

The Aylesbury Vale Academy Trust



Centre Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Policy Reference:	AVA. 020
Description:	This policy is to minimise the risk of malpractice/maladministration by staff and learners
Status:	Policy
Policy Audience:	Staff
Academy Contact:	Exams Officer
Other Related Policies and Procedures:	Staff Conduct, Whistleblowing
Governor Committees:	Full Governing Body
Approved by the Governing Board on:	12.10.2026
Latest Date for Next Review:	12.10.2027
Version + Schedule of Amendments:	17.10.2024 – Dates and Links checked and updated 15.10.2025 – Significant updates to entire document
Signed:	
Date of Signature	12.10.2026

In reviewing this policy, the Governing Board has had regard to the Equality Act 2010 and carried out an equality impact assessment. It is satisfied that no group with a protected characteristic will be unfairly disadvantaged by this policy.

Contents

Purpose of the policy	2
JCQ Compliance Statement	2
Causes of Potential Malpractice	2
1. Disruptive Candidates.....	2
2. Unauthorised Materials.....	2
3. Candidate Malpractice	2
4. Staff Malpractice.....	2
5. Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Assessments	2
Acceptable Use	3
Unacceptable Use	3
Centre Responsibilities	3
Candidate Awareness.....	3
Documentation and Reporting	3
Further guidance to inform in regards of malpractice	3
Ofqual.....	3
JCQ.....	3
GOV.UK	3
Appendix 1 JCQ Form M1	3

Purpose of the policy

This policy outlines the procedures and responsibilities for identifying, preventing, and reporting malpractice and maladministration by candidates or centre staff. It complies with JCQ General Regulations Section 5.11 and the JCQ publication *Suspected Malpractice – Policies and Procedures*

JCQ Compliance Statement

In line with JCQ Section 5.11, the centre will:

- a) Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after assessments have taken place;
- b) 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;
- c) As required by an awarding body, gather evidence of any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes maladministration), in accordance with the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures*, and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require.

Causes of Potential Malpractice

1. Disruptive Candidates

- Invigilators must warn disruptive candidates and record the incident.
- Candidates may be removed from the exam room if they pose a continued disruption.
- The awarding body must be informed, and penalties may include disqualification.

2. Unauthorised Materials

- Invigilators must confiscate unauthorised materials and summon assistance if needed.
- A full report must be submitted to the Exams Officer.

3. Candidate Malpractice

Includes but is not limited to:

- Plagiarism, copying, impersonation, falsifying results, or false authenticity declarations.
- Must be reported to the Head of Centre immediately.
- Form JCQ/M1 must be completed and submitted to the awarding body.

4. Staff Malpractice

Includes:

- Failure to follow exam board procedures.
- Fraudulent certificate claims.
- Inappropriate assistance to learners.
- Withholding critical information.
- Breaches of confidentiality or data security.
- Must be reported to the Head of Centre or Exams Officer as appropriate.

5. Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Assessments

In accordance with JCQ Regulation 5.3(x), the centre's malpractice policy acknowledges the use of AI tools and outlines acceptable and unacceptable practices.

Acceptable Use

- AI may be used for idea generation or research **only if**:
 - The final work is the candidate's own.
 - AI use is **clearly referenced**, including tool name, date, and purpose.
 - The candidate can demonstrate understanding and independent effort.

Unacceptable Use

- Submitting AI-generated content without acknowledgment.
- Using AI to complete substantial parts of assessments.
- Misrepresenting AI-generated work as original.
- These actions constitute malpractice and will be investigated accordingly.

Centre Responsibilities

- Staff must educate candidates on responsible AI use.
- Teachers must authenticate work and report concerns.
- The Head of Centre must report confirmed cases to awarding bodies.

Candidate Awareness

- Candidates must be informed of potential penalties, including disqualification.
- JCQ's *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* must be referenced during candidate briefings.

Documentation and Reporting

- All suspected malpractice must be documented using JCQ/M1 (candidate) or JCQ/M2 (staff).
- Scripts must be packed as normal; forms submitted separately.
- Investigations must follow JCQ procedures and timelines

Further guidance to inform in regards of malpractice

Ofqual

Exam boards rightly expect schools and colleges to take malpractice, and the risk of malpractice, seriously. They expect schools and colleges to have proper processes in place for investigating and dealing with allegations of malpractice. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ofqual-guide-for-schools-and-colleges-2025>

JCQ

Malpractice information

[Malpractice – Joint Council for Qualifications](#)

Instructions for conducting examinations

[Instructions for Conducting Exams \(ICE\) – Joint Council for Qualifications](#)

General regulations

[General regulations for approved centres – Joint Council for Qualifications](#)

Special consideration

[Access Arrangements, Reasonable Adjustments and Special Consideration – Joint Council for Qualifications](#)

GOV.UK

A guide to support schools with malpractice incidents

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ofqual-guide-for-schools-and-colleges-2025>

Appendix 1 JCQ Form M1

JCQ/M1

Suspected candidate malpractice

Confidential

This form is to be used by centres to report instances of suspected candidate malpractice.

For guidance on how to complete this form please **see page 7** of this form.

Awarding body

--

Date of incident

--

Time (AM/PM session)

--

Centre number

--

Centre name and address

--

--

--

--

Head of centre's email address

--

Head of centre's telephone number

--

Candidate number(s) Candidate name(s)

--

--

--

--

--

--

--

--

--

--

--

--

--

--

Section B (Vocational qualifications only)

Describe how the candidates were made aware of the examination or assessment regulations.



