

Red Kite Special Academy



Malpractice Policy September 2025 – 2026

Date Policy Agreed by governors: Autumn 2025
Policy Review Date: Autumn 2026
Review Cycle: Annually
Version: 4

Contents

Key Staff Involved in.....	3
Purpose of the process	3
Introduction	3
Candidate malpractice	3
Centre staff malpractice	4
Suspected malpractice.....	4
General principles at Red Kite.....	4
Preventing malpractice	4
Escalating suspected malpractice issues.....	5
Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body.....	5
Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures	6
Communicating malpractice decisions	6
Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice.....	6
AI - Use in Assessments.....	7
What is AI Misuse.....	7
Acknowledging AI Use.....	8

Key Staff Involved in

<u>Role</u>	<u>Name/s</u>
Head Teacher	Karen Smith
Assistant Head Teacher/ Examinations Officer	Kate Seaton
SENCo	Suzy Geraghty
Business Manager	Louise Holmes

Purpose of the process

To confirm Red Kite Special Academy:

has in place a written malpractice policy which covers all qualifications delivered by the centre and details how candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments, how suspected malpractice issues should be escalated within the centre and reported to the relevant awarding body.

Introduction

What is malpractice and maladministration?

‘Malpractice’ and ‘maladministration’ are related concepts, the common theme of which is 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
- a breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered
- a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification which:
 - gives rise to prejudice to candidates
 - compromises public confidence in qualifications
 - compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate
 - 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’ means 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 writing of any examination paper.

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

Suspected malpractice

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice.

General principles at Red Kite

In accordance with the regulations Red Kite Special Academy will:

Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place.

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.

As required by an awarding body, gather evidence of any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration) in accordance with the JCQ publication.

Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require.

Preventing malpractice

Red Kite Special Academy has in place:

Robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

This includes ensuring that all 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;*
- *Plagiarism in Assessments;*
- *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications;*
- *A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2025-2026*

Escalating suspected malpractice issues

Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre can report it using the appropriate channels.

Suspected malpractice should be escalated to the examinations lead/senior leader Bonnita Pawlusek. Where malpractice is suspected by the examinations team, the head of centre/head teacher will lead this escalation. The initial investigation will be carried out within ten working days.

The investigation will involve establishing the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true. Where appropriate, the staff member concerned and any potential witnesses will be interviewed and their version of events recorded on paper.

The candidate/member of staff will be:

- informed in writing of the allegation made against him or her
- informed what evidence there is to support the allegation
- informed of the possible consequences, should malpractice be proven
- given the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations
- given the opportunity to submit a written statement
- given the opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required)

Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body

The examinations lead/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 publication.

Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures

The head of centre will ensure that where a candidate who is a child/vulnerable adult is the subject of a malpractice investigation, the candidate's parent/carer/ appropriate adult is kept informed of the progress of the investigation.

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.

Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication need not 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 (a candidate or a member of staff) will be informed of the rights of accused individuals.

Once the information gathering has concluded, the investigator 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.

Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used.

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.

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.

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Red Kite Special Academy 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 publication **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**.

AI - Use in Assessments

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. While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice.

Teachers and students should also be aware that AI tools are still being developed and there are often limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

AI chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. Users can ask follow-up questions or ask the chatbot to revise the responses already provided. AI chatbots respond to prompts based upon patterns in the data sets (large language model) upon which they have been trained. They generate responses which are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate. AI chatbots can complete tasks such as the following:

- Answering questions
- Analysing, improving, and summarising text
- Authoring essays, articles, fiction, and non-fiction
- Writing computer code
- Translating text from one language to another
- Generating new ideas, prompts, or suggestions for a given topic or theme
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or format

What is AI Misuse

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of 'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism' include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- 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.

Acknowledging AI Use

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. This allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether that use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

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. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own

See <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/> for further information.