

Reviewed 31st Octobre 2025

MALPRACTICE IN ASSESSMENT/EXAM POLICY

The **Lycée Français Charles de Gaulle**, known as **the Centre**, is committed to ensuring the promotion of justice, equality of opportunity and fair treatment for all candidates to prove their abilities and knowledge during all assessments.

Purpose of the Policy

In accordance with the JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures and in order for exams to be fair for all and for results to be trusted, The Centre 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 will be escalated within the Centre and reported to the relevant **AO** (Awarding Organisation).

Role in Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications]

Protecting the integrity of qualifications is a fundamental responsibility of the Centre. In accordance with section 1.7 of the JCQ Instructions for Conducting Examinations (ICE) 2025–2026, the Centre must ensure that all examinations and assessments are conducted in a secure, consistent and reliable manner so that public confidence in the validity of awarded qualifications is maintained. The Centre recognises that any breach of security—whether digital, procedural or physical—has the potential to compromise the authenticity of assessments and therefore takes a proactive approach to safeguarding all processes associated with exams and assessments.

What is malpractice and maladministration?

This policy uses the word malpractice to cover both malpractice and maladministration, i.e. any act which involves a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment, including:

- 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.

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) at the Centre; or

- An individual appointed in another capacity by the Centre such as an invigilator, a communication professional, a language modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader or a scribe.

Suspected malpractice

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

Below is a summary of the rules, which are also clearly set out in the Joint Council for Qualification's (JCQ) [information for candidates](#).

- For timed written assessments, these rules ensure that all candidates have an equal experience under assessment conditions so that no candidate can gain an unfair advantage over another.
- For coursework submissions, these rules ensure that a candidate cannot receive credit for plagiarism, using somebody else's work without acknowledgement, or by re-using their own work for more than one assessment, or for using AI (Artificial Intelligence) tools such as ChatGPT, Snapshot or MyAI.

General principles

In accordance with the JCQ regulations the Centre 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 AO, 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 AO may reasonably require

Preventing malpractice

The Centre has in place:

- Robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined 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 AO guidance, including candidate's authentication forms

Artificial intelligence (AI)

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools are now widespread and easy to access. Staff, students and parents/carers may be familiar with generative chatbots such as ChatGPT and Google Bard. The Centre recognises that AI has many uses to help students learn, but may also lend itself to cheating and plagiarism.

Candidates **may not** use AI tools:

- During assessments, including internal and external assessments, and coursework
- To write their homework or class assignments, where AI-generated text is presented as their own work

Candidates **may** use AI tools:

- As a research tool to help them find out about new topics and ideas
- When specifically studying and discussing AI in schoolwork, for example in IT lessons or Art homework about AI-generated images. All AI-generated content must be properly referenced
- Where a candidate uses an AI tool, they should retain a copy of the question(s) asked and the AI-generated responses. Candidates must submit this along with the assessment.

Centre Staff should:

- Be aware that AI tools are still being developed and should use such tools with caution as they may provide inaccurate, inappropriate or biased content
- Follow the JCQ guidance on identifying and preventing plagiarism.
- Use appropriate detection methods, maintain vigilance for AI-generated or third-party content, and clearly instruct students on the difference between acceptable research support and prohibited copying.
- Make students aware of the risks of using AI tools and that they need to appropriately reference AI as a source of information to maintain the integrity of assessments

For more information on AI misuse, see JCQ's 'AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications'. Any misuse of AI tools may be treated as **Malpractice**.

Informing and advising candidates

- All candidates will have been briefed by their teachers at the start of the academic year, including the [JCQ quick guide for students to AI and Assessments](#).
- Candidates with NEA component will have been made aware by their subject teachers of the JCQ's [Information for candidates - non-examination assessments/coursework assessments](#)
- Our malpractice policy is sent every year to all candidates alongside their examination timetable and other JCQ/boards important exam information for candidates before the Summer exams season start in April.
- A candidate briefing session is held by the Head of Centre before the start of the Summer exam season, which includes candidate malpractice.

