above.

Keeping Records

The Head of Centre is responsible for ensuring that our school maintains clear records of all instances where:

- exams office staff have members of their family (which includes step-family, foster family and similar close relationships) or close friends and their immediate family (eg, children) being entered for examinations and assessments either at the school/college itself or other centres
- school/college staff are taking qualifications at their centre which do not include internally assessed components/units
- school/college staff are taking qualifications at other centres.

These records must:

- include details of the measures which have been put in place to mitigate any potential risk to the integrity of the affected qualifications
- be available for inspection by a visiting JCQ Centre Inspector and/or awarding body staff
- be available if requested in the event of concerns being reported to an awarding body
- be kept until the deadline for reviews of marking has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed (whichever is later).

7. Procedures used to deal with the above

7.1 Where the school discovers or suspects an individual, or individuals, of malpractice it will conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation.

7.2 Such an investigation will be initially undertaken by the Principal or designated member of staff, who will interview all personnel linked to the allegation.

7.3 The school will make the individual(s) aware (preferably in writing) at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of possible consequences should malpractice be proven.

7.4 The investigation will proceed through the following stages:

- Preliminary investigation into the allegation to determine whether a full investigation is necessary.
- If the allegation appears to have substance, then all assessments by this member of staff should be halted until the investigation is complete.
- Should it be determined that a full investigation is necessary it shall be conducted by an Independent Investigation Officer appointed by the Principal.

7.5 During the investigation the school will give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.

7.6 All stages of the investigation shall be documented by the person leading the investigation.

7.7 The individual will be informed of the avenues for appealing against any judgments made.

7.8 The Investigation Officer will produce a report of their findings for the attention of the Principal.

7.9 For cases of staff malpractice, the Principal will decide whether to invoke the Disciplinary Rules and Procedures for Schools.

7.10 For cases of student assessment malpractice, reference should be made by the teacher or Curriculum Leader to the Student Malpractice section 6.2 above.

7.11 Where the Curriculum Leader indicates that the student assessment is suspect or flawed, then the relevant policy/statement should be consulted for appropriate penalties.

8. Monitoring and Evaluation

8.1 Internal monitoring/verification of assessment activity within each department will include malpractice checks.

8.2 Evidence of both assessment and internal verification/moderation must be available for auditing.

9. Publicity

All new staff and students recruited to the School will be made aware of this Policy. The Policy will be posted on the Shared (S) drive of the School's IT Network.