Policy Statements and Procedures

MANAGING MALPRACTICE POLICY

(To include Controlled Assessment and BTEC)

NOVEMBER 2026

INTRODUCTION

This policy has been written in line with guidance from JCQ: Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice and should be read in conjunction with the Examinations Centre policy.

Members of staff should also refer to the Staff Guidance issued on A.I. Plagiarism and Authentication and the Examination Compliance Notices for students.

Hewens College believes malpractice is deemed to be those actions and practices which threaten the integrity of public examinations, and/or damage the authority of those responsible for conducting them.

JCQ define malpractice as: 'Malpractice', which includes maladministration and non-compliance with the Regulations, means any act, default or practice which is a breach of the Regulations or which:

- compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate; and/or
- damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or Centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or Centre. Failure by a Centre to notify, investigate and report to an awarding body all allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself. Also, failure to take action as required by an awarding body, as detailed in this document, or to co-operate with an awarding body's investigation, constitutes malpractice.
- JCQ also states: Instances of malpractice arise for a variety of reasons:
- some incidents are intentional and aim to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment;
- some incidents arise due to ignorance of the regulations, carelessness or forgetfulness in applying the regulations;
- some occur as a direct result of the force of circumstances which are beyond the control of those involved (e.g. a fire alarm sounds and the examination is disrupted). It is the responsibility of everyone involved in the Centre's examinations process to read, understand and implement this policy.

Members of staff involved with examinations should be fully conversant with all JCQ regulations and are recommended to consult the relevant documents. To ensure internally and externally set examinations are carried out in accordance with JCQ Guidelines and meets the statutory responsibilities of Examination Centre's the College has in place the following Team:

- Principal (Named Head of Centre for Examinations) - ML
- Vice Principal – Quality of Education Achievement (oversight of KS4 Examinations) - SB
- Examinations Officer – SC
- ICT Manager – AUD

Response to allegations of suspected malpractice

Hewens College investigates allegations of malpractice swiftly and thoroughly. Such investigation would be led by the Head of Centre (the Principal) and a full written report of any case then submitted to the relevant examination board including:

- A statement of the facts; a detailed account of the circumstances of the alleged malpractice and detail of any investigation carried out by the Centre
- The evidence relevant to the allegation; such as written statement(s) from the invigilator(s), assessor, internal verifier(s), or other staff who are involved
- Written statement(s) from the candidate(s)
- Any exculpatory evidence and/or mitigating factors
- Information about the College's procedures for advising candidates of examination board regulations
- Seating plans showing the exact position of candidates in the examination room
- Any unauthorised material found in the examination room

Any of the candidate's work and associated material, e.g. relevant source material for coursework JCQ has its own policies and procedures for dealing with allegations of malpractice and our College adheres to these: The Head of Centre must:

- notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice. The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or nonexamination assessments before the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate. If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the Head of Centre must inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate(s);
- complete Form JCQ/M1 (suspected candidate malpractice) or Form JCQ/M2a (suspected malpractice/maladministration involving Centre staff) to notify the awarding body/bodies whose qualifications are involved in an incident of malpractice. Each form is available from the JCQ website http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice Malpractice - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications Notifications in letter format will be accepted providing the information given covers the same points as Form JCQ/M1 or JCQ/M2a;
- supervise personally, and as directed by the awarding body, all investigations resulting from an allegation of malpractice unless the investigation is being led by the awarding body or another party;
- ensure that if it is necessary to delegate an investigation to a senior member of Centre staff, the senior member of Centre staff chosen is independent and not connected to

the department or candidate involved in the suspected malpractice. The Head of Centre should ensure there is no conflict of interest which can otherwise compromise the investigation;

