Meridian Trust

Appendix 20a

Learner's Examination Malpractice Procedure 25-26

1. The Allegation

Suspected malpractice by students

1.1. Examiners, moderators and external verifiers who suspect malpractice in an examination or assessment must notify the Academy Examination Manager. A full account of the incident **must** be submitted together with supporting evidence and an indication of which regulation or specification requirement has been broken.

1.2. Where suspected malpractice is identified by a centre, the head of centre must submit full details of the case at the earliest opportunity to the relevant awarding body.

1.3. While the potential for student artificial intelligence (AI) misuse is new, most of the ways to prevent its misuse and mitigate the associated risks are not; the Trust has established measures to ensure students are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice. (More information can be found in **Appendix A** of this document)

The Trust emphasises the following requirements:

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(k) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/general-regulations/), teachers and assessors must only accept work for qualification assessments which is the students' own;
- Students 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;

- 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 independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded (please see the Acknowledging AI use and AI use and marking sections below and Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work at the end of this document); and
- Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate and take appropriate action.

The JCQ awarding organisations' staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for identifying, reporting and investigating student malpractice, including the misuse of AI.

JCQ guidance refers to AI tools and AI detection tools: http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice. Examples of candidate AI misuse cases and marking candidate work where AI tools have been used can be found in JCQ appendices A (page 16) and B (page 18) AI-Use-in-Assessments_Apr25_FINAL.pdf (This JCQ guidance was first published on 26 April 2023. Version 2 was amended on 30 April 2025).

Form JCQ/M1 (suspected candidate malpractice) or **Form JCQ/M2a** (suspected malpractice/maladministration involving centre staff) **must** be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of malpractice. Each form is

available from the JCQ website - http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice

Notifications in letter format will be accepted providing the information given covers the same points as Form JCQ/M1 or JCQ/M2a.

1.4. Malpractice by a candidate in a coursework or controlled assessment component of a specification discovered prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication need not be reported to the awarding body but must be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures.

Centres should not normally give credit for any work submitted which is not the candidate's own work. If any assistance has been given, a note **must** be made of this on the cover sheet of the candidate's work or other appropriate place.

(Note: Centres are advised that if coursework or portfolio work or controlled assessment which is submitted for internal assessment is rejected by the centre on grounds of malpractice, candidates have the right to appeal against this decision. The JCQ website contains advice on the recommended procedures for appeals against internal assessment decisions.)

1.5. Awarding bodies are aware that the reporting of malpractice by a member of staff or a candidate can create a difficult environment for that staff member or candidate.

Accordingly, an awarding body will try to protect the identity of an informant if this is asked for at the time the informant gives information.

An awarding body will use such information in its investigation but will not present to the Malpractice Committee information from an informant who wishes to withhold his/her identity.

1.6. If the information is provided over the telephone, the informant will usually be asked to make the allegation in writing.

1.7. When an awarding body receives an allegation from someone other than the head of a centre (including anonymous reports),

the awarding body will evaluate the allegation in the light of any other available information, to see if there is cause to investigate.

2. The awarding body's response to an allegation of malpractice

2.1. In the case of notifications of suspected malpractice received from examiners, moderators, external verifiers, the regulator or members of the public (including whistle-blowers) the awarding body will consider the information provided and decide to:

- take no further action; **or**
- ask the head of centre, or another suitably qualified individual, to conduct a full investigation into the alleged malpractice and to submit a written report; **or**
- investigate the matter directly.

2.2. The awarding body will notify the regulators as soon as it receives an allegation of a serious breach of security. The other awarding bodies which have approved that centre, and the police, may also be informed.

2.3. On receipt of a notification of suspected malpractice, submitted by a head of centre, the awarding body will consider the information provided and decide either:

- to take no further action; **or**
- if the notification takes the form of a Report, to make a decision on the case in accordance with the procedures, (where the evidence permits) - **see sections 8 to 13**; **or**
- to ask the head of centre to carry out a further investigation as described in **sections 6.1 to 6.6** and provide further evidence; **or**
- to investigate the matter further itself.

2.4. Regardless of whether the allegation of malpractice is proven or not, in order to ensure the integrity of, and public confidence in, future examinations/assessments, the awarding body may

undertake additional inspections and/or monitoring, and/or require additional actions

3. The investigation

Investigations carried out by the head of centre/appointed investigator

3.1 It will normally be expected that investigations into allegations of malpractice will be carried out by the head of centre. The head of centre should be with the investigation in a timely manner

3.2 Those responsible for conducting an investigation should establish the full facts and circumstances of any alleged malpractice. It should not be assumed that because an allegation has been made, it is true.

