



## **PEGASUS ACADEMY**

### **Malpractice Policy (Exams) 2025/26**

Issue number:	001
Approved by:	Kimberley Buttery
Date:	September 2025
Review date:	September 2026

This procedure is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

## Key staff involved in the procedure

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	<b>Andrew Landers</b>
Exams officer	<b>David Ingram</b>
Senior leader(s)	<b>Andrew Landers, Kimberley Buttery &amp; Sarah Lawson</b>
ALS lead/SENCo	<b>Rachel Anslow</b>

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

Reference in the policy to **GR** and **SMPP** relate to relevant sections of the current JCQ publications **General Regulations for Approved Centres** and **Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures**.

## Introduction

### What is malpractice and maladministration?

(SMPP 1.2) '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 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

For the purposes of this document, suspected malpractice means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice (SMPP 2)

## Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy is to confirm how Pegasus Academy manages malpractice under normal delivery arrangements in accordance with the regulations.

## General principles

In accordance with the regulations Pegasus Academy will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place (GR 5.11, a)
- 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, b)
- 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, 1 September to 31 August 2024* and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11, c)

## 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 (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)

## Preventing malpractice

Pegasus Academy has in place robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3. Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre can report it using the appropriate channels. (SMPP 4.3)

## Identification and reporting of malpractice

- 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 (SMPP4.1.3)
- 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 (SMPP 4.4, 4.6)
- 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** (SMPP 4.5)
- 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 in writing and provided a copy of the JCQ document SMPP (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 their enquiries (SMPP 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 information-gatherer must ensure that the accused individuals are made fully aware of their rights and responsibilities (section 5.34) prior to submission of the report to the awarding body. The checklists inside the forms must be completed to provide assurances that this has been done (SMPP 5.39)
- 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)

Malpractice cases are usually confidential between the centre and the awarding body. However, in cases of serious malpractice, such as where the threat to the integrity of the examination or assessment is such as to outweigh a duty of confidentiality, it may be necessary for information to be exchanged amongst:

- the regulators.
- other awarding bodies.
- other regulatory or investigative bodies; and
- other centres where the malpractice may affect the delivery of an awarding body's qualification. (SMPP 11.2)

Awarding bodies will normally only communicate directly with a candidate (or the candidate's representative) when they are a private candidate, or the awarding body has been liaising with the candidate directly regarding their alleged involvement in malpractice (SMPP 11.4)

For example, awarding bodies reserve the right to communicate directly with candidates regarding investigations where they are directly impacted, and the awarding body does not have assurance that the centre is communicating appropriately with the candidate(s) (SMPP 11.4)

## Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Pegasus Academy will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process 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**.

## Prevention of AI Misuse in Exams/NEAs

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a technological tool used to generate work/aspects of work be this written or any other media form, through means not based on independent human thought processes. AI misuse in exams is essentially the practice of when work produced for examination purposes, is not cited properly and ultimately is used to produce work for a candidate, meaning they have had very little input into the creation of the work concerned.

Pegasus Academy acknowledges that due to the increasing development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) based tools, the following advice should be issued to staff delivering components which may lend themselves to the use of this tool:

- Do not use it to mark work and if it is used, it must not be the sole marker of the candidates work, but the centre staff should be discouraged from any risks associated with it. It is an aid not a replacement for human judgment.
- Do not enable the use of AI by telling Candidates about the fact it can be used.

If it is used as an aid, the candidate is required to cite what AI has been used for and the software specifically used to perform the actions within the assignment. Should a candidate be found to be passing off AI generated work as their own without citing its use officially (*"It remains essential that students are clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and that they know how to do this"* – pp.6 of AI Use in Assessments JCQ Policy Document February 2024), then it must be reported to the relevant exam board through the use of an M1 Form in the usual manner conducted for any instance of examination malpractice.

To prevent AI being used in any form of assessment written or NEA, electronic devices with access to such technology must be handed in by the candidate, to be held securely by the centre staff/examination team outside of the designated exam room. This includes mobile phones, air pods, smart watches etc. Any NEAs conducted using computers must have restricted access to the internet, or if the internet is required, then the candidates must be closely supervised by centre staff running these assessments with the assistance of the Examinations Officer where applicable. Working in line with the standard rule of 1 to 30 ratio of students to supervising/invigilation staff.

The risk of using AI for examinations of any kind can lead to the blurring of the lines between the students work and that of the AI generator. Specifically, this means that examiners/moderators will not be able to fully establish the full extent of a candidate's ability, because the AI in most cases will provide higher quality work than the candidate would ever create.

Candidates should be made aware of AI and the potential risks of its misuse during the delivery of the coursework brief to ensure all candidates understand the consequences of misusing AI and how it affects the ability to certify any given qualification they are undertaking where AI could likely be used to gain an unfair advantage in producing work and the quality of this same work.

Additionally, in line with Pegasus Academy's own acceptable use policies for AI based tools, candidates must only, where permitted, use AI software that has been approved by the Academy Trust. Currently the software permitted by the Trust is the Microsoft Copilot AI. The interface should never be used as a substitute for the candidates own ability to undertake any form of formal examination, be this in the form of an NEA or a final written examination.