

Bishop Vaughan Catholic School

Malpractice Policy

Malpractice Policy



Key staff involved in the policy:

Role	Name
Head of Centre	Mrs Emma Pole
Senior Leaders	Mr Carl Walker
Exams Officer	Mr Joseph Slater

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Bishop Vaughan Catholic School 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 Publications **General Regulations for Approved Centres** and **Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures**.

Introduction

What is Malpractice and Maladministration?

(SMPP 1) '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.

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice (SMPP 2).

Purpose of the Policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm how Bishop Vaughan Catholic School manages malpractice under normal delivery arrangements in accordance with the regulations.

General Principles

In accordance with the regulations Bishop Vaughan Catholic School will:

Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations 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 JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures** and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11).

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 (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).

Preventing Malpractice

Bishop Vaughan Catholic School has in place robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3.3 of the JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (SMPP 4.3).

Identification and Reporting of Malpractice

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 publication **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (SMPP4.1.3).

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).

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 (SMPP 4.5).

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 (SMPP 5.32).

Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of centre (or other appointed information-gatherer) will submit a written report summarising the case to the relevant awarding body, accompanied by the information obtained during the course of their enquiries (SMPP 5.34).

Form JCQ/M1 will be used when reporting candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used (SMPP 5.36).

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 5.39).

Communication 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).

Appeals Against Decisions Made in Cases of Malpractice

Bishop Vaughan Catholic School will:

Provide the individual with information on the process 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**.

Additional Information

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.

In addition to the above, where students use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. 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.

Copies of this policy are available on our website, in policy folders on the school network and can be made available on request.

Date: October 2023

Review Date: November 2024

Review Date: November 2025

Policy Next Review Date: November 2026