

# **LINK19 College**



## **MALPRACTICE and MALADMINISTRATION POLICY**

**Date: Winter 2026**

**Review Date: Winter 2027**

## LINK19 College

### Malpractice and Maladministration Policy

This policy will be reviewed annually but will be updated sooner if required following the publication of updated JCQ regulations.

LINK19 College follows the JCQ guidance on malpractice should any case of suspected malpractice arise, go to [Malpractice – Joint Council for Qualifications](#). For awarding bodies that do not follow JCQ regulations, this Malpractice and Maladministration Policy will be followed in addition to the specific awarding bodies own guidance on Malpractice.

#### **Definition of Malpractice**

Malpractice is an act, default or practice which is in breach of the regulations. This relates to the conduct of Controlled Assessments, Non-Examination Assessments (NEAs), coursework and examinations.

'*Suspected malpractice*' means all alleged or suspected incidents of malpractice. If a centre fails to investigate allegations of suspected malpractice this also constitutes malpractice by the centre.

#### **Centre Staff Malpractice**

This relates to malpractice committed by a member of staff. This could be a teacher, invigilator, oral language modifier, practical assistant, prompter, reader, scribe or sign language interpreter.

Some examples of this could be:

- breach of security - failing to keep question papers or materials secure, adjusting the time of the examination or tampering with candidates work prior to moderation.
- deception - changing marks for NEAs, tampering with candidates work prior to moderation, making up assessments or internal verification records.
- improper assistance to candidates - assisting candidates with their work when not allowed to do so, permitting prohibited items into an exam room, prompting candidates during controlled assessments or examinations.
- Maladministration - failure to ensure controlled assessments, coursework and NEAs have been completed under controlled conditions, failing to inform the awarding body of an alternative site for examinations/assessments, access arrangements being used incorrectly for examinations or assessments.

#### **Candidate Malpractice**

This relates to malpractice by a candidate in any examination or assessment – including NEAs, controlled assessments and coursework. The poster shown in Appendix 5 is distributed to learners along with their Information to Candidates for written exams and non-assessment exams documents.

Some examples of this could be:

- Copying from another candidate or allowing work to be copied.
- Being in possession of confidential material in advance of the examination.
- Allowing others to assist in the production of work when not allowed.
- Plagiarism (taking someone else's work or ideas and passing them off as one's own).
- Using books, internet or other sources without acknowledgement.
- Bringing unauthorised material into the examination room or assessment.
- Behaving in a manner which undermines the integrity of the examination/assessment.
- Misuse of AI (Artificial Intelligence) in exams, reference will be made to the JCQ document **AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications, the Use of AI in Assessments and Exams Policy and LINK19 College Use of AI Policy**.

### AI (Artificial Intelligence)

AI is technology that enables computers and machines to simulate human intelligence and problem-solving capabilities. There are a wide range of AI applications available that may be used by learners, centres, and training providers.

**Examples include, but are not limited to:**

- Assistive software for reading or writing support (speech recognition, screen reader, grammar checker, translation)
- Productivity tools within office applications (note takers, scheduling tools)
- Content creation applications and chatbots (text, image, video and audio, computer code). For example: ChatGPT, Claude, Jenni AI, Midjourney.
- Learning support chatbots (Q&A)
- Adaptive learning technology (personalised course recommendations, adaptive assessment)
- Automated marking tools
- Data analysis tools (analysing assessment performance data and insights)
- Plagiarism tools for checking authenticity of work

**What is AI Misuse?**

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

## Misuse of Artificial Intelligence in NEAs

Learners must make sure that work submitted for assessment is demonstrably their own.

If sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified by the learner and the learner must understand that this will not allow them to demonstrate that they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore they will not be rewarded.

**Learners who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice**, in accordance with JCQ regulations, and may attract severe sanctions. See JCQ documents relating to malpractice and the use of AI [Malpractice – Joint Council for Qualifications](#)

Learners and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice.

Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the learner's own.

If teachers have doubts that the authenticity of learner work submitted for assessment, and if the use of AI has not been properly acknowledged, they must investigate and take appropriate action.

Learners will be made aware of the JCQ poster [JCQ-AI-poster-for-learners-2.pdf](#) alongside their Information to Candidates for Written Examinations and Non-Examination Assessments.

### Identifying and Detecting Misuse of AI:

Teachers and leaders will use a wide range of approaches to review work.

