

SPALDING HIGH SCHOOL



ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ASSESSMENT POLICY

HEADMISTRESS	Mrs M K ANDERSON
LINK GOVERNOR: (STANDARDS & SEND)	Mrs D MULLEY
(SAFEGUARDING)	Mrs F HAUNCH
(SAFEGUARDING)	Mrs J ELLIS

DATE AGREED:

3rd March 2026

Review Frequency:

Annual

Executive Summary:

This policy aims to provide guidance and support to all stakeholders, concerning the use of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in school; whilst ensuring that we protect the integrity of assessments, in line with the guidance from the JCQ.

Links to related policies:

Assessment, monitoring and reporting policy
Behaviour for learning policy
Charging policy
Curriculum policy
Equality and diversity policy
Examinations Policy
Student acceptable use agreement
Personal and electronic devices, mobile phone and social media policy
SEND policy

Chair of Governors

Date

Headmistress

Date

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use in Assessments & NEA: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications Policy

This policy has been shared with Heads of Department.

- This policy is based on [JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications guidance](#) and is intended to provide teachers involved in delivering JCQ qualifications with the information they need to manage use of AI in assessments.
- JCQ identify the use of AI in Non-Examinable Assessments (NEAs): [JCQ AI Use in Assessments guidance](#).
- This policy identifies the expectations of the use of AI in JCQ qualifications delivered at this centre, Spalding High School. It outlines the ways to prevent its misuse and mitigate the associated risks of the use of AI in NEAs or associated assessments.
- This policy should be read in line with other exam-based policies that are in place that establish measures to ensure that students are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice:
 - Examinations Policy
 - Personal Electronic Devices, Mobile Phone and Social Media Policy
 - Acceptable Use (Student) Policy
 - Behaviour for Learning Policy

This policy emphasises the following requirements:

- That, in accordance with section 5.3(k) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/>), **teachers and 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 ([Malpractice - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications](#));
- 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. Examples of this have been shared with students and teaching staff (see the 'Acknowledging AI use' and 'AI use and marking for teachers' sections below as well as Appendices A ('AI misuse examples') and B ('Exemplification of AI use in marking student work').
- 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 (see the 'Preventing AI misuse and indicators of AI use', 'Automated detection' and 'Reporting AI misuse or potential misuse' sections below).

The policy applies to:

- Students complete the majority of their exams and a large number of other assessments under close staff supervision with limited access to authorised materials and no permitted access to the internet. The delivery of these assessments should be unaffected by developments in AI tools as students must not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments, although care must be taken when a student is allowed to use a laptop or similar device for exams, to ensure they have no access to AI tools (see sections 14.20-14.27 of the [Instructions for conducting examinations](#) document).
- There are some assessments in which access to the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages. The majority of these assessments will be Non-Examined Assessments (NEAs), coursework and internal assessments for General Qualifications (GQs) and Vocational and Technical

Qualifications (VTQs). This document is primarily intended to explain the regulations and provide supporting guidance in relation to these assessments.

What is AI and the risks of using it in assessments?

- 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 chatbots currently 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/>)
- Bloomai (<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/>)
 - Runway (<https://runwayml.com/>)
 - LTX Studio (<https://ltx.studio/>)
 - Soundraw (<https://soundraw.io/>)
 - Musicfy (<https://create.musicfy.lol/>)
-
- It is important that teachers and students are aware that the range of AI tools and their capabilities is expanding quickly, and that there are limitations to their use such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.
 - The lists of certain suppliers of AI-related products are for information purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement by JCQ. It is each centre's or individual's responsibility to investigate and verify any suppliers they use, including any terms and conditions which govern the sale or use of the supplier's products. The lists provided are not exhaustive.

- The use of AI tools may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments, not least the risk of committing malpractice, for which serious sanctions can apply.
- As also noted above, the tools have been developed to produce responses based upon the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response and so the responses cannot be relied upon. AI tools often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. Some AI tools have been identified as providing answers to questions that can prompt inappropriate actions, and some can also produce fake references to books/articles.

Section 1: Defining AI misuse

- 1.1 In accordance with section 5.3(k) 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.
- 1.2 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](#)
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 Students must be able to demonstrate the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.
- 1.5 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.
- 1.6 See **Appendix C** for anonymised examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding bodies. N.B. these examples have been provided by JCQ and do not relate to/ or involve Spalding High School.
- 1.7 AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>).
- 1.8 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 and are identified below.
- 1.9 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.