Section C (All general qualifications and other qualifications if applicable)

Examinations

Was the *Warning to Candidates* displayed outside the examination room? (either by means of a projector or in hard copy paper format)

YES	☐
NO	☐

Had the candidate(s) been issued with a copy of the *Information for candidates?* (either electronically or a paper version)

YES	☐
NO	☐

Were candidates reminded of examination regulations at the beginning of this particular examination?

YES	☐
NO	☐

Coursework/non-examination assessment

Had the candidate(s) been issued with a declaration of authentication?

YES	☐
NO	☐

Had the candidate(s) signed the declaration of authentication stating that all work completed was the candidate's own?

YES	☐
NO	☐

Was the *Information for candidates* issued to the candidate(s) prior to signing the declaration of authentication?

YES	☐
NO	☐

Section D (All qualifications)

If the incident involves disruptive behaviour, did the candidate's behaviour cause disturbance to other candidates?

YES	☐
NO	☐

If the answer to the above question is yes and you wish to request special consideration for other candidates, please submit an application for special consideration in the normal way.

If the incident involves the introduction of unauthorised material, is a copy/image of the unauthorised material enclosed?

YES	☐
NO	☐

If the answer to the above question is no, please give a detailed description of the unauthorised material and an explanation of why a copy/image has not been provided.

If the case involves plagiarism, please provide full details (i.e. title, author, edition, website, AI tool, etc.) of the material plagiarised and include copies.

If there are any other details you feel are relevant to this allegation, including mitigating circumstances, please give further information below.

Supporting information

Please indicate below the supporting information submitted with this report. All relevant information and materials **must** be submitted at this time. Information submitted subsequently may not be considered.

Please ensure that all supporting documents are scanned and attached (preferably as PDF documents) to the same email.

Information submitted with this form	
Statement(s) from invigilator(s)	☐
Statement from teacher/tutor/head of subject/assessor/internal verifier	☐
Statement from examinations officer	☐
Statement(s) from candidate(s)	☐
Statement from employer	☐
Seating plan of examination room	☐
Unauthorised material removed from the candidate(s)	☐
Copies of sources of plagiarised material	☐
Assessment and Internal Verification or Moderation records	☐
Other (please give details)	☐

- ☐ If statement(s) from the candidate(s) is/are not enclosed, please put a cross in this box to indicate that the candidate(s) has/have been given the opportunity to make a statement, but has/have chosen not to do so.

Report of suspected candidate malpractice

This checklist is intended to assist centres when completing a report of suspected candidate malpractice.

It is the responsibility of the head of centre to ensure that these requirements have been met.

Reference is made to the requirements detailed in the JCQ document:

Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures:

<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>

Please indicate by putting a cross in the appropriate box for the following points:

		Yes	No
1.	The candidate(s) has/have been informed of their individual responsibilities and rights (section 5.33).	☐	☐
2.	A candidate or candidates accused of malpractice:		
	• has/have been informed (preferably in writing) of the allegation made against him or her;	☐	☐
	• has/have been advised that a copy of the JCQ document <i>Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures</i> can be found on the JCQ website;	☐	☐
	• know(s) what evidence there is to support the allegation;	☐	☐
	• know(s) the possible consequences should malpractice be proven;	☐	☐
	• has/have had the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations (if required);	☐	☐
	• has/have had an opportunity to submit a written statement;	☐	☐
	• has/have had an opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required);	☐	☐
	• has/have been informed of the applicable appeals procedure should a decision be made against him or her;	☐	☐
	• has/have been informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators and other appropriate authorities.	☐	☐

To be completed by the head of centre

Name (please print)		Tel no.	
Signature*		Date	

* Submission by email from the centre's registered email address will be accepted in place of a signature.

NOTES ON THE COMPLETION OF FORM JCQ/M1

This form **must** be used by the head of the centre to notify the appropriate awarding body of an instance of suspected candidate malpractice in the conduct of examinations or assessments. It can also be used to provide a report on investigations into instances of suspected malpractice.

In order to prevent the issue of erroneous results and certificates, it is essential that the awarding body concerned is notified immediately of instances of suspected candidate malpractice.

Full details of the procedures which **must** be followed when investigating cases of suspected malpractice can be found in the JCQ document: *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*.
<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>

Reports on investigations from centres **must** include:

- a detailed account of the circumstances surrounding the suspected candidate malpractice including, in the case of disruptive behaviour, an indication as to whether the behaviour continued after warnings were given, and whether the candidate was removed from the examination room/assessment situation or not;
- the procedures for advising candidates of the regulations concerning the conduct of examinations and/or assessments;
- a report of any investigation carried out subsequently by the centre;
- signed and dated statements from the staff concerned (e.g. invigilators, assessors, teachers, tutors, etc.) on the centre's official letterheaded paper;
- signed and dated statements from the candidate(s) concerned or a clear indication that they have been given the opportunity to make a statement; (In circumstances which make it inappropriate to interview the candidate, the centre should discuss the case in confidence with the awarding body.)
- seating plans of the examination room (if appropriate).

This form is intended to be used as the basis for the report.

This form and supporting information should be submitted by email.

All supporting documents should be scanned and attached (preferably as PDF documents) to the same email, and the originals retained within the centre.

The awarding body concerned will acknowledge receipt of this form.

The form and supporting documentation must be sent to:

AQA

irregularities@aqa.org.uk

CCEA

malpractice@ccea.org.uk

City & Guilds

investigationandcompliance@cityandguilds.com

NCFE

providerassurance@ncfe.org.uk

OCR

malpractice@ocr.org.uk

Pearson

candidatemalpractice@pearson.com

WJEC

malpractice@wjec.co.uk