These include comparing the assessment material with work previously created by the learner. Further examples of what to look for can be found on page 9 of the aforementioned JCQ guidance.

### Potential indicators of AI use

If you see the following in learners' work, it may be an indication that they have misused AI:

- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms, and other localisations\*
- A default use of language or vocabulary which might not be appropriate to the qualification level\*
- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected. Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
- A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects.
- Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.
- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a learner in the classroom or in other previously submitted work.
- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work.
- A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected.
- A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the learner themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected.
- The inadvertent inclusion by learners of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability.
- The submission of learner work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten.

- The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth, variety or to overcome its output limit.
- The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content.
- Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the learner's usual style.

*\*Please be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages and levels of proficiency when generating content. However, some AI tools will produce quotations and references.*

#### **AI may be used in assessment for:**

- Gathering information and conducting research
- Generating ideas and brainstorming
- Revising and editing work
- Generating example questions on a given subject to help with assessment preparation

#### **Acknowledging AI use**

It is essential learners are clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and they know how to do this. Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments. If a learner uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the learner and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, learners must ensure they independently verify the AI-generated content – and reference the sources they have used.

Learners acknowledging the use of AI and showing clearly how they have used it allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether the 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, learner acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated. For example:

ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2025.

The learner 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 included with the work the learner submits for assessment, so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. If this is not submitted, but the teacher/assessor suspects that the learner has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and must take action to assure themselves the work is the learner's own. Where the teacher/assessor cannot assure themselves, they must follow their centre's internal procedures and the published guidance for assessment.

Further guidance is set out in the *JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments* document (see link below).

The JCQ regulations for candidates on referencing may be found in the following:

- [Instructions for conducting coursework](#)

- [The Information for Candidates documents](#)

The JCQ guidance for teachers on referencing may be found in the following:

- [Plagiarism in Assessments](#)

Other actions which should be considered in relation to acknowledging AI use are:

a) Learners are reminded, as with any source, poor referencing, paraphrasing and copying sections of text may constitute malpractice, and could attract severe sanctions including disqualification. In the context of AI use, learners must be clear what is, and what is not, acceptable in respect of acknowledging AI content and the use of AI sources. For example, it would be unacceptable to simply reference 'AI' or 'ChatGPT', just as it would be unacceptable to state 'Google' rather than the specific website and webpages which have been consulted;

b) Learners are also reminded if they use AI they have not independently met the marking criteria therefore they will not be rewarded. Examples of how to implement this can be found in [Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking learner work](#).

### **Definition of Maladministration**

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

### **Examples of maladministration**

The categories listed below provide some examples of centre and learner maladministration.

Examples include but are not limited to:

- Failure to adhere to learner registration and certification procedures of examination boards
- Continual late learner registration
- Inaccurate or fraudulent claims for certificates
- Failure to maintain appropriate auditable records, e.g. certificate claim and/or forgery of evidence
- Unreasonable delays in responding to requests or communications from awarding body organisations including deliberate acts of omission of information
- Inappropriate administration arrangements and or records management
- Deliberate misuse of examination board logo's
- Failure to carry out actions identified by our external verifiers in the required timescales

Please see separate Use of AI in Assessments and Exams Policy for guidance on AI in assessments

### **Suspected malpractice/maladministration identified by a centre**

Where suspected malpractice/maladministration is identified by a centre, the Head of Centre must inform the awarding body immediately. They will then investigate all allegations. The full facts will be determined and noted on the relevant form (Appendices 1, 2 and 3). This will include a statement of facts, a detailed account of the alleged malpractice/maladministration and details of any investigations carried out by the centre.

The following JCQ forms are used for reporting:

JCQ/M1 – used to report instances of suspected candidate malpractice (along with supporting evidence where necessary)

JCQ/M2 – notification of suspected malpractice/maladministration involving centre staff

JCQ/M3 – report into suspected malpractice/maladministration involving centre staff

Some awarding bodies may have their own '*notification of malpractice*' form, so this must be used if one exists. The Exams Office template for notifying a candidate that suspected malpractice has been made against them will be used, see appendix 4.

### **Centre Staff Malpractice/Maladministration Procedure**

The member of staff in question will be informed in writing of the allegation against them and invited to attend a meeting with the Head of Centre and another Senior Leadership Team member. This meeting will give them the opportunity to respond to the allegation made against them and put across their statement.

