



The Charter School
North Dulwich

ASSESSMENT
MALPRACTICE
POLICY
2026-27

Author(s)	Kate Howard Davies Exams Officer
Approved by	M Pain
Last reviewed on:	October 2026
Next review due by:	October 2027

Contents

1. Purpose of the policy.....	3
2. Centre Actions to Prevent Malpractice	3
3. Definition of Malpractice by Learners.....	4
4. AI use.....	5
5. Definition of Malpractice by centre Staff	6

1. Purpose of the policy

- To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or learners.
- To advise all staff that they have a responsibility for reporting any potential malpractice that they may identify.
- To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively.
- To standardise and record any investigation of malpractice to ensure openness and fairness.
- To impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on learners or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) of malpractice are proven.
- To protect the integrity of this Centre and the integrity of the examination process.
- To ensure the Centre complies with the regulations set out by the JCQ in [Malpractice-September-2026.pdf.pdf](#)

2. Centre Actions to Prevent Malpractice

To do this, the Centre will:

- seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and lessons (and/or assemblies) to inform learners of the Centre's policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice.
- require that all staff have a responsibility for reporting any potential malpractice that they may identify.
- in non-examined assessments and coursework, ensure that subject teachers make candidates aware of notices to candidates relating to malpractice as outlined by JCQ and/or the awarding bodies instruction (refer to Appendix 1 and the school's NEA Policy for further information).
- ensure all staff involved in NEAs are aware of authentication procedures.
- ensure students are aware of notices to candidates from JCQ or awarding bodies when relevant and required (either through lessons, assemblies, briefings, posters, ClassChart notices or email, or a combination of these) before candidates start work on their NEAs.
- show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources.
- ask learners to declare that their work is their own.
- ask learners to provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used.
- investigate in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation. Such an investigation will be supported by the Headteacher, and all personnel linked to the allegation. It will proceed through the following stages:
 1. Investigation by Subject Leader or Key Curriculum Leader or Lead Invigilator
 2. Investigation by the Examinations Officer, Quality Nominee or member of SLT nominated by the Head of Centre
 3. Reporting to the Head of Centre and relevant exams board/JCQ if potential evidence of malpractice found

Or

1. Investigation by Head of Centre or Quality Nominee if requested by exam body/JCQ
 2. Recommendation of Quality Nominee for sanction to learner / staff member to Headteacher
- make the individual fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice, of the evidence gathered that suggests their involvement in malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.

- give the individual the opportunity to respond to the allegations made.
- Consider whether there might be any safeguarding concerns when interviewing candidates suspected of malpractice and ensure that appropriate support is provided if so, in line with the detailed provisions set out in Appendix 11 of JQC Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures 2026
- provide the individual with guidance as specified by JQC and awarding body.
- inform the individual of the avenues for appealing against any judgment made.
- document all stages of any investigation.

Where malpractice is proven, this Centre will apply the appropriate and proportionate penalties / sanctions issued by the awarding body, JQC or appropriate body.

Interviews with staff or candidates during an investigation will refer to the Centre's Safeguarding Policy, and the Centre will contact the awarding body before any interview takes place if there are concerns for the wellbeing of the student/staff member.

The Centre will be mindful that individuals involved in an investigation into alleged malpractice/maladministration may experience detrimental impacts to their wellbeing, will embed safeguarding into any investigation that takes place, and will consider the appropriate support to be given to individuals at specific key stages of an investigation – see Appendix 3 for further details.

For all non-examined assessments, coursework, and all internal work, the Centre reserves the right to not submit work to an awarding body (or for marking in the case of internal exams) where an investigation concludes there is a possibility of malpractice on the part of the learner. In such an event, the subject teacher should consult with the Exams Officer, who will relay this decision with the Head of Centre.

If the Head of Centre decides not to submit work based on malpractice, the Exams Officer will relay this decision to the candidate at the earliest opportunity, along with information on internal appeals proceedings as described in Internal Assessment Appeals Policy - Reviews of Marking, Centre Assessed Marks.

Evidence from malpractice investigations where there is suspected malpractice will have records kept in line with the Trust's GDPR practice or JQC guidance and as part of assessment records.