- respond speedily and openly to all requests for an investigation into an allegation of malpractice. This will be in the best interests of Centre staff, candidates and any others involved;
- speedily and openly make available information as requested by an awarding body;
- co-operate and ensure their staff do so with an enquiry into an allegation of malpractice, whether the Centre is directly involved in the case or not;
- inform staff members and candidates of their individual responsibilities and rights as set out in these guidelines;
- forward any awarding body correspondence and evidence to Centre staff and/or provide staff contact information to enable the awarding body to do so;
- pass on to the individuals concerned any warnings or notifications of penalties, and ensure compliance with any requests made by the awarding body as a result of a malpractice case.
- consider reporting the matter to the Local Authority Designated Safeguarding Officer (LADO) or other safeguarding authorities if there is a legitimate concern of harm to a child or adult at risk. This includes reference to our Safeguarding policy for interviewing individuals who may be at risk, and, if the centre has any concerns about an individual's wellbeing, they should contact the awarding body before conducting the interview. Awarding bodies will consider any physical or learning difficulties or disabilities when conducting interviews.
- Those reporting malpractices who wish to remain anonymous should be aware that awarding bodies may need to disclose their details to others. This could include:
    - in response to subject access requests made under data protection legislation;
    - where we are required to share information with regulatory bodies (such as Ofqual, the SIA and the TRA); or
    - when we are required to provide information to the police. Those reporting malpractices should also be aware that those subject to any subsequent investigation may draw their own conclusions regarding who has reported malpractice, based on the information an awarding body will need to disclose in order to take an investigation forward. In these circumstances, individuals reporting malpractice should be provided with appropriate privacy notices regarding the processing of their personal data.
- Awarding bodies are aware that reporting suspected malpractice by a member of staff or a candidate can create a difficult environment for that individual. Investigation processes will consider any mitigating actions that can be taken to protect a reporting individual if:
- the reporting individual is at risk of retaliation or retribution by reported individuals/centres

- concerns are identified for the reporting individual's mental health or wellbeing.

Staff Responsibilities for Reporting Suspected Malpractice

All members of staff, including teaching staff, support staff, assessors, internal verifiers, examination officers and invigilators, have a responsibility to remain vigilant and immediately report any suspected, alleged or actual malpractice or maladministration identified in connection with examinations, coursework, controlled assessments or non-examination assessments.

Any concerns must be reported without delay to the Examinations Officer, who will immediately inform the Head of Centre. Staff must not delay reporting while attempting to establish whether malpractice has occurred. All concerns must be treated seriously, handled confidentially and investigated in accordance with JCQ regulations and the College's established procedures.

Staff must co-operate fully with any subsequent investigation and ensure that relevant evidence is preserved. Failure to report suspected malpractice or comply with the required procedures may itself constitute malpractice.

Definitions of Malpractice:

Centre Staff Malpractice

Normally involves malpractice where there is an element of systemic failure, a breach in policies or widespread malpractice such that a Centre-level sanction is appropriate.

The following are examples of malpractice by Centre staff. The list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered and acted upon.

- Moving the time or date of a fixed examination (beyond that permitted) without notifying the relevant Awarding Body.
- Failing to keep examination papers secure prior to the examination.
- Obtaining unauthorised access to examination material prior to an examination.
- Assisting candidates in the production of coursework, beyond that permitted by the regulations.
- Allowing candidates unsupervised access to coursework exemplar material, whether this is the work of former students or that provided by the Awarding Body.
- Staff delivering/assessing coursework, internal assessments and/or non examination assessments are aware of centre procedures relating to the authentication of learner work and have robust processes in place for identifying and reporting plagiarism (including AI misuse) and other potential candidate malpractice.
- Failing to keep student computer files secure.
- Assisting or prompting candidates with the production of answers.
- Failure to take action as required by an awarding body. This includes knowingly providing inaccurate or misleading information during the course of an investigation.

Candidate Malpractice

The following are examples of malpractice by candidates. The list is not exhaustive and other instances of malpractice may be considered and acted upon.

- Misuse of examination material.
- Behaving in such a way as to undermine the integrity of the examination.
- Failing to abide by the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor or the Awarding Body in relation to the examination rules and regulations.
- Failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations.
- Disruptive behaviour in the examination room (including the use of offensive language).
- Introduction of unauthorised material into the examination room e.g. notes, study guides and personal organisers, own blank paper, calculators, dictionaries (when prohibited), personal stereos, mobile phones or other similar devices and watches.
- Introducing into the examination room notes in the wrong format (when notes are permitted) or incorrectly annotated texts (in open book examinations).
- Obtaining, receiving, exchanging or passing on information which could be examination related (or the attempt to) by means of talking or written paper/notes.
- Personation: pretending to be someone else, arranging for another to take one's place in an examination.
- The inclusion of inappropriate, offensive or obscene material in scripts or coursework.
- Copying from another candidate (including the misuse of ICT to do so).
- Collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates.
- Plagiarism: the failure to acknowledge sources properly and/or the submission of another person's work as if it were the candidate's own.
- Theft of another's work.
- The deliberate destruction of another's work.
- The alteration of any results documents, including certificates.