The member of staff will also be told at the end of the meeting about the Appeals Process should a decision be made against them. This will be the awarding body's own Appeals Policy.

Any witnesses to the suspected malpractice/maladministration will also be written to and interviewed separately. They will be asked to provide a written statement before attending the interview.

The full report will be sent to the awarding body in question for them to respond back to the Head of Centre. If they feel that a sanction is necessary, they will advise the college.

Where a member of staff has been found guilty of malpractice/maladministration, an awarding body may impose the following sanctions as examples:

- Written warning – this could state more serious sanctions if malpractice/maladministration occurs again.
- Further training – it could be a condition that this is undertaken before they are involved with any future assessments.
- Special conditions – it could be stated that any work undertaken by the member of staff is supervised should they be involved with any future assessments.
- Suspension from assessments – this may be for a set period of time.
- Dismissal - if the malpractice/maladministration constitutes gross professional misconduct.

### **Candidate Malpractice Procedure**

The candidate in question will be informed in writing of the allegation against them and invited to attend a meeting with their parent/carer, Head of Centre and another Senior Leadership Team member. This meeting will give them the opportunity to respond to the allegations made against them and share their statement.

The candidate and their parent/carer will also be told at the end of the meeting about the Appeals Process should a decision be made against them. This will be the awarding body's own Appeals Policy.

Any witnesses to the suspected malpractice/maladministration will also be written to and interviewed separately. They will be asked to provide a written statement before attending the interview.

The full report will then be sent to the awarding body in question for them to respond back to the Head of Centre. If they feel that a sanction is necessary, they will advise the college.

Where a candidate has been found guilty of malpractice/maladministration, an awarding body may impose the following sanctions as examples:

- warning
- loss of marks for a section
- loss of marks for a component
- loss of all marks for a unit
- disqualification from a unit
- disqualification from all units in one or more qualification
- disqualification from a whole qualification
- disqualification from all qualifications taken in that series

The Exams Policy, including the Malpractice and Maladministration Policy, is accessible to candidates and their parents/carers on the college website. Candidates are informed of this by the staff teaching them. Staff have access to all college policies as a hard copy or online.

### **Single Equalities Scheme impact Assessment (Equalities Act 2010)**

This policy has been developed to ensure that there is no negative or adverse impact on any individual or group in terms of disability, race, belief, gender, sexual orientation or age. All opportunities for potential positive impact on individuals, groups and the community are embedded within the ethos, vision and values of the college.

*LINK19 College is committed to achieving Best Value in all decisions made. We use the principles of Best Value as they apply to securing continuous improvement in this college.*

Date: Winter 2026

Review Date: Winter 2027

APPROVED by LINK19 College board of Directors.

Signed by LINK19 College Lead:





### Centre Staff Malpractice/Maladministration Form

**Awarding Body**

**Centre Number**

**Centre Address**

  
  

**Head of Centre Name:**

**Contact telephone number:**

**Head of Centre Email:**

**Date of Incident:**

**Name of centre staff involved and if alleged staff member or witness:**

**Details of qualification affected:**

**Nature of suspected malpractice/maladministration:**

**Could candidates have been unfairly advantaged or disadvantaged – if so, provide details:**

**Name:** .....

**Position:** .....

**Date:** .....



## Centre Staff Malpractice/Maladministration Report

**Awarding Body**

**Centre Number**

**Centre Address**

  
  

**Head of Centre Name:**

**Contact telephone number:**

**Head of Centre Email:**

**Date of Incident:**

**Name and position of centre staff involved in suspected malpractice/maladministration:**

**Details of qualification affected:**

**Details of investigation and findings:**

**Name:** .....

**Position:** .....

**Date:** .....



### Candidate Malpractice/Maladministration Report

**Awarding Body**

**Centre Number**

**Centre Address**

  
  

**Head of Centre Name:**

**Contact telephone number:**

**Head of Centre Email:**

**Date of Incident:**

**Candidate Name & Number:**

**Details of qualification affected:**

**Name of invigilator and/or witness(es):**

**Describe the nature of the suspected malpractice/maladministration:**

**Name:** .....

**Position:** .....

**Date:** .....

## SUSPECTED MALPRACTICE: **CANDIDATE NOTIFICATION FORM**

Date		Candidate Name	
------	--	----------------	--

This notification is to inform you/confirm to you [insert as/if relevant to the candidate, and your parent/carer/appropriate adult] that an alleged, suspected or actual report of malpractice has been made against you.

