

FHS

Francis Holland Schools

Malpractice Policy

Contents

Key staff involved in preventing and dealing with malpractice.....	3
Introduction	3
What is malpractice and maladministration?	3
Candidate malpractice	4
Centre staff malpractice	4
Suspected malpractice	4
Purpose of the policy	4
General principles	5
Preventing malpractice	5
Informing and advising candidates how to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments	5
Non-examination assessments and coursework.....	5
Written examinations.....	6
AI use in assessments.....	6
Identification and reporting of malpractice	6
Escalating suspected malpractice issues.....	6
Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body	7
Communicating malpractice decisions	7
Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice.....	8

Exams: Malpractice Policy

This policy applies to:

Francis Holland Regents Park **Francis Holland Sloane Square** **Francis Holland Prep**

Where there are differences between the schools these have been clearly highlighted.

Related Policies:

Academic Integrity Policy

Key staff involved in preventing and dealing with malpractice

Role	Regent's Park School	Sloane Square School
Head of Centre	Katharine Woodcock	Alexandra Haydon
Senior Deputy Head / Deputy Head Academic	Amelia Slocombe	Max Devenport
Assistant Head Assessment & Data		Tristan Marshall
Exams Officer	Suraya Kazi	Rowan Dinwoodie

Introduction

What is malpractice and maladministration?

'Malpractice' and 'maladministration' are **distinct but** related concepts, the common theme of which is that they involve a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This policy 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
 - Compromise public confidence in qualifications
 - Compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualifications 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.

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)

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 19). (SMPP 2)

Purpose of the policy

To confirm Francis Holland Schools:

- have 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)

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at Francis Holland Schools is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations.

This policy is based on JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations>, hereafter GR) and JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>, hereafter SMPP) as well as JCQ Information for Candidates (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents/>), but is also consistent with policies and procedures for malpractice for Cambridge exams in Section 5.6 of the Cambridge Handbook (<https://www.cambridgeinternational.org/exam-administration/cambridge-exams-officers-guide/>).

General principles

In accordance with the regulations Francis Holland Schools 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

Francis Holland Schools have 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 (SMPP 3.3.1):
 - *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*

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

Francis Holland Schools communicate with candidates in the following ways to minimise the chances of malpractice:

Non-examination assessments and coursework

- Early in their courses, examination cohorts are given an assembly on cheating, collusion, plagiarism and use of AI.
- Candidates are reminded of JCQ/Cambridge regulations and how they apply to specific NEA/coursework components by their subject teachers.
- Sessions on referencing and plagiarism are included in mandatory EPQ training for Year 12.
- Candidates are reminded about regulations relating to plagiarism and AI prior to signing candidate declarations.

Written examinations

- A detailed briefing is given to all candidates sitting public examinations, both before their mock examinations and **public examinations**
- JCQ **information** for candidates **documents** are shared with pupils on the school intranet
- JCQ and/or Cambridge posters are displayed outside and/or inside all examination rooms
- Before all written examinations, the start of examination announcement is given in full, following JCQ or Cambridge guidelines
- Mock examinations are carried out following an identical format so that candidates can become familiar with the regulations and learn from any mistakes before they sit public examinations.

AI use in assessments

- Advice given to candidates regarding AI is informed by the JCQ publication *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications* <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/>
- Candidates at Francis Holland Schools are reminded in the *Academic Integrity Policy* of the importance of producing one's own work and not relying on someone else's work, even if that is generated by using artificial intelligence.
- The Examinations Officer, Head of Year and/or Deputy Head Academic remind candidates in examination year groups of the importance of academic integrity and specifically not to use AI for any assessments, especially portfolios, NEAs or essays.
- Candidates are reminded by teaching staff about how the regulations regarding AI apply to specific NEA/coursework components, including how to acknowledge any use of AI.
- Candidates are informed that Francis Holland Schools use Turnitin Originality, software that highlights the level of similarity to other work, allowing us to challenge plagiarism and unacknowledged use of AI tools.
- All candidates completing GCSE and A Level NEAs, coursework or EPQs will be expected to read and sign the 'AI use in assessments' **policy and JCQ Information for Candidates – Artificial Intelligence & assessments.**
- At Regent's Park, candidates are also reminded in the Examinations Handbook which is provided to all candidates ahead of a public examination window that they must not rely on AI for any assessment.

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)

The member of staff should contact the Examinations Officer without delay. If the Examinations Officer is unavailable or the Examinations Officer is suspected of malpractice, the member of staff should contact the Deputy Head Academic or Head of Centre. If the Head of Centre is suspected of malpractice, the member of staff should contact the Chair of Governors.

If candidate malpractice is suspected in the examination room, the member of staff must note full details of the incident and actions taken in the incident log. The Examinations Officer should alert the Head of Centre before contacting parents.

If malpractice is suspected in the preparation of NEA or coursework components prior to a candidate signing the candidate declaration, malpractice will be dealt with internally. If malpractice is suspected after a candidate has signed the candidate declaration, the malpractice must be reported to the awarding body following the procedures below, even if an examination entry has not yet been submitted to the awarding body.

Failure to report suspected malpractice or allegations of malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself (SMPP 4.1.5).

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 (or Cambridge form 9d) will be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of candidate malpractice. Form JCQ/M2 (or Cambridge form 9a) will be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of suspected staff malpractice/maladministration (SMPP 4.4, 4.6). Note that Cambridge requires the notification step to be completed by 12 noon the day after the malpractice incident.
- 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 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 (SMPP 4.5)
- If, in the view of the information gatherer, 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 and provided with a copy of the JCQ *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* document (SMPP 5.33)
- Once the information gathering has concluded, the head of Centre (or other appointed information-gatherer) 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 (SMPP 5.35)
- Form JCQ/M1 (or Cambridge form 9c) will be used when reporting candidate cases; for Centre staff, form JCQ/M3 (or Cambridge form 9b) 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)

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)

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Francis Holland Schools will:

- Make candidates aware that they may appeal:
 - internally to the Centre if their NEA/coursework was rejected due to malpractice.
 - via the Head of Centre to the awarding body against a finding of malpractice and/or the sanction imposed by the awarding body. Candidates are not permitted to appeal directly to awarding bodies.
 - internally to the Centre if the Head of Centre does not support an appeal to the awarding body against a finding of malpractice and/or the sanction imposed by the awarding body. Such an appeal would normally be reviewed by the Head of Centre at the sister Francis Holland School.
- Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal, where relevant
- For internal appeals, refer to the Francis Holland Schools' *Internal Appeals Policy*. For appeals to awarding bodies, refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ document *A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes* or the *Cambridge Handbook*.

Review

Policy author/s	RP: Senior Deputy Head SSq: Deputy Head Academic
This review	Spring 2026
Approved by	Execs: Spring 2026.
Date of publication	5 th February 2026
Next review	Spring 2026