Procedures for informing candidates of Awarding Bodies' regulations

All candidates receive a copy of the Awarding Bodies' regulations regarding coursework and examinations. During the course of the examination period, notices are displayed both in the area immediately outside the examination room and on display in the examination area.

Verbal Announcements

Before the beginning of every examination, candidates are given a verbal reinforcement of the Awarding Body's regulations. In addition, candidates are given the opportunity to hand in mobile phones that are kept securely outside of the examination room until the end of the examination.

Procedures for investigating alleged malpractice

All cases of malpractice are reported to the Examinations Officer who will inform the Head of Centre. The Examinations Officer will obtain written statements from those concerned, whether the malpractice is by members of staff or candidates.

Investigation by Hewens College into alleged malpractice by candidates

The Examinations Officer will conduct a full enquiry into the malpractice in conjunction with the Head of Centre. If malpractice is deemed to have taken place, then a full written report (using Form JCGQ/M/01 where appropriate) is submitted to the Awarding Body with supporting evidence.

- Candidates accused of malpractice are made fully aware at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice, and of the possible consequences should be malpractice be proven. The parents, guardians and carers of the candidates are also notified - preferably in writing - of the alleged malpractice and of the possible consequences.
- Candidates accused of malpractice must be given the opportunity to respond (preferably in writing) to allegations made.
- Candidates accused of malpractice should be made aware of the avenues for appealing should a judgement be made against him or her. Full details of an Awarding Body's appeals procedure will be sent to the candidate and parents, guardians and carers if the judgement goes against the candidate.
- The candidate and parents, guardians and carers will be informed in writing of the outcome of the Awarding Body's decision.
- consider reporting the matter to the Local Authority Designated Safeguarding Officer (LADO) or other safeguarding authorities if there is a legitimate concern of harm to a child or adult at risk;
- Where candidates may have been advantaged by a suspected centre staff malpractice incident, awarding bodies will need to consider appropriate action to protect the integrity of qualifications and maintain public confidence.
- The individual authorised to gather information must report to the awarding body by the time specified, and providing all the requested evidence. Failure to do so may itself constitute malpractice.
- A separate checklist is required for each member of staff implicated in the allegation.
- 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. Doing so is considered as suspected malpractice.
- 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, which are entirely separate from any centre disciplinary sanctions: Written warning, Training, Special Conditions and/or Suspension/debarment.
- If a member of centre staff moves to another centre while subject to a finding of malpractice or 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 finding of malpractice and/or the sanction.

Internal Procedures for Potential Candidate Malpractice Identified Before Authentication

Where potential candidate malpractice relating to the content of coursework or non-examination assessments is identified before the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, the College will manage the matter internally in accordance with its malpractice procedures and relevant JCQ guidance. Such incidents do not need to be reported to the awarding body.

This may include concerns relating to inappropriate or offensive content, copying, collusion, plagiarism, unauthorised assistance or misuse of Artificial Intelligence (AI).

The following procedures will apply:

- The teacher, assessor or other relevant member of staff must raise the concern with the relevant subject or departmental lead and Examinations Officer.
- The work must be reviewed to establish the nature and extent of the suspected malpractice.
- The candidate should be given an appropriate opportunity to explain their work and address any concerns identified.
- Where necessary, the candidate may be required to demonstrate their understanding or amend their work in accordance with the applicable assessment requirements.
- The teacher or assessor must ensure that the work meets the requirements of the assessment and is the candidate's own before the declaration of authentication is signed.
- The incident, investigation, actions taken and outcome must be recorded and retained by the College.

Where malpractice is identified after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, the matter must be escalated to the Head of Centre and reported to the relevant awarding body immediately, in accordance with JCQ requirements.

Any suspected malpractice involving a member of staff must be escalated immediately to the Head of Centre and reported to the relevant awarding body, regardless of whether candidate authentication has taken place.

Candidate Guidance on Preventing Malpractice

The College will ensure that all candidates are informed of the regulations and expectations relating to examinations, coursework, controlled assessments and non-examination assessments, and are provided with appropriate guidance on how to avoid committing malpractice.

Candidates will receive information and guidance through examination briefings, classroom teaching, assessment instructions, Examination Compliance Notices and verbal announcements before examinations.

This guidance will cover:

- Examination room regulations, including prohibited materials and electronic devices.
- The importance of completing assessments independently and avoiding collusion.
- The correct acknowledgement and referencing of information obtained from other sources.
- The appropriate use and acknowledgement of Artificial Intelligence (AI).
- The importance of maintaining the security and confidentiality of examination materials.
- The potential consequences of malpractice, including awarding body sanctions and disqualification.