3.3 The head of centre should consider that both staff and candidates can be responsible for malpractice.

If the investigation is delegated to another **senior member of centre staff**, the head of centre retains overall responsibility for the investigation. In selecting a suitable **senior member of centre staff** the head of centre **must** take all reasonable steps to avoid a conflict of interest.

Where a conflict of interest may be seen to arise, investigations into suspected malpractice should not be delegated to the manager of the section, team or department involved in the suspected malpractice. In the event of any concerns regarding conflicts of interest or the suitability of the potential investigator, the head of centre should contact the awarding body as soon as possible to discuss the matter.

3.4 If a centre is reporting the suspected malpractice, the awarding bodies recommend that, as a minimum, the centre provides the accused individuals with a completed copy of the form or letter used to notify the awarding body of the malpractice.

3.5 Where the person conducting the investigation deems it necessary to interview a candidate or member of staff in connection with an alleged malpractice, the interviews must be conducted in accordance with the centre's own policy for conducting disciplinary enquiries.

3.6 The involvement of legal advisors is not necessary, at least where there is no allegation of criminal behaviour.

However, if any party wishes to be accompanied by a solicitor or trade union official, the other parties must be informed beforehand to give them the opportunity to be similarly supported. An awarding body will not be liable for any professional fees incurred.

The head of centre is required to make available an appropriate venue for such interviews. Interviews may also be conducted over the telephone. Individuals involved may be requested to provide a written statement.

4. Investigations carried out by the awarding body

4.1 An awarding body will not normally withhold from the head of centre any evidence or material obtained or created during the course of an investigation into an allegation of malpractice.

However, it may do so where this would involve disclosing the identity of an informant who has asked for his/her identity to remain confidential. In such cases, the awarding body will provide the evidence and material and will withhold information that would reveal the person's identity and will explain why the withheld information cannot be provided.

Any material or evidence not provided to the head of centre will not be provided to a Malpractice Committee and will not be considered when deciding whether an allegation of malpractice is proven or not.

4.2 If investigations reveal that candidates had prior knowledge of the content of an examination or assessment, the awarding body must establish whether information could have been divulged to candidates at other centres or to other unauthorised persons.

4.3 Sometimes it is necessary for the awarding body to interview a candidate during an investigation. If the candidate is a minor or a vulnerable adult, and if the interview is to be conducted face to face, the awarding bodies undertake to do this only in the presence of the head of centre, or other senior member of staff, or

the candidate's parent/carer or with the permission of the head of centre or parent/carer.

4.4 Interviews may also be conducted over the telephone.

4.5 When it is necessary for a member of the awarding body staff to conduct an interview with a staff member, the member of staff being interviewed may be accompanied by a friend or advisor (who may be a representative of a teacher association or other association).

4.6 If the individual being interviewed wishes to be accompanied by a legal advisor, the other parties must be informed beforehand to give them the opportunity to be similarly supported.

The head of centre will be required to make available an appropriate venue for such interviews.

4.7 The individual being interviewed may also be requested to provide a written statement

4.8 When in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence to implicate an individual in malpractice, that individual whether a candidate or a member of staff, accused of malpractice, **must**:

- be informed (preferably in writing) of the allegation made against him or her;
- be advised that a copy of the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments: Policies and Procedures can be found on the JCQ website - http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice
- know what evidence there is to support that allegation;
- know the possible consequences should malpractice be proven;
- have the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations (if required);
- have an opportunity to submit a written statement;

- be informed that he/she will have the opportunity to read the submission and make an additional statement in response, should the case be put to the Malpractice Committee;
- have an opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required);
- be informed of the applicable appeals procedure, should a decision be made against him or her;
- be informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice may be shared with other awarding bodies, the regulators, the Police and/or professional bodies including the Teaching Agency as appropriate

4.9 Responsibility for informing the accused individual rests with the head of centre. In certain circumstances it may be necessary for the head of centre to exercise discretion, in the light of all the circumstances of the case, as to the timing and the means by which an allegation of malpractice and the supporting evidence is presented to the individual(s) involved.

Full details of the awarding body's appeals procedures will be sent to the head of centre involved in an appeal.