All incidents of suspected staff and Centre malpractice/maladministration and all incidents of suspected candidate malpractice identified after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication must be reported to the relevant awarding body.

Incidents of suspected candidate malpractice identified before the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication do not necessarily need to be reported to the awarding body where the malpractice relates to the content of the work (unless the work has already been submitted), and in these instances the Centre may determine a course of action and/or sanction as deemed appropriate. Where the suspected malpractice relates to the conditions of the assessment (such as taking a mobile phone or other device into a controlled assessment), the Centre must report this to the awarding body, even where an authentication form has not yet been signed.

3. Definition of Malpractice by Learners

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this Centre at its discretion:

- plagiarism of any nature, including use of AI
- collusion by working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work
- copying (including the use of ICT and AI to aid copying)
- deliberate destruction of another's work
- fabrication of results or evidence
- false declaration of authenticity (including the unreferenced use of AI) in relation to the contents of a

portfolio or coursework

- impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test
- impersonation by pretending that someone else's work in an assessment/examination/test is their own.

4. AI use

What is AI and what are the risks of using it in assessments?

Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools can generate text, images, ideas, translations, code, and summaries in response to prompts. Common examples include ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Midjourney, and DALL·E. While these tools can be useful, they may produce inaccurate, biased, or misleading information and should not be relied upon without verification.

AI and Assessment Integrity

Students must submit work that is genuinely their own. Any use of AI that replaces a student's independent thinking, knowledge, analysis, or skills may be considered malpractice. Qualification assessments are designed to measure a student's own attainment and understanding.

Examples of AI Malpractice

Malpractice may include:

- Copying or paraphrasing AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the student's own.
- Using AI for translation purposes in the production of NEA.
- Using AI to complete all or part of an assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations.
- Failing to acknowledge AI use appropriately.
- Providing incomplete, misleading, or inaccurate references.

AI-related malpractice may result in penalties, including loss of marks, disqualification, or other JCQ sanctions.

Acknowledging AI Use

Where AI has been used as a source of information, students must:

- Clearly identify the AI tool used.
- Record the date the content was generated (for example: 'ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2024')
- Retain evidence of the prompts and responses used (for example, screenshots).
- Explain in detail how the AI-generated content contributed to their work.
- Verify and reference any information obtained through AI using reliable sources.
- Submit all of this information with the work so that the teacher/assessor can review it.

Key Reminder

Using AI is not prohibited, but students remain responsible for ensuring that all submitted work reflects their own understanding and meets the assessment requirements. Poor referencing, excessive

reliance on AI, or presenting AI-generated content as original work may constitute malpractice even where its use has been acknowledged.

Students are reminded that:

- as with any source, poor referencing, paraphrasing and copying sections of text may constitute malpractice, which can attract severe sanctions including disqualification – in the context of AI use, students must be clear what is and what is not acceptable in respect of acknowledging AI content and the use of AI sources. For example, it would be unacceptable to simply reference 'AI' or 'ChatGPT', just as it would be unacceptable to state 'Google' rather than the specific website and webpages which have been consulted
- if they use AI so that they have not independently met the marking criteria, they will not be rewarded.

5. Definition of Malpractice by centre Staff

This list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered by this Centre at its discretion:

- Improper assistance to candidates
- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made
- Failure to keep candidate coursework/portfolios of evidence secure
- Fraudulent claims for certificates
- Inappropriate retention of certificates
- Assisting learners in the production of work for assessment, where the support has the potential to influence the outcomes of assessment, for example where the assistance involves Centre staff producing work for the learner
- Producing falsified witness statements, for example for evidence the learner has not generated
- Allowing evidence, which is known by the staff member not to be the learner's own, to be included in a learner's assignment/task/portfolio/coursework
- Facilitating and allowing impersonation
- Misusing the conditions for special learner requirements, for example where learners are permitted support, such as an amanuensis, this is permissible up to the point where the support has the potential to influence the outcome of the assessment
- Falsifying records/certificates, for example by alteration, substitution, or by fraud
- Fraudulent certificate claims, that is claiming for a certificate prior to the learner completing all the requirements of assessment.
- Knowingly providing inaccurate or misleading information during a malpractice investigation.
- Posting candidates' work (for example from an NEA) on social media.

This policy will be reviewed every year by the Quality Nominee and Examinations Officer.