

Malpractice Policy - Examinations

2025/2026

This process is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Marie Rooney Audrey Baker-Smith	
Date of next review	Sept 2026

Introduction

What is malpractice and maladministration?

'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 uses 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

Incidents of malpractice arise for a variety of reasons, such as:

- some incidents are intentional and aim to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment;
- some incidents arise due to a lack of awareness of the regulations, carelessness, or forgetfulness in applying the regulations (which may often be called 'maladministration');
- some occur as a result of the force of circumstances which are beyond the control of those involved (e.g. a fire alarm sounds and the supervision of candidates is disrupted).

The individuals involved in malpractice also vary. They may include:

- candidates;
- teachers, lecturers, tutors, trainers, assessors or others responsible for the conduct, administration or quality assurance of examinations and assessments, including examinations officers, invigilators and those facilitating access arrangements (e.g. readers, scribes and practical assistants);
- assessment personnel, such as examiners, assessors, moderators or internal and external verifiers;
- other third parties (e.g. parents/carers, siblings or friends of the candidate).

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)

Suspected malpractice

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

Purpose of the policy

To confirm Bournville School:

- 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 should be escalated within the centre and reported to the relevant awarding body

General principles

In accordance with the regulations Bournville School 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 (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 JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures** and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11)

Preventing malpractice

Bournville School has in place robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of 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 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

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.

Using all appropriate communication channels to provide updated information, guidance and training for all stakeholders, including learners, in relation to the prevention of malpractice and maladministration.

- Fully utilising the JCQ Centre Inspection Service (CIS) that acts on behalf of the awarding bodies, ensuring that centre checks are undertaken with appropriate regularity and rigour.
- Responding efficiently and with clarity to a request from a centre to provide it with guidance on how best to prevent malpractice and maladministration.
- Monitoring social media, where appropriate, for any indication of malpractice and maladministration.
- Monitoring data, including entry data, to identify patterns, trends, double entering, failure to meet deadlines and any other information that may indicate malpractice has occurred.
- Reviewing proven cases of malpractice to analyse what, if anything, the awarding body/bodies should learn from the occurrence.

Additional information:

Centre Specific

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

- All JCQ notices e.g. information for candidates, non-examination assessment, coursework, on screen tests, written examinations, social media, plagiarism are distributed to candidates before assessments and examinations take place, documents are also available on Bournville website.
 - Ensure Candidates are informed verbally (during assemblies) and in writing about the required conditions under which the assessments are conducted, including warnings about the prohibition of materials and devices into the assessments and access to restricted resources.
 - Ensure candidates are aware of actions that constitute malpractice and the sanctions that can be imposed on those who commit malpractice.
 - Ensure that candidates are aware of the sanctions of passing on or receiving confidential assessment materials, if a candidate receives confidential Information they must report it to a member of centre staff immediately.
 - Ensure that candidates involved in examination clash arrangements are aware of appropriate behaviour during supervision, i.e. ensuring that candidates cannot pass on or receive information about the content of assessments thereby committing candidate malpractice.
 - Ensure that candidates completing coursework or non-examination assessments are aware of the need for the work to be their own and are provided with clear instructions on how to avoid plagiarism (including AI misuse)
-
- Ensure that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the JCQ documents above and any further awarding body guidance
 - Ensure that staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the key dates and deadlines and that there are robust procedures in place to ensure these are met.
 - Ensure that examination officers are appropriately trained, resourced and supported
 - Ensure that exams, including those delivered at alternative sites are conducted in accordance with JCQ ICE requirements
 - Ensure that all staff who manage and implement special consideration and access arrangements are aware of the requirements and are appropriately supported and resourced
 - Ensure that members of staff do not communicate any confidential information about examinations and assessment materials, including via social media
 - Ensure that members of staff follow appropriate security procedures to ensure confidential information relating to examinations and assessment materials is not breached.
 - Ensure that in the event of an examination clash arrangements are planned and managed effectively
 - Ensure that staff delivering/assessing coursework, internal assessments and/or non-examination assessments have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting plagiarism (including AI misuse) and other potential candidate malpractice

- Ensure that the centre has a culture of honesty and openness so that any concerns of potential malpractice can be escalated appropriately without fear of repercussion

AI Use in Assessments

Ensure teachers and assessors are aware of and have access to the JCQ AI use in assessments: protecting the integrity of qualifications.