Teachers and assessors are responsible for reinforcing these expectations when setting and supervising assessments. Candidates must be given the opportunity to clarify any concerns or questions regarding the regulations before undertaking or submitting assessed work.

Investigation by the College into alleged malpractice by members of staff

- Investigations into any case of malpractice or irregularities against a member of staff must normally be carried out in the first instance by the Head of Centre of the College, in conjunction with the Awarding Body.
- Investigations into alleged malpractice or irregularities against the Head of Centre must be carried out by the Chair of the College's Governing Body, or the responsible employer, and reported to the Awarding Body when completed.
- Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must be made fully aware (preferably in writing) at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice, and the possible consequences should malpractice be proven.
- Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must have the opportunity to respond (preferably in writing) to allegations made.
- Any member of staff accused of malpractice or irregularities must be made aware of the avenues for appealing should a judgement go against him or her.
- When investigating serious cases or alleged staff malpractice, it may be necessary for a member of the Awarding Body staff to be present at an interview with the staff member concerned. The member of staff being interviewed may be accompanied by a friend or union representative.
- In accordance with the requirements of the Code of Practice and the Arrangements for the Statutory Regulation of External Qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, a report on cases where members of staff are found to have committed malpractice, together with details of the action taken by the Head of Centre, the Governing Body or the responsible employer must be forwarded to the regulatory authorities and may be made available to other Awarding Bodies if the Awarding Body decides that the circumstances of the case are sufficiently serious to warrant such reports being made.
- consider reporting the matter to the Local Authority Designated Safeguarding Officer (LADO) or other safeguarding authorities if there is a legitimate concern of harm to a child or adult at risk. This includes reference to our Safeguarding policy for interviewing individuals who may be at risk, and, if the centre has any concerns about an individual's wellbeing, they should contact the awarding body before conducting the interview. Awarding bodies will consider any physical or learning difficulties or disabilities when conducting interviews.
- Those reporting malpractices who wish to remain anonymous should be aware that awarding bodies may need to disclose their details to others. This could include:
    - in response to subject access requests made under data protection legislation;
    - where we are required to share information with regulatory bodies (such as Ofqual, the SIA and the TRA); or
    - when we are required to provide information to the police. Those reporting malpractices should also be aware that those subject to any subsequent investigation may draw their own conclusions regarding who has reported malpractice, based on the information an awarding body will need to disclose in order to take an investigation forward. In these circumstances, individuals reporting malpractice should be provided with appropriate privacy notices regarding the processing of their personal data.

- Awarding bodies are aware that reporting suspected malpractice by a member of staff or a candidate can create a difficult environment for that individual. Investigation processes will consider any mitigating actions that can be taken to protect a reporting individual if:

  - the reporting individual is at risk of retaliation or retribution by reported individuals/centres
  - concerns are identified for the reporting individual's mental health or wellbeing.

Reports

It is the responsibility of the Head of Centre, acting on behalf of the Awarding Body, to submit a full written report of an investigation and to provide the following where appropriate:

- A statement of the facts, a detailed account of the circumstances and details of any investigations carried out by the Centre.
- Written statement(s) from the invigilators or other staff concerned.
- Written statements from the candidate(s) concerned.
- Any mitigating factors (e.g. relevant medical reports).
- Information about the School's procedures for advising candidates of the Awarding Bodies' regulations.
- Seating plans.
- Unauthorised material found in the examination room.
- Any work of the candidate and any associated material (e.g. source material for coursework) which is relevant to the investigation.
- The form JCGQ/M/01 should be used as the basis of the report.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a serious offence in the context of examinations. Advice will always be given to students that:

- Plagiarism is using others' ideas and words without clearly acknowledging the source of that information. It is very important that you give credit where it is due.

  How can students avoid plagiarism?

  - To avoid plagiarism, you must give credit whenever you use:
  - another person's idea, opinion or theory
  - any facts, statistics, graphs, drawings – any pieces of information that
  - are not common knowledge
  - quotations of another person's actual spoken or written words
  - paraphrase of another person's spoken or written words.

