



LANDAU
FORTE
COLLEGE
DERBY

Policy Name	Malpractice and Maladministration Policy
Policy Number	5
Date of Issue	September 2023
Author	A Potts
Reviewed by	RMA
Date of next review	September 2024

Examinations Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

Purpose

The College is committed to the integrity of the external examinations process and follows the JCQ guidance document Suspected malpractice in Examinations and Assessments. A copy of which can be found following this link https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Malpractice_Sep23_FINAL.pdf

The policy is updated on a yearly basis by the examinations officer in line with any changes to above document. The person with overall responsibility for the conduct of examinations and assessments is the Principal as Head of Centre.

Definition of Malpractice

Malpractice is essentially any activity or practice which deliberately contravenes regulations and compromises the integrity of the internal or external assessment process and/or the validity of certificates. It covers any deliberate actions, neglect, default or other practice that compromises, or could compromise:

- the assessment process
- the integrity of a regulated qualification
- the validity of a result or certificate
- the reputation and credibility of awarding bodies
- the qualification or the wider qualifications community.

Malpractice may include a range of issues from the failure to maintain appropriate records or systems to the deliberate falsification of records in order to claim certificates. Malpractice may also include misconduct relating to the discrimination or bias towards groups of learners in contravention of the College's policy on Equal Opportunities.

The HOC must report to the awarding body immediately all cases of suspected malpractice in connection with the examination.

Definition of Maladministration

Maladministration is essentially any activity or practice which results in non-compliance with administrative regulations and requirements and includes the application of persistent mistakes or poor administration (e.g. within a centre, inappropriate learner records).

Form JCQM2 – Notification of suspected malpractice/maladministration involving centre staff is now referenced together with form JCQ/M1- report of suspected candidate malpractice.

https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/JCQ-Form-M1_Sep2023-FINAL.docx
https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/JCQ-Form-M2_Sep2023-FINAL.docx

Objectives

- To ensure that the College is compliant with the regulations expected by all awarding bodies through whom examinations/assessments are taken.
- To ensure that all staff and students involved in the teaching or organisation of examinations and assessments are fully aware of the regulations and consequences of malpractice/maladministration
- To ensure that in the event of any Malpractice/Maladministration that procedures are followed in line with the JCQ regulations and/or those associated with the specific awarding body for whom the examination/assessment relates.

All staff involved have been made aware of the specific types of malpractice which may affect the Summer 2024 series including:

- breaches of internal security;
- deception;
- improper assistance to students;
- failure to appropriately authenticate a student's work;
- over direction of students in preparation for common assessments;
- allegations that centres submit grades not supported by evidence that they know to be inaccurate;
- centres enter students who were not originally intending to certificate a grade in the Summer 2024 series;
- failure to engage as requested with awarding organisations during the External Quality Assurance and appeal stages; and
- failure to keep appropriate records of decisions made and teacher assessed grades.

Dealing with cases of malpractice and maladministration

Malpractice conducted by students in NEAs

Any incident of suspected malpractice by students occurring as part of an NEA (Non-examined assessment) will be dealt with in the following way:

Before a student has signed a Candidate declaration form

In line with JCQ regulations, the College is not obliged to inform the awarding body if suspected malpractice is identified before the candidate has signed the declaration form. In the event that malpractice is suspected, the College will follow the procedure below:

- The subject teacher will inform their subject leader of suspected malpractice
- The subject leader will inform the Vice Principal, Head of Centre and Examinations officer.
- The subject leader will inform the student and parents that malpractice is suspected and that an investigation will take place with a specific timeline (usually 1 College week) and that they will be informed of the outcome.
- An investigation will be conducted by the subject leader and Vice Principal to establish:
 - What malpractice (if any) has taken place
 - The intent or otherwise of the student to commit malpractice

- The advice/direction afforded by the subject teacher to the student before and during the NEA
- Any mitigating circumstances
- Following the investigation the Head of Centre will make a decision that may include:
 - Expectation that the candidate re-submits parts of their NEA which were compromised by the malpractice (depending on submission deadlines).
 - Expectation that the candidate does not receive any credit for a particular affected section of the NEA (documentated clearly in marking annotations in the case of external verification).
- The outcome will be reported to the student and parent by the Head of Centre.
- The student will have the opportunity to complain in accordance with College complaints policy.