Actions to Implement the Policy

All incidents of suspected staff and Centre malpractice/maladministration cases and all incidents of suspected candidate malpractice in an examination will be reported to the AO; that also includes all cases of suspected candidate malpractice in an assessment/coursework identified after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication. Cases will also be considered by the Head of the Centre of the British Section and all results will be withheld until the investigation is complete.

Any incidents of suspected candidate malpractice identified before the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication do not need to be reported to the AO but will be considered by the Head of Centre and could, after investigation, involve the Centre's disciplinary procedures.

The Centre takes seriously its responsibility to ensure that any instances of offence/malpractice are investigated fully, and appropriate, sensitive and responsive action is taken.

Candidates who have been found guilty of malpractice could lose their marks for their assessment or even be disqualified from the subject.

Identification and reporting of malpractice

Escalating suspected malpractice issues

All staff have a responsibility for reporting any potential malpractice that they may identify. Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff can report it using the appropriate channels.

- ✓ Suspected student malpractice should be reported to the Exams Officer & Head of Centre
- ✓ Concerns regarding the Exams Officer should be reported to the Head of Centre
- ✓ Concerns about the Head of Centre should be reported to the Proviseure.

Reporting suspected malpractice to the AO

- 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 AO 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 AO but will be dealt with in accordance with the Centre's internal procedures. The only exception to this is where the AO's confidential assessment material has potentially been breached. The breach will be reported to the AO 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 case to the relevant AO, accompanied by the information obtained during the course of their enquiries; Form JCQ/M1 will be used for candidate cases; for centre staff, form JCQ/M3 will be used;
- The AO 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.
- Candidates Assessment records will be updated according to the decision of the AO

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

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice, including staff decisions to reject a candidate's work on the grounds of malpractice

The Centre 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 publication "A guide to the Awarding Bodies' appeals processes "

C. Shulver - Head of Centre

S. Schurer - Exams Officer

Next review: October 2026

Candidate Malpractice examples (list is non-exhaustive)

The regulations follow widely-held principles; Examples that could lead to an investigation include:

- Bringing into the examination room or assessment situation unauthorised material, even if you do not make use of them, for example: notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators (when prohibited), dictionaries (when prohibited), instruments which can capture a digital image, electronic dictionaries (when prohibited), translators, wordlists, glossaries, iPods, mobile phones, earphones/earbuds, AirPods, watches, smart glasses or other similar electronic devices;
- the unauthorised use of a memory stick or similar device where a candidate uses a word processor;
- Bringing into the examination room notes in the wrong format (where notes are permitted in examinations) or inappropriately annotated texts (in open book examinations);
- Some items, such as calculators and statute books, may be permitted, but you will be told in advance if this is the case;
- Being in possession of confidential material in advance of the examination;
- Impersonation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another person to take one's place in an examination or an assessment;
- A breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor, or the awarding body in relation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations;
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments;
- Disruptive behaviour in the examination room or during an assessment session (including the use of offensive language);
- The inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts, controlled assessments, coursework or portfolios;
- Sharing information about an exam or assessment if you have sat it before others;
- Passing on rumours or information about exam content;
- Posting your work online, in part or full, before an exam or assessment;
- Receiving help in producing your work, or helping others produce their work;
- Plagiarism: copying from another candidate (including the use of IT/AI to aid the copying);
- Allowing work to be copied e.g. posting written coursework on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment;
- Making comments about cheating in exams or assessments
- The deliberate destruction of another candidate's work;
- Failing to report exam-related rumours or information you have been sent by others;
- Breaking the rules, even accidentally, including late submission of a timed assessment, i.e. outside the timeframe given, may result in a penalty;
- Using AI tools to write text, make art or creating music, and claiming it as your own work;
- Using AI, when allowed by your subject teacher, and not referencing the AI tools used (name, date, how it was used and screenshot of questions and answers);
- For any assessment, sign a declaration without properly referencing any AI use;
- The alteration or falsification of any results document, including certificates;

Maladministration examples (list is non-exhaustive)

Other instances of maladministration may be identified and considered by the AO at their discretion.

Failure to adhere to the regulations regarding the conduct of controlled assessments, coursework and examinations or malpractice in the conduct of the examinations/assessments and/or the handling of examination question papers, candidate scripts, mark sheets, cumulative assessment records, results and certificate claim forms, etc.