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3 (k) of the JCQ General regulations for approved centres ([Gen regs approved centres 25-26 FINAL.pdf](#))
- teachers and assessors must only accept work for qualifications assessments which is the student's own.

Students who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own they will have committed malpractice in accordance with JCQ regulations and may attract severe sanctions.

- Students and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice.
- Students must make sure that work submitted for assessment is demonstrably their own, if any sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified by the student and they must understand that this will not allow them to demonstrate that they have met the marking criteria and therefore will not be regarded.
- Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment e.g. they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI but this has not been acknowledged they must investigate and take appropriate action.

Identification and reporting of malpractice

Once suspected malpractice is identified, any member of staff at the centre can report it using the appropriate channels

Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body

- The head of centre **MUST** 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 (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)

- 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)
- Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment 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.
- **Note:** Centres are advised that if coursework, controlled assessment, non-examination assessment or portfolio work which is submitted for internal assessment is rejected by the centre on grounds of malpractice, there should be an internal process in place at the centre so that candidates can request an internal appeal against this decision
- 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 (SMPP 5.33)

Information Gathering:

- The awarding body will determine who should gather information for the investigation. The individuals that can be chosen include: • the head of centre; • the Chair of Governors of the centre; • the responsible employer (or his/her nominee), e.g. Director of Education the Chief Executive Officer of a multi-academy trust; • awarding body staff from the malpractice investigation team; or • another suitably qualified individual such as an Ofsted Inspector or the head of another school in the same multi-academy trust
- Where the head of centre wishes to appoint a staff member to gather information, the agreement of the awarding body must be obtained first. The head of centre will retain responsibility for ensuring the information has been obtained appropriately. The head of centre must ensure the information gathering meets the deadlines and requirements set by the awarding body
- in all cases, the head of centre must confirm to the awarding body the identity of the individual who will gather information and that the individual is appropriately senior, experienced in conducting similar types of investigations and that their appointment will not create a conflict of interest. The awarding body will confirm whether or not they agree to the suggested information gatherer. A conflict of interest would arise where • the information-gatherer has direct line management responsibility for any of the accused individuals; • the information-gatherer has overall responsibility for the area of work subject to the investigation; • the information-gatherer has a relationship, beyond the working relationship, with any of the accused individuals; • the above do not apply but there is or could be a perception that the individual would have a conflict of interest

- Where the awarding body delegates the information gathering to the head of centre, the awarding body will set out: • the allegation made (this may be redacted – see sections 5.30–5.32 for further information); • why this would constitute malpractice, if proven; • who the centre needs to interview/collect statements from – this could include staff and/or students; • if any other information (such as class list, SENCO records, written documents given to students by the teacher etc.) is required • the key lines of enquiry the information gatherer must follow in order to appropriately cover the allegations made; • the expected timescales for the information gathering and subsequent report
- Those responsible for gathering information for an investigation should obtain the information specified by the awarding body, in the formats and to the timescales required. Individuals should always gather the information specified by the awarding body, regardless of their assessment of the matter
- When interviewing member of centre staff or students, centres must conduct those interviews in accordance with their own internal policy for conducting enquiries and with the requirements of this document
- Information gatherers must ensure that those implicated in malpractice are given their rights as detailed in section 5.33 (SMPP)
- 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 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

Bournville School will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal, where relevant
- For candidate malpractice cases, the centre has the right to contest the decision by asking for the matter to be referred to the Malpractice Committee. They have 14 days in which to do so.
- Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ publication

A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes

Sanctions

Awarding bodies impose sanctions on individuals and on centres responsible for malpractice in order to:

- minimise the risk to the integrity of examinations and assessments, both in the present and in the future;
- maintain the confidence of the public in the delivery and awarding of qualifications;
- ensure as a minimum that there is nothing to gain from breaching the regulations;
- deter others from doing likewise