5. The Report

5.1 After investigating an allegation of malpractice the head of centre must submit a full written Report of the case to the relevant awarding body.

5.2 The Report should be accompanied by the following documentation, as appropriate:

- a statement of the facts, a detailed account of the circumstances of the alleged malpractice, and details of any investigations carried out by the centre;
- 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 mitigating factors;
- information about the centre's procedures for advising candidates of the awarding bodies' regulations;
- seating plans showing the exact position of candidates in the examination room;
- 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.

5.3 Form **JCQ/M1 or Form JCQ/M2b** should be used as the basis of the Report.

The forms are available from the JCQ website - http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice

Reports in letter format will be accepted providing the information given covers the same points as the form.

5.4 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

6. The decision

The Malpractice Committee

6.1 In order to determine the outcomes in cases of alleged malpractice awarding bodies may appoint a Panel or Committee composed of internal and/or external members experienced in examination and assessment procedures. Alternatively, this function may be allocated to a named member or members of staff. In this document the Committee (or awarding body personnel responsible for making decisions in malpractice cases) is referred to as the "Malpractice Committee".

The Committee may be assisted by an awarding body member of staff.

6.2 The following applies to the activities of the Malpractice Committee (or to the personnel acting in this capacity):

- The work of the Malpractice Committee is confidential.
- Members of the Malpractice Committee are required to identify any case of which they have personal knowledge or might be said to have some interest which could lead to an inference that the committee had been biased. Any member with a close personal interest will take no part in the discussion of the case and will not be present when the Malpractice Committee discusses the matter.
- Accused individuals, heads of centre and their representatives are not entitled to be present at meetings of the Malpractice Committee.

6.3 The key principle underpinning the composition of the Malpractice Committee is that it is independent of those who have conducted the investigation.

6.4 Awarding body staff who have directly investigated the case will play no role in the decision-making process.

6.5 No one who declares an interest in the outcome of the case will be present in the room when the case is considered.

6.6 Information supplied to the Malpractice Committee will be only that which is directly relevant to the case under consideration and which has been made available to the person against whom the allegation has been made, subject to redaction.

The person against whom the allegation has been made will be given the opportunity to make a statement to the Malpractice Committee in light of the material provided.

Making the decision - overview

6.7 In making a decision on any Report, the Malpractice Committee will establish that correct procedures have been followed in the investigation of the case, and that all individuals involved have been given the opportunity to make a written statement.

6.8 If satisfied, the Malpractice Committee will then seek to determine:

- whether the examination and assessment regulations have been broken;
- where the culpability lies for the breach of regulations.

6.9 If the Malpractice Committee is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence that malpractice has occurred, the Committee will then determine:

- appropriate measures to be taken to protect the integrity of the examination or assessment and to prevent future breaches;
- the nature of any sanction or penalty to be applied.

Making the decision

Each case of suspected malpractice will be considered and judged on an individual basis in the light of all information available. Where there is an established, clearly evidenced, repeated pattern of behaviour this may be taken into consideration when determining whether a sanction should be applied.

The Malpractice Committee will seek to make decisions unanimously, but, if necessary, may decide by a majority.

6.10 The Malpractice Committee will consider, as separate issues:

- whether or not there has been malpractice; and
- if malpractice is established, whether a sanction should be applied.

6.11 When making a decision in a case the Malpractice Committee will:

- identify the regulation or specification requirement which it is alleged has been broken;
- establish the facts of the case. Where there are conflicting statements the decision as to whether or not there has been malpractice is made by reference to the facts as disclosed by the papers, independent of any decision on sanctions;
- decide whether the facts as so established actually breach the regulations or specification requirements.

If a breach of regulations has occurred, the Malpractice Committee will establish who is responsible for this and;

- consider any points in mitigation;
- determine an appropriate level of sanction or penalty, considering the least severe penalty first.

6.12 The Malpractice Committee must be satisfied from the evidence before it that on the balance of probabilities the alleged malpractice occurred (i.e. that it is more likely than not). It is possible that the evidence in some cases may be inconclusive, but the awarding body may decline to accept the work of the candidates in order to protect the integrity of the qualification for the majority

6.13 In situations where a case is deferred because the Committee requires further information in order to make a determination, the deferral and the nature of the request will be shared with the investigation team and the individual against whom the allegation has been made.

