



The BRIT School

Malpractice Policy (Exams)

2025-2026

KEY STAFF INVOLVED

| Role | Name(s) |
|----------------|----------------------------------|
| Head of Centre | Stuart Worden |
| Senior Leaders | Louise Cooper Katie Findlater |
| Exams Officer | Charlotte Byrne |

Purpose of the Policy

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice at The BRIT School is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations. The purpose of the policy is to confirm The BRIT School has a malpractice policy in place which covers qualifications delivered by the centre. It details how candidates

are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in exams/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).

Introduction

Malpractice and maladministration are distinct but closely related concepts, both involving a failure to follow the rules of an exam or assessment. For the purposes of this policy, the term malpractice is used to cover both malpractice and maladministration. It refers to any act, default, or practice that constitutes a breach of regulations, a failure to meet awarding body requirements for the delivery of a qualification, or non-compliance with established procedures. Such actions may disadvantage candidates, undermine public confidence in qualifications, compromise (or attempt to compromise) the assessment process, the integrity of a qualification, or the validity of results or certificates. They may also damage the authority, reputation, or credibility of an awarding body, centre, or any of their officers, employees, or agents (SMPP 1).

Candidate malpractice

Candidate malpractice normally involves malpractice by a candidate in connection with any exam or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments, coursework or non-exam assessments, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the completion of any exam. (SMPP 2)

Centre staff malpractice

Centre staff malpractice means malpractice committed by a member of staff, contractor, 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 1.9). (SMPP 2)

General principles

In accordance with the regulations The BRIT School 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

The BRIT School has robust processes in place to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures. 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 (this document)
- 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

Candidates are informed and advised on how to avoid committing malpractice in examinations and assessments through a structured process led by the Head of Year and the exams team. Prior to each exam season, a briefing is delivered during an assembly by the Head of Year, outlining the school's expectations and detailing what constitutes malpractice and how to avoid it. This information is reinforced through infographics and other resources, which are made available on the Exams notice board and via the Exams Linktree, ensuring candidates can access these guidelines at any time.

Candidates are briefed at the start of each exam, emphasising key rules and expectations. Specific attention is given to the risks associated with AI misuse, including submitting AI-generated work as their own. Candidates are informed that such actions will be treated as malpractice. This thorough process ensures that students are fully aware of both traditional malpractice risks and the emerging challenges posed by AI misuse, enabling them to approach exams with a clear understanding of the rules.

AI use in assessments

In accordance with JCQ guidance on AI Use in Assessments, The BRIT School ensures that the integrity of qualifications is maintained by closely supervising exams and assessments. In these instances where the internet is allowed to be accessed, JCQ's guidance is followed to ensure students and teachers understand how to

appropriately use AI. AI-generated content must not be presented as the student's own work, and any use of AI tools must be properly acknowledged. The misuse of AI, such as generating unoriginal content without appropriate acknowledgment, will be treated as malpractice. Clear instructions and examples are provided to help both students and staff understand appropriate AI use.

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. The Lead Internal Verifier / Quality Nominee / Exams Officer will inform the Head of Centre and the Awarding Body as soon as possible. Where appropriate, the Exams Officer or Quality Nominee assists with completing the JCQ Malpractice Form JCQ/M1 as required.

The candidate is advised of the malpractice allegation and evidence. They will be asked to complete a statement, and will be emailed to inform them of the investigation and allegation made against them. The candidate (and parents where appropriate to age) will be sent, via email and letter, information about the possible outcomes of the malpractice investigation and evidence submitted to the exam board. They will be given information about the appeal process, and the opportunity to consider their response and seek advice as necessary. They will be advised they can provide a supplementary statement.

For a Non-Exam Assessment suspected malpractice / suspected data security breach, if grades have not been submitted to the Awarding Body yet, it will be investigated using Internal Centre Malpractice policy.

The exam board procedures then take place following the set steps from the JCQ suspected Malpractice policy. The Awarding Body decision is communicated from the exam board to the Head of Centre. Any sanctions and penalties will be imposed as required by the Awarding Body decision. The Exam Officer will inform the candidate (and parents where appropriate to age) of the outcome of the malpractice investigation.

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 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-exam 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-exam 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)

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

The BRIT School will provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal where relevant, and follow the process provided in the JCQ document "A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes".

Examples of 'candidate malpractice'

These include (but are not limited to):

Introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room

- Own blank paper - used for rough work; used for final answers.
- Calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited) - not used; used or attempted to use.
- Bringing into the exam room notes in the wrong format or prohibited annotations - notes/annotations go beyond what is permitted but do not give an advantage / content irrelevant to subject; notes/annotations are relevant

and give an unfair advantage; notes/annotations introduced in a deliberate attempt to gain an advantage.

- Unauthorised notes, study guides or personal organisers - content irrelevant to subject; content relevant to subject; relevant to subject and evidence of use.
- Mobile phone or similar electronic devices (including earphones or earbuds (e.g. AirPods, mobile phones, MP3/4 players or similar devices, smart glasses, tablets (e.g. iPads or iPods), watches or any other smart devices - not in the candidate's possession but make a noise in the exam room; in the candidate's possession but no evidence of being used by the candidate; in the candidate's possession and evidence of being used by the candidate.
- Watches (not smartwatches) - in candidate's possession.

Breaches of examination conditions

- A breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding body in relation to the examination rules and regulations - minor non-compliance: e.g. sitting in a non-designated seat / continuing to write for a short period after being told to stop; major non-compliance: e.g. refusing to move to a designated seat / significant amount of writing after being told to stop; related non-compliance.
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security and integrity of the examinations - leaving examination early (no loss of integrity) / removing script from the examination room, but evidence of the integrity was maintained; removing script from examination room but with no proof that the script is safe / taking home materials; deliberately breaking a timetable clash supervision arrangement / removing script from the examination room and with proof that the script has been tampered with / leaving examination room early so integrity is impaired.
- Disruptive behaviour in the examination room or assessment session (including use of offensive language) - minor disruption lasting a short time / calling out, causing noise, turning around; repeated or prolonged disruption / unacceptably rude remarks / being removed from the examination room / taking another's possessions; warnings ignored / provocative or aggravated behaviour / repeated or loud offensive comments / physical assault on staff or property.

Exchange, obtaining, receiving, or passing on information which could be examination related (or the attempt to)

- Verbal communication - isolated incidents of talking before the start of the exam or after papers have been collected; talking during the exam about matters not related to the exam / accepting exam related information; talking about exam related matters during the exam / whispering answers to questions.
- Communication - passing/receiving written communications which clearly have no bearing on the assessment; accepting assessment related information; passing assessment related information to other candidates / helping one another / swapping scripts.

Offences relating to the content of candidates' work

- The inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework, non-examination assessments or portfolios - isolated offensive words or drawings; frequent offensive words or drawings / isolated obscenity or offensive comments directed at an individual or group; frequent obscenities / discriminatory language, remarks or drawings directed at an individual or group.

- Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from or reproduction of third party sources (including the internet and AI tools); incomplete referencing - minor amount of plagiarism/poor referencing in places; plagiarism from work listed in the bibliography or referenced/acknowledged / or minor amount of plagiarism from a source not listed in the bibliography or referenced/acknowledged; plagiarism from work not listed in the bibliography or referenced/acknowledged / or plagiarised text consists of the substance of the work submitted and the source is listed in the bibliography or referenced/acknowledged.