A permanent record will be kept of the impact of any sanctions on an individual candidate's results. For this reason, centres must not withdraw candidates after malpractice has been identified, even if the candidates have not completed the assessments in question. Similarly, centres are required to continue to make an entry for a candidate(s) who were not entered at the time they were found to have committed malpractice (see section 4.5 for more details). All other information relating to specific instances of malpractice or irregularities will be destroyed, following the expiry of the awarding body's data retention period

Heads of centre must inform those individuals found guilty of malpractice that information may be passed on to other awarding bodies and/or other appropriate authorities. This information will typically include the names, offences and sanctions applied to those found guilty of breaching the published regulations

Sanctions for Centre Staff malpractice: Individuals

When determining the appropriate sanction which should be applied to an individual, the awarding body will consider whether the integrity of its qualifications might be at risk if an individual found to have committed malpractice were to be involved in the future conduct, supervision or administration of the awarding body's examinations or assessment

In determining the appropriate sanction, the awarding body will consider factors including:

- the potential risk to the integrity of the examination or assessment;
- the potential adverse impact on candidates;

- the number of candidates and/or centres affected; and
- the potential risk to those relying on the qualification (e.g. employers or members of the public)

The awarding body may consider, at its discretion, mitigating factors supported by appropriate evidence. Ignorance of the regulations will not, by itself, be considered a mitigating factor

Individuals may be subject to one or more sanctions

Where a member of staff or contractor has been found guilty of malpractice, an awarding body may impose one or more of the following sanctions:

Written warning A written warning that if the member of staff commits malpractice within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied

Training The member of staff, as a condition of future involvement in the delivery of the awarding body's examinations and/or assessments, to undertake specific training or mentoring within a particular period of time. The awarding body may request written confirmation of the delivery of the training

Special conditions Special conditions are imposed on the member of staff regarding their future involvement in the delivery of the awarding body's examinations and/or assessments. For example, the member of staff must be supervised

Suspension/debarment The member of staff is suspended/debarred from all involvement in the delivery or administration of the awarding body's examinations and assessments for a set period of time. Other awarding bodies, regulators, and other organisations such as the Teaching Regulation Agency (TRA) and Education Workforce Council (EWC) may be informed when a suspension/debarment is imposed

These sanctions will be notified to the head of centre who must ensure that they are communicated to the individual(s) upon whom they have been imposed and that the sanctions are adhered to. Failure to communicate any sanction to an individual will be considered to be malpractice by the head of centre

If a member of centre staff moves to another centre while being subject to a sanction, or if a member of centre staff moves to another centre during an investigation, the head of centre (of the centre at which the malpractice occurred) must immediately notify the awarding body of the move. Awarding bodies reserve the right to inform the head of the centre to which the staff member is moving as to the nature of, and the reason for, the sanction

If a centre changes awarding body for a qualification, and a member of staff involved in the delivery or assessment of the qualification is subject to a sanction, the head of centre must notify the new awarding body

The awarding body may, at its discretion, ask for monitoring activity to be undertaken, or a plan devised to provide assurance that sanctions against centre staff are being appropriately applied.

Sanctions for centre staff malpractice: Centres

Awarding bodies may, at their discretion, impose the following sanctions against centres:

Written warning A written warning to the head of centre advising of the malpractice and warning that further action may be taken (including the application of sanctions and special conditions) should there be a recurrence, or subsequent malpractice at the centre

Review and report procedures/action plans The head of centre will be required to review the centre's procedures for the conduct or administration of a particular examination/assessment, or all examinations/assessments in general. The head of centre will additionally be required to report back to the awarding body on improvements implemented by a set date. Alternatively, an action plan will be agreed between the awarding body and the centre which will need to be implemented as a condition of continuing to accept entries or registrations from the centre

Approval of specific assessment tasks The approval by the awarding body of specific assessment tasks in situations where these are normally left to the discretion of the centre

Additional monitoring or inspection The awarding body may increase, at the centre's expense, the normal level of monitoring that takes place in relation to their qualification(s)

Removal of direct claims Direct claims status may be removed from the centre, meaning that all claims for certification must be authorised by the centre's external verifier (This sanction only applies to vocational qualifications).