6.14 In straightforward cases where the evidence is not contested or in doubt, awarding bodies may invoke a summary procedure. A sanction or sanctions may be applied and notified to an individual or centre following consideration of the case by an awarding body member of staff.

6.15 Sanctions and penalties applied under this summary procedure are subject to appeal, as are all other sanctions and penalties resulting from cases of malpractice.

Please see the JCQ publication A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes - http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/appeals

Centres/centre staff

The awarding bodies may investigate credible allegations that raise concerns about the failure to follow due procedures in the teacher assessed grade process.

Examples (for General and Vocational qualifications) include:

- A Head of Centre fails to submit the required declaration when approving and submitting their teacher assessment grades.
- A failure by a centre to appropriately manage Conflicts of Interest (COIs) within a centre.
- Teacher assessment grades being released to learners (or their parents/carers) before the issue of results.
- A failure to submit teacher assessment grades, this might include situations in which centre staff have been unreasonably pressured into making changes to their teacher assessment grades.
- A failure to accurately report grades of completed units for vocational qualifications.

Examples of malpractice/maladministration, taken from Centre Policy advice include:

- Breaches of internal security.
- Deception.
- Improper assistance to students.
- Failure to appropriately authenticate a student's work.
- Over direction of students in preparation for common assessments.
- Allegations that centres submit grades not supported by evidence that they know to be inaccurate.
- Failure to engage as requested with awarding organisations during the External Quality Assurance and appeal stages; and failure to keep appropriate records of decisions made and teacher assessed grades. All such instances of Malpractice or maladministration will be investigated and dealt with in line with this procedure.

Learners

It is possible that some learners may attempt to influence their teachers' judgements on their teacher assessed grades. Learners might try to do this by submitting false evidence of performance or by applying pressure. The awarding bodies anticipate that the majority of such instances will be dealt with by the centre internally. However, if the learner's behaviour continues then please inform the relevant awarding body using the JCQ M1 form. The awarding bodies will contact your centre directly if we receive credible allegations that such pressure has been applied.

Possible Consequences

The consequences of malpractice or maladministration as published in the JCQ guidance: *JCQ Suspected* Malpractice: Policies and Procedures and including the risk of a delay to students receiving their grades, up to, and including, removal of centre status have been outlined to all relevant staff.

https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/

Appendix A – AI in Assessments and exams

This appendix will cover various aspects of AI and its use in assessments

What is AI and how is it used?	
What are the risks of AI?	
How can students use AI in assessments? / Acknowledging AI use	
What is AI Misuse by students?	
Our responsibilities as a Centre in relation to AI	
AI Use in marking	
Teachers and Assessors - Preventing AI misuse and informing candidates	
Teachers and Assessors – Identifying AI misuse in assessments	
Reporting AI Malpractice	

What is AI and how is it used?

AI use in this context refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments, which contributes to the award of qualifications.

When properly referenced, this can be acceptable, although students cannot be credited for any work they produce for assessment which is not their own so the benefit to them of using AI is likely to be limited and they risk committing malpractice if AI is misused.

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 formality

AI tools available include:

- ChatGPT (https://chat.openai.com/auth/login)
- Jenni AI (https://jenni.ai)
- Jasper AI (https://www.jasper.ai/)
- Writesonic (https://writesonic.com/chat/)
- Bloom AI (https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom)
- Gemini (https://gemini.google.com/)
- Claude (https://claude.ai/)
- Gauth (https://gauthmath.com/)
- Question AI (https://questionai.com/)
- Brainly (https://brainly.com/)

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate images, music or video, such as:

- Midjourney (https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/)
- Stable Diffusion (https://stablediffusionweb.com/)
- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (https://openai.com/dall-e-2/)
- Soundraw (https://soundraw.io/)
- Musicfy (https://create.musicfy.lol/)
- Runway (https://runwayml.com/)
- LTX Studio (https://ltx.studio/)

In accordance with section 5.3 of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/), students must submit work for assessments which is their own. This applies to both internal and private candidates.

Student work submitted for assessment must be in their own words and not copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool and must reflect their own independent work. Students must demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding as required for the qualification in question and set out in the qualification specification. This includes demonstrating their performance in relation to the assessment objectives for the subject relevant to the question/s or other tasks students have been set.

The requirements for students are set out in the documents:

- JCQ Information for candidates – Non-examination assessments
- JCQ Information for candidates – Coursework assessments

Students are given a copy of the above in hardcopy and sign for receipt at the beginning of the academic year. The documents are also placed on the school website, and students are directed to that site during an exam assembly.