After a student has signed a Candidate declaration form

If suspected malpractice has been identified after the student has signed a candidate declaration form, the Head of Centre will inform the awarding body immediately and complete the appropriate documentation as detailed in JCQ regulations. The Awarding body will then report back to the College with a judgement.

Use of AI in Assessments – Preventing Plaiqarism

The College recognises the prevalence of AI and the opportunities for students to use AI within their NEA and the potential for Malpractice to occur.

What is AI?

AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications. Misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice. The College is aware that AI tools are evolving quickly but there are still limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content. However, the use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments.

What is AI misuse?

Students must be able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>). Instances of Malpractice by students within the College will be dealt with in accordance with the College Malpractice & Maladministration policy.

Mitigation

In order to prevent cases of student malpractice during NEA assessments, the College will ensure that students and parents are advised of appropriate and inappropriate use of AI in a qualification assessment and make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice. To further mitigate against this the College will:

- Explain the importance of students submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice;
- Ensure that the vast majority of any NEA work is conducted within College where staff can more closely supervise students and access to AI tools is blocked under College ICT filtering.
- Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages;
- Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident that the student understands the material;
- Consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work;
- Ensure students are given clear guidance on how students should reference appropriately (including websites) and acknowledge any use of AI;
- Ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools
- Ensure that, where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, AI tools have been blocked from student use.
- Ensure that each student is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate *JCQ Information for Candidates* (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents);
- Reinforce to students the significance of their (electronic) declaration where they confirm the work they're submitting is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and that they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject;
- Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice
- Ensure that teachers are aware that the College policy is that they must not use AI tools to assess students work.

Acknowledging use of AI and assessing student work where AI is acknowledged

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2024.

The student must, retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used. This must be submitted with the work the student submits for assessment, so the subject teacher is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the College suspects that the student has used AI tools, the College will follow its policy on Malpractice and Maladministration.

Students will be reminded that if they use AI, they will not have independently met the marking criteria so will not receive credit for any section where they have used AI. Where students' referencing is incomplete, students will be expected to rectify this.

When marking student work in which AI use has been acknowledged, and there are no concerns of AI misuse, the subject teacher must still ensure that if the student has used AI tools such that they have not independently met the marking criteria, they are not rewarded. Depending upon the marking criteria or grade descriptors being applied, the subject teacher may need to take into account the failure to independently demonstrate their understanding of certain aspects when determining the appropriate mark/ grade to be awarded. Where such AI use has been considered, and particularly where this has had an impact upon the final marks/grades awarded by the subject teacher, the subject leader, Vice Principal and Examinations officer must be consulted and clear records should be kept – this provides feedback to the student and provides clarity in the event of an internal appeal or the work being selected for moderation/ standards verification.

Identifying misuse

The College will advise staff that when reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the student. Where the work is made up of writing, one can make note of the following characteristics:

- Spelling and punctuation
- Grammatical usage
- Writing style and tone
- Vocabulary
- Complexity and coherency
- General understanding and working level
- The mode of production (i.e. whether handwritten or word-processed)

Subject staff could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions.

Potential indicators of AI misuse

If the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication that the student has misused AI:

- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations
- A default use of language or vocabulary which might not appropriate to the qualification level
- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected
- Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)

- A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled) which might be notable for some subjects. Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.
- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
- A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
- A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
- The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output
- The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
- The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth and variety or to overcome its output limit
- The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
- Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.

Where unsure, subject staff may be encouraged to use automated detection services to identify where AI has been used but not acknowledged

All other forms of Malpractice/Maladministration

The College with the Head of Centre with overall responsibility will ensure any other cases of alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice or maladministration before, during or after examinations/assessments (by centre staff, candidates, invigilators) are investigated and reported to the awarding body **immediately**, by completing the appropriate documentation. As detailed in the JCQ regulations.



LANDAU
FORTE
CHARITABLE
TRUST

Date	September 2023
Change Made	September 2024
Made By	RMA/AP