Restrictions on examination and assessment materials For a specified period of time, a centre will be provided with examination papers and assessment materials shortly before such papers and materials are scheduled to be used. These papers might be opened and distributed under the supervision of the awarding body officer (or appointed agent) responsible for the delivery. The centre might also be required to hand over to an awarding body officer (or appointed agent) the completed scripts and any relevant accompanying documentation, rather than using the normal script collection or despatch procedures. These measures may be applied for selected subjects or all subjects

Independent invigilators The appointment for a specified period of time, at the centre's expense, of independent invigilators to ensure the conduct of examinations and/or assessments is in accordance with the published regulations

Suspension of candidate registrations or entries An awarding body may, for a period of time, or until a specific matter has been rectified, refuse to accept candidate entries or registrations from a centre. This may be applied for selected subjects/occupational areas or all subjects/occupational areas

Withdrawal of approval for a specific qualification(s) An awarding body may withdraw the approval of a centre to offer one or more qualifications issued by that awarding body

Withdrawal of centre recognition/approval The awarding body may withdraw its recognition or approval for the centre. This would mean that the centre will not be able to deliver or offer students the respective awarding body's qualifications. The regulators, awarding bodies and other appropriate authorities will be informed if this action is taken. At the time of withdrawal of centre recognition, where determined by an awarding body, a centre will be informed of the earliest date at which it can reapply for registration and any measures it will need to take prior to

this application. Centres which have had centre recognition withdrawn should not assume that re-approval will be treated as a formality

Sanctions applied against Candidates

Awarding bodies may, at their discretion, impose the following sanctions against candidates (it should be noted that, whilst the sanctions are numbered for ease of reference, the sequence of numbers does not imply that the sanctions become progressively more severe. Not all sanctions are applicable to all qualification types):

1. **Warning** The candidate is issued with a warning that if he/she commits malpractice within a set period of time, further specified sanctions may be applied
2. **Loss of all marks for a section** The candidate loses all the marks gained for a discrete section of the work A section may be part of a component, or a single piece of nonexamination assessment if this consists of several items
3. **Loss of all marks for a component** The candidate loses all the marks gained for a component A component is more often a feature of a linear qualification than a unitised qualification, and so this sanction can be regarded as an alternative to sanction 4. Some units also have components, in which case a level of sanction between numbers 2 and 4 is possible
4. **Loss of all marks for a unit** The candidate loses all the marks gained for a unit. This sanction can only be applied to qualifications which are unitised For linear qualifications, the option is sanction 3. This sanction usually allows the candidate to aggregate or request certification in that series, albeit with a reduced mark or grade
5. **Disqualification from a unit** The candidate is disqualified from the unit. This sanction is only available if the qualification is unitised. For linear qualifications the option is sanction The effect of this sanction is to prevent the candidate aggregating or requesting certification in that series, if the candidate has applied for it For qualifications with assessments taken throughout the academic year, the candidate will be disqualified from the unit and will not be able to use the unit to aggregate/certificate. The candidate will need to redo the unit in order to be eligible for aggregation/certification, subject to the awarding body's qualification requirements
6. **Disqualification from all units in one or more qualifications taken in that series or academic year** If circumstances justify, sanction 5 may be applied to other units taken during the same examination or assessment series. (Units which have been banked in previous examination series are retained.) This sanction is only available if the qualification is unitised. For linear qualifications the option is sanction 8 For qualifications with assessments taken throughout the academic year, the candidate will be disqualified from the unit(s) and will not be able to use the unit(s) to aggregate/certificate. The candidate will need to redo the unit in order to be eligible for aggregation/certification, subject to the awarding body's qualification requirements
7. **Disqualification from a whole qualification** The candidate is disqualified from the whole qualification taken in that series or academic year. This sanction can be applied to unitised qualifications only if the candidate has requested aggregation. Any units banked in a previous examination series are retained, but the units taken in the present series and the aggregation

opportunity are lost. If a candidate has not requested aggregation, the option is sanction 6. It may also be used with linear qualifications.