For example:

- Failing to ensure that candidates' coursework or work to be completed under controlled conditions is adequately monitored and supervised;
- Inappropriate members of staff assessing candidates for access arrangements who do not meet the criteria as detailed in the JCQ publication Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments;
- Failure to use current assignments for assessments;
- Failure to train invigilators adequately, leading to non-compliance with the JCQ Instructions for conducting examinations;
- Failing to issue to candidates the appropriate notices and warnings, e.g. JCQ Information for candidates documents;
- Failure to inform the JCQ Centre Inspection Service of alternative sites for examinations;
- Failing to post notices relating to the examination or assessment outside all rooms (including Music and Art rooms) where examinations and assessments are held;
- Not ensuring that the examination venue conforms to the requirements as stipulated in the JCQ publication Instructions for conducting examinations;
- The introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room, either prior to or during the examination; (N.B. this precludes the use of the examination room to coach candidates or give subject-specific presentations, including power-point presentations, prior to the start of the examination).

Staff Malpractice examples (list is non-exhaustive)

Other instances of malpractice may be identified and considered by the AO at their discretion.

Breach of security

Any act which breaks the confidentiality of question papers or materials, and their electronic equivalents, or the confidentiality of candidates' scripts or their electronic equivalents.

It could involve:

- Failing to keep examination material secure prior to an examination;
- Discussing or otherwise revealing secure information in public, e.g. internet forums;
- Moving the time or date of a fixed examination beyond the arrangements permitted within the JCQ publication Instructions for conducting examinations.
- Conducting an examination before the published date constitutes centre staff malpractice and a clear breach of security;
- Failing to supervise adequately candidates who have been affected by a timetable variation; (This would apply to candidates subject to overnight supervision by centre personnel or where an examination is to be sat in an earlier or later session on the scheduled day.)

- Permitting, facilitating or obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination;
- Failing to retain and secure examination question papers after an examination in cases where the life of the paper extends beyond the particular session. For example, where an examination is to be sat in a later session by one or more candidates due to a timetable variation;
- Tampering with candidate scripts or controlled assessments or coursework after collection and before despatch to the AO/examiner/moderator; (This would additionally include reading candidates' scripts or photocopying candidates' scripts prior to despatch to the AO/examiner. The only instance where photocopying a candidate's script is permissible is where he/she has been granted the use of a transcript.)
- Failing to keep candidates' computer files secure which contain controlled assessments or coursework.

Deception

Any act of dishonesty in relation to an examination or assessment, but not limited to:

- Inventing or changing marks for internally assessed components (e.g. coursework) where there is no actual evidence of the candidates' achievement to justify the marks awarded;
- Fabricating assessment and/or internal verification records or authentication statements;
- Substituting one candidate's controlled assessment or coursework for another.
- Entering fictitious candidates for examinations or assessments, or otherwise subverting the assessment or certification process with the intention of financial gain (fraud);

Improper assistance to candidates

Any act where assistance is given beyond that permitted by the specification or regulations to a candidate or group of candidates, which results in a potential or actual advantage in an examination or assessment.

For example:

- Assisting candidates in the production of controlled assessments or coursework, or evidence of achievement, beyond that permitted by the regulations;
- Sharing or lending candidates' controlled assessments or coursework with other candidates in a way which allows malpractice to take place;
- Assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers;
- Permitting candidates in an examination to access prohibited materials (dictionaries, calculators etc.);
- Prompting candidates in an examination/assessment by means of signs, or verbal or written prompts, in the exception of a prompter being officially granted;
- Assisting candidates granted the use of an oral language modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader, a scribe or a sign language interpreter beyond that permitted by the regulations.
- Failure to co-operate with an investigation
- Failure to make available information reasonably requested by an AO in the course of an investigation, or in the course of deciding whether an investigation is necessary; and/or
- Failure to investigate on request in accordance with the AO's instructions or advice; and/or



- Failure to investigate or provide information according to agreed deadlines; and/or
- Failure to report all suspicions of malpractice.