



Functional Skills L2 (English)
Malpractice Policy
Sir Thomas Rich's

Functional Skills L2 (English) Malpractice Policy

Centre name	Sir Thomas Rich's
Centre number	57143
Date first created	1/04/2026
Current policy approved by	Senior Leadership Team (SLT)
Current policy reviewed by	Jo Tyler (EO)
Date of review	1/04/2027
Date of next review	April 2027

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Matthew Lynch
Senior leader(s) i/c exams	Dave Dempsey (Deputy Headteacher/Deputy Head of Centre) Sonja Jones (Director of Finance and Operations, Line Manager for exams)
Quality Nominee	Joanne Loveridge (SENDCO)

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Aims

1. To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or learners
2. To respond to any incident of alleged malpractice promptly and objectively
3. To standardise and record any investigation of malpractice to ensure openness and fairness
4. To report all alleged, suspected, and actual incidents of malpractice to Pearson
5. To protect the integrity of this centre and Functional Skills qualifications.

To do this, Sir Thomas Richs will:

- Foster a culture in which all learners and staff feel able to report any concerns of wrongdoing by anyone
 - Seek to prevent malpractice by using the induction period and the learner handbook to inform learners of our policy on malpractice and the sanctions for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice
 - Show learners the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources
 - Require 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
 - Advise learners of our rules regarding whether AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT) can be used and, if so,
 - Require learners to acknowledge the use of artificial intelligence (AI) sources and provide copies of any interactions with AI tools made in the production of their work
 - Report to Pearson all alleged, suspected and actual incidents of malpractice in accordance with JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures
-
- If Sir Thomas Richs discover or suspect a learner or member of staff of having committed malpractice, the individual will be made fully aware (preferably in writing) at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.
 - Cases of suspected learner malpractice in external assessments will be reported to Pearson immediately. The Head of Centre will complete JCQ Form M1 and

submit this along with all supporting documentation to Pearson's Investigations Processing team at candidatemalpractice@pearson.com.

- Cases of suspected learner malpractice in internal assessments will be reported to Pearson if the learner has signed the declaration of authentication. The Head of Centre will complete JCQ Form M1 and submit this along with all supporting documentation to Pearson's Investigations Processing team at candidatemalpractice@pearson.com.
- For internal assessment, where learners have not completed a declaration of authentication, Sir Thomas Richs will follow the internal assessment malpractice/academic misconduct policy in resolving the matter as this does not need to be reported to Pearson.
- Where required, gather information for an investigation in accordance with Pearson instructions. Such an investigation will be supported by the Head of Centre / Principal / CEO and all personnel linked to the allegation
- comply with the requirements as set out in the Centre Guidance: Dealing with Malpractice and maladministration.

Where malpractice is proven, Pearson will determine the sanctions to be imposed.

Learner Malpractice

This list of examples is not exhaustive:

- Plagiarism of any nature, including the misuse of AI tools
- Collusion by working collaboratively with other learners to produce work that is submitted as individual learner work
- Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying)
- Deliberate destruction of another's work
- Fabrication of results or evidence
- False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework
- Impersonation, by pretending to be someone else to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test.

Staff Malpractice

This list of examples is not exhaustive:

- Improper assistance to learners

- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed work (coursework or portfolio evidence) where there is insufficient evidence of the learners' achievement to justify the marks given or assessment decisions made
- Failure to keep learner coursework/portfolios of evidence secure
- 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
- Failing to provide reasonable adjustments where these have been approved, such as having a scribe or reader

General principles

In accordance with the regulations Sir Thomas Rich's 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

Sir Thomas Rich's School has in place:

Robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**. (SMPP 4.3)

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

(SMPP 3.2)

Informing and advising candidates how to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments

Exam briefing assemblies are held prior to all public examinations and mock examinations undertaken by Years 10-13 by the Examinations Officer and by Heads of Year to Years 7-9 in their end of year exams. In addition to this, for Public Exams, all JCQ information for students, a copy of the briefing slides and a candidate handbook are also emailed to students and parents/guardians. These exam briefings cover all the JCQ Information for Candidates guidance to ensure that candidates are clear on all the regulations pertaining to prohibited items (including calculators), what formal exam conditions are, lateness, equipment and malpractice.