All teachers and assessors that have an NEA or coursework component in their course must read the following JCQ guidance and school policies:

- This malpractice policy including the Appendix A (AI in Assessments and Exams)
- The JCQ AI Documentation – AI Use in Assessments
- The JCQ AI Documentation – Instructions for conducting coursework
- The JCQ AI Documentation – Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments

These documents are placed on the schools internal file sharing system and the school website, at which staff are directed to read at the start of the academic year.

What are the risks of AI?

While AI is becoming a useful tool in the workplace, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it is important students develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying and do not rely on AI.

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

If work submitted by a candidate has not appropriately acknowledged the use of AI, this constitutes malpractice, and the candidate will be sanctioned in accordance with the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/).

How can students use AI in assessments? / Acknowledging AI use

It is essential students 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 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 must ensure they independently verify the AI-generated content – and reference the sources they have used.

Students 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, student 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 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 included with the work the student submits for assessment, so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used.

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

Plagiarism in Assessments (Plagiarism in Assessments - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications)

Students 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, students 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.

Students are also reminded if they use AI they have not independently met the marking criteria therefore they will not be rewarded.

What is AI Misuse by students?

AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

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

The definition of artificial intelligence is any system or technology that can produce answers, sources, or resources through software and internet-based solutions. AI can be used to assist students with their learning, and produce information that may be useful and relevant for an assessment, but must be acknowledged and identified clearly by the student as not being their own work.

All instances of AI use within an assessment should be clearly labelled and identified by students.

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

Our responsibilities as a Centre in relation to AI

In accordance with section 5.3 of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/), the Head of Centre is responsible for having arrangements in place to ensure that students' centre-assessed work is produced, authenticated and marked, in accordance with the awarding bodies' instructions. This applies to all candidates, including private candidates.

To ensure compliance with the regulations, teachers, assessors and other staff will:

- regularly review the use of AI in qualification assessments and agree their approach to managing use of AI by students in their school, college or exam centre.
- make students aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment.
- make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.
- consider how to best communicate with parents/carers to make them aware of the risks and issues and ensure they support the centre's approach. Communications are made with parents during the Key Stage four and Key Stage five parent forums at the start of the academic year. This is supported by monthly emails containing information about e-safety and AI use.

and the school must:

a) Explain to students the importance of submitting work that is a result of their own independent efforts for assessments, and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice;

b) Regularly review the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy to acknowledge the use of AI (e.g. what it is, the risks of using it, what AI misuse is, how this will be treated as malpractice, when it may be used, how it should be acknowledged and how teachers will authenticate work);

c) Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students must reference appropriately (including websites);

d)Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students must acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse (see the above section on Acknowledging AI use);

e) Ensure teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools (see the What is AI use and what are the risks of AI and the What is AI misuse by students sections);

f) Ensure, where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, teachers and relevant centre staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access where this is prohibited;

g)Ensure each student is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates (Information for candidates documents - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications) document;

h) Reinforce to students the significance of their declaration where they confirm the work they submit is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject;

i) Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice

j) Ensure teachers are aware they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work (see AI use and marking section below);

k) Ensure teachers and Heads of Department are clear about their responsibility to only authenticate and submit work for assessment by the awarding organisation that they are confident is the student's own;

l) Have a process in place for teaching staff to follow where misuse of AI is suspected **before** the student has signed the declaration form as this does not need reporting to the awarding organisation and must be dealt with in the centre directly (See Reporting AI below)

AI Use in marking

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

The School may determine, after careful consideration of any data privacy concerns, whether it is appropriate for their teachers and assessors to use AI tools to help mark student work. Where the school does permit AI tools to be used to mark student work, an AI tool cannot be the sole marker. A human assessor must review all the work in its entirety and determine the mark it warrants, regardless of the outcomes of an AI tool. The assessor remains responsible for the mark/grade awarded.

Teachers and Assessors - Preventing AI misuse and informing candidates

While there may be benefits to using AI in some situations, there is the potential for it to be misused by students, either accidentally or intentionally. AI misuse, in that it involves a student submitting work for qualification assessments which is not their own, can be considered a form of plagiarism. JCQ has published guidance on plagiarism which provides information on what plagiarism is, how to prevent it, and how to detect it (Plagiarism in Assessments - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications).