Details of the allegation / incident

Type of offence

As an approved examination centre, [insert centre name] is required to follow the policies and procedures in the JCQ **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** [document available](http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice) here [www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice](http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice).

As stated in this document (4 **Identification and reporting of malpractice**), the head of centre **must** notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice.

Enclosed [Attached (if sending this notification by email)] you are provided with:

- a copy of the form **JCQ/M1** used to report the allegation/incident to the awarding body supported by copies of any supporting evidence, where relevant
- details of (section 5.33) **The rights of accused individuals** to inform you of your individual responsibilities and rights taken from the document referenced above

As further stated in sections of this document (7 **Sanctions**, 10 **Sanctions applied against candidates**), awarding bodies will impose sanctions on individuals found guilty of malpractice where appropriate. You may therefore also want to refer to Appendix 6 (**Indicative sanctions against candidates**) of this document.

The awarding body will not normally communicate with you directly unless particular circumstances warrant this. Once a decision has been made, it will be communicated in writing to the head of centre as soon as possible (11 **Communicating decisions**).

On receiving communication from the awarding body, the head of centre will communicate the decision to you and pass on details of any sanction(s) and action imposed on you, together with information on the process for submitting an appeal, where relevant.

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, and other appropriate bodies as detailed in the JCQ document above (11 **Communicating decisions**).

Please read through all the information provided to you. If anything is unclear, please contact [insert name and/or job title and relevant contact details].

Enclosures [Attachments]:

Copy of form **JCQ/M1** (and supporting evidence where relevant)  
Details of **The rights of accused individuals**

The information below was taken directly from the JCQ document **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (1 September 2025 to 31 August 2026) on 10/10/2025.

### **The rights of accused individuals – information gathering**

**5.33** If, in the view of the information gatherer, there is sufficient evidence that an individual may have committed malpractice, that individual (the candidate or the member of staff) **must**:

- be informed (preferably in writing) of the allegation made against them;
- be provided with a copy of the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*:  
<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice>
- be made aware of all evidence that has been obtained during the investigation which supports the allegation;
- be made aware that providing knowingly misleading or inaccurate information constitutes malpractice;
- know the possible consequences should malpractice be proven (as set out in Appendices 4–6);
- have the opportunity and sufficient time to consider their response to the allegations;
- be given an opportunity to submit a written statement in response to the allegations;
- be informed that if the case is referred to the awarding body’s Malpractice Committee, they will:
  - be provided with a complete set of case documentation
  - have the opportunity to read and make a statement in response to the case documentation
  - have the opportunity to seek professional advice and to provide a supplementary statement;
- be made aware of their right to appeal should a sanction be applied to them (as set out in the JCQ document *A Guide to the Awarding Bodies’ Appeals Processes*):  
<http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/appeals>



# AI and Assessments

## A quick guide for students



### What is AI?

- AI stands for artificial intelligence and using it is like having a computer that thinks
- AI tools like ChatGPT or Snapchat My AI can write text, make art and create music by learning from data from the internet, but watch out – they can also make things up and be biased



### How can AI be misused in assessments?

AI misuse is when you take something made using AI and say it's your own work.

**THIS IS CHEATING!**



### How do I make sure I don't misuse AI?



#### 1 Know the rules

- You're **not allowed** to use AI tools when you're in an exam
- Your teachers will tell you if you're allowed to use AI tools when doing your coursework – the rules will depend on your qualification
- Even if you're allowed to use AI tools, you can't get marks for content just produced by AI – your marks come from showing your own understanding and producing your own work

#### 2 Reference reference reference!

If you're allowed to use AI tools, you must reference them clearly

- Name the AI tool you used
- Add the date you generated the content
- Explain how you used it
- Save a screenshot of the questions you asked and the answers you got

#### 3 Declare it's all your own work

– When you hand in your assessment, you have to sign a declaration. Anything without a reference must be all your own work. If you've used an AI tool, don't sign the declaration until you're sure you've added all the references



### What happens if I misuse AI?

If you've misused AI, you could lose your marks for the assessment – you could even be disqualified from the subject.

**DON'T RISK IT!**



**REMEMBER**  
Misusing AI is cheating!

Know the rules  
Talk to your teachers  
Reference clearly