Plagiarism and the internet

- The internet has become a more popular source of information for student papers, and many questions have arisen about how to avoid plagiarising these sources. In most cases, the same rules apply as to a printed source: when a writer must refer to ideas or a quote from a website, they must cite that source.
- If a writer wants to use visual information from a website, many of the same rules apply. Copying visual information or graphics from a website (or from a printed source) is very

similar to quoting information, and the source of the visual information or graphic must be cited. These rules also apply to other uses of textual or visual information from websites – for example, if a student is constructing a web page as a class project, and copies graphics or visual from other sites, they must also provide details about the source of this information. In this case, it might be a good idea to obtain permission from the website's owner before using the graphics.

Strategies for Avoiding Plagiarism

- Put in quotations everything that comes directly from the text, especially when taking notes.
- Paraphrase, but make sure you are not just rearranging or replacing a few words. Read over what you want to paraphrase carefully: cover up the text with your hand, or close the text so you cannot see any of it (and so are not tempted to use the text as a 'guide'). Write out the idea in your own words without peeking.
- Check your paraphrase against the original text to be sure you have not accidentally used the same phrases or words, and that the information is accurate.
- Using someone else's ideas, but putting them in your own words. This is probably the skill you will use most when incorporating sources into your writing. Although you use your own words to paraphrase, you must still acknowledge the source of the information.

Additional Information

AI - Use in Assessments

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.

While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice. Teachers and students should also be aware that AI tools are still being developed and there are often limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

AI chatbots are 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 the 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 tasks such as the following:-

- Answering questions
- 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 or theme
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or format

What is AI Misuse

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice:

Policies and Procedures (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of 'making a false declaration of authenticity and plagiarism include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated

in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

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

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the students 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 students 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.

Acknowledging AI Use

If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way.
Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.

In addition to the above, where students use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. This allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether that use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

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/), 25/01/2023. 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 so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the Centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own. See https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/ for further information.

Staff Awareness, Training and Responsibilities Regarding AI Use

The College will ensure that all relevant members of staff, including teachers, assessors, internal verifiers and other staff involved in the delivery, supervision and assessment of qualifications, are made aware of the appropriate use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the risks associated with AI misuse.

Staff will be provided with relevant guidance on AI use, plagiarism, authentication and the requirements of the Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ). This information will be communicated through staff briefings, examinations updates, induction and refresher guidance, as appropriate, and whenever significant changes to awarding body regulations or guidance are introduced.

Teachers and assessors are responsible for:

- Understanding the permitted and prohibited use of AI within the qualifications and assessments they deliver.
- Clearly communicating expectations regarding AI use and academic integrity to students.

- Reviewing submitted work and considering whether it represents the student's own knowledge, understanding and ability.
- Identifying potential AI misuse, including unacknowledged AI-generated content.
- Raising any concerns promptly with the Examinations Officer and following the College's malpractice reporting procedures.
- Ensuring that appropriate evidence is retained where suspected malpractice is identified.

The College will ensure that staff have access to the relevant guidance and understand their responsibilities for preventing, identifying and reporting suspected AI misuse.

Student Awareness and Guidance on Appropriate AI Use

The College will ensure that all students are made aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in coursework, controlled assessments and non-examination assessments.

Students will receive guidance on AI use at the beginning of the academic year and before undertaking relevant assessed work. This guidance will be communicated through classroom teaching, assessment briefings, tutor sessions and the College's Examination Compliance Notices.

Students will be informed of:

- What constitutes appropriate and inappropriate AI use within assessments.
- The importance of ensuring that submitted work reflects their own knowledge, understanding and independent contribution.
- The requirement to acknowledge and reference AI tools where they have been used.
- The importance of verifying AI-generated information and retaining evidence of how AI has been used.
- The consequences of inappropriate AI use, including potential malpractice investigations and awarding body sanctions.

Teachers and assessors are responsible for reinforcing this guidance when setting and supervising assessments and ensuring students understand the requirements before submitting their work.

Internal Appeals Against Decisions Relating to Candidate Malpractice

Where a candidate disagrees with a decision made by a member of staff to reject or withhold their work on the grounds of suspected malpractice, they will have the opportunity to challenge that decision through the College's internal appeals process.

Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Head of Centre, setting out the reasons for the appeal and any supporting evidence.

The appeal will be reviewed by an appropriate senior member of staff who was not involved in the original decision, to ensure impartiality and fairness.

The candidate will be given the opportunity to provide further information or evidence in support of their appeal. The outcome of the appeal, together with the reasons for the decision, will be communicated to the candidate in writing and a record retained by the College.

This internal process does not replace or affect the candidate's right to appeal through the relevant awarding body's procedures where applicable.

Created	May 2024
Updated	November 2026
Next Review Date	September 2027