At the beginning of the academic year, in addition to our 'Teacher Guide to Exams' (which covers all aspects of the Exams Cycle), as well as internal assessment/endorsements, all teaching staff are sent JCQ documentation regarding NEAs, coursework, use of calculators (including FAQs-Using calculators) and reasonable adjustments in A level science. In addition, they are also sent links to our Internal Appeals Procedure Policy, NEA Policy, Notice to centres informing students of their centre assessed marks, Plagiarism in Assessments and the latest JCQ publication AI use in assessments protecting the integrity of qualifications, along with all the Information for Candidates documents (including the AI poster for students and IFC AI

(Artificial Intelligence in Assessments) and SLT Presentation for Teachers and Teacher Presentation for Students to use for training and in the classroom with students.

AI use in assessments

With reference to the JCQ guidance for Teachers & Assessors - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications:

Students complete the majority of their exams and a large number of other assessments under close staff supervision with limited access to authorised materials and no permitted access to the internet. The delivery of these assessments should be unaffected by developments in AI tools as students must not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments.

There are some assessments in which access to the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages. The majority of these assessments will be Non-Examined Assessments (NEAs), coursework and internal assessments for General Qualifications (GQs). JCQ's guidance, which is designed to help students and teachers to complete NEAs, coursework and other internal assessments successfully, is followed in relation to these assessments.

AI chatbots and AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. Users can ask follow-up questions or ask the chatbot to revise the responses already provided. AI chatbots respond to prompts based upon patterns in data sets (large language model) upon which they have been trained. They generate responses which are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate. AI chatbots can complete the following tasks: analysing, improving and summarising text, authoring essays, articles, fiction and non-fiction, writing computer code, translating text from one language to another, generating new ideas, prompts or suggestions for a given topic/theme and generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment or formality.

At Sir Thomas Rich's School, in addition to the information shared with candidates and teaching staff helping teachers to understand and prevent AI misuse and to support students to better understand the rules of AI in Assessments (**see section above: Informing and advising students how to avoid committing malpractice in examination/assessments**), teaching staff then use these documents to brief their candidates on all the regulations surrounding the completion of NEAs/Coursework and models of calculators allowed in exams. Heads of Department ensure that candidates are clear on acceptable AI usage, so that like any other sources they use, they avoid plagiarism. They go through with candidates the risks of using AI in assessments and how to correctly reference any AI content they may wish to use. They are told to keep a copy of the computer-generated content for reference and authentication. This is to avoid the risk of misuse (i.e. not acknowledging/poor/incomplete acknowledgement of the use of AI as a source, using AI to complete/copy/paraphrase whole or parts of an

assessment, submitting work that uses deliberately incomplete/misleading references), which could result in malpractice. Students are then required to sign their authentication statement/declaration.

Candidates will be issued with of the JCQ **Information for candidates - AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)** or similar centre document prior to completing their work/prior to signing the declaration of authentication.

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. (SMPP 4.3)

During examinations, any suspected malpractice is identified to the Examinations Officer by the Invigilator. The candidate is immediately informed that this has to be reported to the Examination Board and that they will have the opportunity to submit a statement themselves after the exam. The Examinations Officer, authorised by the Head of Centre, uses JCQ/M1 form and collects evidence and takes a statement from the Invigilator and candidate after the exam along with the incident log and takes a photograph, where relevant, of any prohibited items used. The candidate's parents/guardians are informed for all candidates. Form M1 and supporting evidence is then checked by SLT Lead for Examinations prior to sending it to the Head of Centre for submission to the Examination Board concerned.

Any suspected malpractice for NEA/Coursework tasks prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication need not be reported to the appropriate Awarding Body and Sir Thomas Rich's School will resolve the matter internally. Teachers will not accept work which is not the candidate's own and check candidate's work regularly for acknowledgement of sources as they complete the assessment, as well as looking out for any changes in style of writing or off topic content. Candidates have strict deadlines for intermediate stages of their assessments where staff carry out these checks. Candidates are briefed on this before beginning any assessments. If any malpractice is suspected this will be escalated to Head of Department (acting under the authority of the Head of Centre) where the student will be informed that their work will not be submitted in its current plagiarised form.

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 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)

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-examination 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-examination 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. (SMPP 11.1)

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Sir Thomas Rich's School will:

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 document **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**

Links

Add links here to key Pearson and /or centre documents that may be helpful for staff when reading or using the policy & procedures. A few are already listed that may be useful.

. This is Pearson's guidance on dealing with assessment malpractice and maladministration.

, which includes guidance on understanding and managing plagiarism