

**Safeguarding Statement**

Langley Park School for Girls is committed to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children and young people and expects all staff and volunteers to share this commitment.

**Equality & Diversity Statement**

Langley Park School for Girls is committed to valuing and celebrating diversity and promoting equality of opportunity for all its staff and students. We are working to create a learning and working environment which is free from prejudice, discrimination, intimidation and all forms of harassment including bullying. Respect for rights is at the heart of our planning, policies, practice and ethos and we expect all members of our school community to model this in their behaviour and relationships.

# LANGLEY PARK SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

## MALPRACTICE (EXAMS) POLICY

<b>Approval Body:</b>	<b>Full Governing Body</b>
<b>Approval Date:</b>	<b>Spring 2026</b>
<b>Implementation Date:</b>	<b>Autumn 2024</b>
<b>Key Staff (as appropriate)</b>	<b>Steve Whittle, Head of Centre Emma Ashman-Clark, Deputy Headteacher Sarah McAleer, Exams Officer</b>
<b>Committee with Remit (as appropriate):</b>	<b>Full Governing Body</b>
<b>Review Date:</b>	<b>Spring 2027</b>

**Version History**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>	<b>Summary of Changes</b>
1.0	Autumn 2023	Policy implemented
2.0	Autumn 2024	Slight changes to reflect wording in JCQ documents; additional text regarding malpractice and use of AI
3.0	Spring 2026	Slight changes to reflect wording in JCQ documents; new heading 'Centre malpractice' added; updated list of JCQ documents for staff and candidates; added situations where the centre will not submit an appeal

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Langley Park School for Girls 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 use 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, appendix 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 Langley Park School for Girls:

- has in place for inspection that must be reviewed and updated annually, a written malpractice policy which covers all qualifications delivered by the centre detailing 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; it must also acknowledge the use of AI (e.g. what AI is, when it may be used and how it should be acknowledged, the risks of using AI, what AI misuse is and how this will be treated as malpractice) (GR 5.3)

## General principles

In accordance with the regulations Langley Park School for Girls 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

Langley Park School for Girls 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
  - 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)

Additional information: not applicable

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

Candidates are regularly informed by Heads of Key Stage, Heads of Department, subject teachers and the exams office team to avoid committing malpractice in examinations and assessments.

Before the commencement of any coursework or NEA (non-examination assessment) required for a qualification, candidates are specifically briefed about the risks of malpractice by their Head of Subject and subject teachers. This includes the acknowledgement of AI (artificial intelligence) and the dangers of plagiarism and reminds students that they will need to demonstrate that all work is their own.

Before each series of formally invigilated mocks and public exams, candidate cohorts attend exam assemblies and briefings where they are reminded of the rules surrounding their conduct in examinations. Candidates are also sent written details of all necessary JCQ 'information for candidates' documents before being entered for examinations, including being issued with the JCQ *information for candidates – AI (Artificial intelligence and assessments)* prior to completing their work/prior to signing the declaration of authentication. They are additionally provided with a student handbook outlining LPGS guidelines and exam protocols. The policies and JCQ documents are available to parents on the school website. Additional notices to students throughout the academic year are provided as necessary on Firefly (the LPGS virtual learning environment).

### **AI use in assessments**

Students complete the majority of their exams and a large number of other assessments under close staff supervision with limited access to authorised materials and no permitted access to the internet. The delivery of these assessments should be unaffected by developments in AI tools, since students must not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments.

There are some assessments in which access to the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages. The majority of these assessments will be Non-Examined Assessments (NEAs), coursework and internal assessments for general qualifications (GQs) and vocational & technical qualifications (VTQs). JCQ's guidance *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications* is followed in relation to these assessments.

Additional JCQ resources are also used to help everyone prevent AI misuse, and to better understand the rules:

*Information Sheet for Teachers*

*Senior Leader Presentation for Teachers*

*Poster for Students*

*Teacher Presentation for Students*

## **Identification and reporting of malpractice**

### **Escalating suspected malpractice issues**

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

Suspected malpractice in coursework/NEA is raised with the Head of Department/Faculty in the first instance and reported immediately to the Exams Officer and Head of Centre. Any other type of malpractice is reported directly to the Exams Officer and Head of Centre. Other pastoral or senior staff (e.g. Head of Key Stage, Deputy Head, CEO of Impact Trust) may be involved, depending on the nature of the concern.

### 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)

Additional information: not applicable

### 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)

Additional information: not applicable

## **Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice**

Langley Park School for Girls 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**

In accordance with the guidance, Langley Park School for Girls will not submit an appeal to the awarding bodies on the grounds that:

- the individual did not intend to cheat or breach exam regulations;
- the individual has an unblemished academic record;
- the individual could lose a FEI/HEI place or employment;
- the individual regrets his/her actions

since these do not, by themselves, constitute grounds for an appeal.