



The Eaglewood School

“Raising Aspiration and Changing Lives”

Exams Malpractice Policy

POLICY DETAILS

Subject and Version of Document:	Exams Malpractice Policy –
Author:	Miss Roma Brackstone, Exams Officer
Persons/Committees consulted whilst document in draft:	Headteacher and Governing Body
Date Policy agreed:	March 2026
Date of next review/update and by whom:	The Eaglewood Governors March 2027
Copy obtainable from and/or distribution:	Clerk to Governors
Date document issued:	March 2026
Responsibility for dissemination to new staff:	SLT
Headteacher Target Audience:	All Staff; Parents; Students; Commissioning Schools; Local Authority

Policy Review

This policy will be reviewed annually.

What is Malpractice and Maladministration?

'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 will 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
- 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

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.

Examples of Candidate Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- Plagiarism: the copying and passing of as the candidate's own work, the whole or part of another person's work.
- The misuse of AI technology (JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications).
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as the candidate's only.
- Failing to abide by the instructions of an assessor – This may refer to the use of resources which the candidate has been specifically told not to use.
- The alteration of any results document.

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates with regards to examinations. This list is not exhaustive:

- Talking during an examination.
- Taking a mobile phone or smart watch such as Apple watches, or equivalent, into an examination (this includes normal wrist watches).
- Taking any item other than those accepted by the Awarding Body into the examination, such as a book or notes.
- Leaving the examination room without permission.
- Passing notes or papers or accepting notes to, or accepting notes or papers from another candidate.

BCS Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Anybody who identifies or is made aware of suspected or actual cases of malpractice or maladministration at any time must immediately notify BCS.

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

Examples of Staff Malpractice

Attempted or actual malpractice activity will not be tolerated. The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regards to portfolio-based qualifications. This list is not exhaustive:

- Tampering with candidates work prior to external moderation/verification.
- Assisting candidates with the production of work outside of the awarding body guidance.
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements.

The following are examples of malpractice by staff with regard to examinations

- Assisting candidates with exam questions outside of the awarding body guidance.
- Allowing candidates to talk, use a mobile phone/i-phone/smart watch/internet or go to the toilet unsupervised.
- Tampering with scripts prior to external marking taking place.

Suspected Malpractice

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice.

Purpose of the Policy

To confirm The Eaglewood School:

- has in place a written Malpractice Policy which covers all qualifications delivered by the Centre and details 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.

General Principles

In accordance with the regulations The Eaglewood School will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place.
- 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.
- 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.

Preventing Malpractice

The Eaglewood School has in place:

- Robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as in the JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

- This includes ensuring that all 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; Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE); Instructions for conducting coursework; Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments; Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments; A guide to the special consideration process; Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures; Plagiarism in Assessments; AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications; A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes.*

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

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 publication **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

- The Head of Centre will ensure that where a candidate who is a child/vulnerable adult is the subject of a malpractice investigation, the candidate's parent/carer/ appropriate adult is kept informed of the progress of the investigation.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- 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.

Appeals Against Decisions Made in Cases of Malpractice

- 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 publication **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**.