Teachers and assessors must ensure that they have read and understood the above guidance ahead of undertaking any NEA and / or coursework with their students.

To prevent misuse, education and awareness of staff and students is key. Here are some actions which the school will put in place:

a) Restriction of access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;

b) Ensure access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams;

c) Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders;

d)Where appropriate, allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be completed in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate all of each student's work with confidence;

e) Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure work is underway in a planned and timely manner and work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages;

f) Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident the student understands the material;

g) Consider whether it is helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain they understand it and it reflects their own independent work;

h) Do not accept, without further investigation, work which staff suspect has been taken from AI tools without proper acknowledgement or is otherwise plagiarised – doing so encourages the spread of this practice and is likely to constitute staff malpractice which can attract sanctions.

i) Issuing tasks for centre-devised assignments which are, wherever possible, topical, current and specific, and require the creation of content which is less likely to be accessible to AI models trained using historic data

Teachers and Assessors – Identifying AI misuse in assessments

Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques teachers are already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own. There are also some tools that may be used. These different methods are explored below.

Comparison with previous work

When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the student. Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions. Where the work is made up of writing, it is possible to make note of the following characteristics:

- Spelling and punctuation

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

Private candidates

Verifying the authenticity of work submitted by private candidates can be more challenging for centres, given they may not have a good understanding of the standard the student is currently working at. Before accepting entries from a private candidate for a subject that includes NEA or coursework, the centre must consider the steps they will take that will enable the teachers/assessors to ensure the work submitted for assessment is the student's own independent work.

This may involve requiring the student to undertake some of the work under supervision, a review of the student's portfolio of evidence across a range of qualifications and a short discussion with the student regarding their work. Further guidance on authenticating student work can be found in the JCQ Instructions for conducting coursework (https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/ coursework/).

Potential indicators of AI misuse

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

a) A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations.

b) A default use of language or vocabulary which may not accord with the qualification level (though be aware AI tools may be instructed to employ different languages, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content).

c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected (though some AI tools will produce quotations and references).

d) Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors).

e) A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which may be notable for some subjects.

f) Instances of incorrect and/or inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.

g) A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work.

h) A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended it.

i) A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected.

j) A lack of specific local or topical knowledge.

k) Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themself, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected.

l) The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output.

m) The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten.

n) The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth and variety or to overcome its output limit.

o) The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content.

p) Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.

Automated detection

AI tools, as large language models, produce content by 'guessing' the most likely next word in a sequence. This means AI-generated content uses the most common combinations of words, unlike humans who tend to use a variety of words in their normal writing. Several programs and services use this difference to statistically analyse written content and determine the likelihood that it was produced by AI, for example:

• Copyleaks (https://copyleaks.com/ai-content-detector)

• GPTZero (https://gptzero.me/)

• Sapling (https://sapling.ai/ai-content-detector)

• Turnitin AI writing detection (https://www.turnitin.com/solutions/topics/aiwriting/ai-detector/)

These may be used as a check on student work and/or to verify concerns about the authenticity of student work. However, it should be noted that the above tools will give lower scores for AI-generated content which has been subsequently

amended by students, as they base their scores on the predictability of words. Spending time getting to know how the detection tools work will help teachers and assessors understand what they are and are not capable of.

AI detection tools, including those listed above, employ a range of detection models which vary in accuracy depending on the AI tool and version used, the proportion of AI to human content, prompt types and other factors (such as an individual's English language competency). In instances where misuse of AI is suspected it may be helpful to use more than one detection tool to provide an additional source of evidence about the authenticity of student work.

The use of detection tools, where used, should form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of students' work; all available information must be considered when reviewing any malpractice concerns. Teachers will know their students best and so are best placed to assess the authenticity of work submitted to them for assessment – AI detection tools can be a useful part of the evidence they can consider.

The list of certain suppliers of AI-related products is not exhaustive.

Reporting AI Malpractice

If a student has not signed the declaration of authentication, centres do not have to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation. Steps to resolve such incidents are detailed in the main body of this document as part of the malpractice policy. Staff will communicate electronically with the exam officer any improper assistance found during a student assessment.

If the student has signed the declaration of authentication and is found to have misused AI in their assessment, the teacher or assessor must report this as malpractice to the Exams Officer so they can raise a malpractice allegation in line with the JCQ regulations with the Awarding Body.