8. Disqualification from all qualifications taken in that series or academic year If circumstances justify, sanction 7 may be applied to other qualifications This sanction can be applied to unitised qualifications only if the candidate has requested aggregation. Any units banked in a previous examination series are retained, but the units taken in the present series and the aggregation opportunity are lost. If a candidate has not requested aggregation, the option is sanction 6. It may also be used with linear qualifications. This sanction is only applied by the affected awarding body

9. Candidate debarment The candidate is barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time. This sanction is applied in conjunction with any of the other sanctions above, if the circumstances warrant it

Unless a sanction is accompanied by a bar on future entry, all candidates penalised by loss of marks or disqualification may re-take the component(s), unit(s) or qualification(s) affected in the next examination series or assessment opportunity if the awarding body qualification permits this. For qualifications which have an endorsement component (such as GCSE English Language or A level Chemistry), candidates can carry forward their endorsement result to the next assessment opportunity, as long as there has been no indication that it has been affected by malpractice

Heads of centre may wish to take further action themselves in cases of candidate malpractice

Communicating Decisions

Once a decision has been made, it will be communicated in writing to the head of centre as soon as possible It is the responsibility of the head of centre to communicate the decision to the individuals concerned and to pass on details of any sanctions and action in cases where this is indicated. The head of centre must also inform the individuals if they have the right to appeal

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 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)

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;
- professional registration and funding bodies; and
- other centres where the malpractice may affect the delivery of an awarding body's qualification

It is the responsibility of the head of centre to inform the accused individual that the awarding body may share information in accordance with paragraph 11.3

Appeals

All awarding bodies have established procedures for considering appeals against sanctions arising from malpractice decisions. The following individuals have a right to appeal against decisions of the Malpractice Committee or officers acting on its behalf:

- heads of centre, who may appeal against sanctions imposed on the centre or on centre staff, as well as on behalf of candidates entered or registered through the centre;
- members of centre staff, including those who may be under contract to fulfil assessment-related functions as detailed on page 6 of this document, who may appeal against sanctions imposed on them personally;
- private (external) candidates;
- third parties who have been barred from taking or delivery of the awarding body's examinations or assessments

Information on the process for submitting an appeal will be sent to all centres involved in malpractice decisions. Appeals must normally be made within 14 days of receiving the malpractice outcome decision.

Further information about the awarding bodies' appeals process may be found in the JCQ document A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes:

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

Changes 2025/2026 to JCQ SMPP booklet.

Key changes for 2025-26

Page number	Section	Paragraph	Summary of change
5	1	1.8	Reference made to providing knowingly inaccurate or misleading information constituting malpractice
7	2		Added centre malpractice definition
11	4	4.1.2	Included certificates possibly being withheld and included the consideration of reporting legitimate concerns to the LADO.
11	4	4.1.3	Confirmation of notifiable malpractice incidents.
13	4	4.5	Confirmation of notifiable malpractice incidents.
14	4	4.11	Reference made to disclosure.
14	4	4.12	Reference made to mitigating actions.
15	4	4.15	Reference made to the summary procedure, sharing intelligence and appropriate actions.
16	5	5.4	Reference made to failure to report in the time specified may constitute malpractice.
18	5	5.12	Reference made to interview wellbeing concerns.
19	5	5.22	Reference made to physical or learning difficulties or disabilities when interviewing.
20	5	5.33	Reference made to providing knowingly misleading or inaccurate information constitutes malpractice.
21	5	5.38	Reference made to a separate checklist for each member of staff implicated in the allegation.
27	7	7.10	Reference made to potential malpractice.
39	Appendix 2		Reference to centre malpractice. Reference made to artificial intelligence not being the sole means of marking. Reference made to providing the correct access arrangements to candidates where approval has been granted.
53	Appendix 7		New illustration of malpractice included.
60	Appendix 8	JCQ/M1	Reference made to the Information for candidates – AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments) document. Added space to provide further details if it has been necessary to tick no in the checklist.

Page number	Section	Paragraph	Summary of change
72	Appendix 10	JCQ/M3	Additional confirmations added to Individual(s) who gathered information section. Reference made to a separate checklist for each member of staff implicated in the allegation. Added space to provide further details if it has been necessary to tick no in the checklist.
77	Appendix 11		New appendix – Guidance on Supporting the Safeguarding and Wellbeing of Centre Staff and Candidates During a Suspected Malpractice Case.