Section 2: Spalding High School Policy and Procedures for assessment that ensure the authenticity of assessments

- 2.1 Spalding High School will make students and staff 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.
- 2.2 Spalding High School will make sure that students and staff are aware of our approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.
- 2.3 Spalding High School will communicate with parents to make them aware of the risks and issues of using AI and ensure they are aware of the need to support our approach.
- 2.4 High School will;
 - Explain the importance of students submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc.) for assessments and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice;
 - Update the Spalding High School's *Examination* and *AI Use in Assessments* policies 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 and how it should be acknowledged);
 - Update the Spalding High School's *Examination* and *AI Use in Assessments* policies to include clear guidance on how students should reference appropriately (including websites);
 - Update the Spalding High School's *Examination* and *AI Use in Assessments* policies to include clear guidance on how students should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse (see the below section on Acknowledging AI use);
 - Ensure that teachers are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools (see the What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments? and What is AI misuse? sections);
 - Ensure that, 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;
 - Ensure that students sign a declaration that they have understood what AI misuse is (see Appendix E);
 - Ensure that each student is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents);
 - Reinforce to students the significance of their (electronic) declaration where they confirm the work they're submitting is their own, the consequences of a false declaration, and that they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject;
 - Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice (see the Awarding Organisation actions section below and the examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations can be found in Appendix C: AI misuse examples at the end of this policy); and,
 - Ensure that teachers are aware they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work (see AI use and marking section below)
 - 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;
 - 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.

Section 3: Acknowledging AI misuse

- 3.1 It remains essential that students are clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and that they know how to do this.
- 3.2 Appropriate referencing, where used in Spalding High School, 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.
- 3.3 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.

- 3.4 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 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.
- 3.5 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/>), 25/01/2024.
- 3.6 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.
- 3.7 This must be submitted with the work the student submits for assessment, so the teacher is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used.
- 3.8 Where this is not submitted, and the teacher suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher will need to consult the Spalding High School's *Examination and AI Use in Assessments* policies for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own. Where the teacher/assessor cannot assure themselves, they must follow their centre's internal procedures and the published guidance for assessment.
- 3.9 Further guidance on ways this could be done are set out in the JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments guidance policy (see link below).
- 3.10 The JCQ guidance on referencing can be found in the following:
- 3.11 Plagiarism in Assessments (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/>)
- 3.12 Instructions for conducting coursework (https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Coursework_ICC_22-23_FINAL.pdf)
- 3.13 The Information for Candidates policy (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents>)
- 3.14 Students will also be reminded that if they use AI so that they have not independently met the marking criteria, they will not be rewarded.

Section 4: AI use and marking for teachers

- 4.1 When marking student work in which AI use has been acknowledged, and there are no concerns of AI misuse, the assessor must still ensure **that if the student has used AI tools such that they have not independently met the marking criteria, they are not rewarded.**
- 4.2 Depending upon the marking criteria or grade descriptors being applied, the assessor may need to take into account the failure to independently demonstrate their understanding of certain aspects when determining the appropriate mark/ grade to be awarded.
- 4.3 Appendix D provides an example of a student failing to meet the marking criteria due to excessive reliance on AI tools, illustrating how teachers can apply the JCQ *AI Use in Assessments* guidance when students do not independently meet the criteria.
- 4.4 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.
- 4.5 Examples of how to take into account the acknowledged use of AI tools when marking can be found in Appendix B of [JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications guidance](#).
- 4.6 Teachers may use AI tools to help mark student work. If AI tools are used to mark student work, **an AI tool cannot be the sole marker.** A human assessor must review all of the work in its entirety and determine the mark they feel it warrants, regardless of the outcomes of an AI tool. The assessor remains responsible for the mark/grade awarded.

Section 5: Preventing AOI uses in assessments and NEAs for teachers

- 5.1 AI misuse involves a student submitting work for qualification assessments which is not their own, which can be considered a form of plagiarism.

- 5.2 JCQ has published guidance on plagiarism, which provides guidance on what plagiarism is, how to prevent it, and how to detect it (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/>).
- 5.3 Teachers must be assured that the work they accept for assessment and mark is authentically the student's own work. Teachers are required to confirm this during the assessment process and, if they have doubts, must follow their centre's internal procedures and published guidance for assessment. This includes ensuring that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams.
- 5.4 Centres must have mechanisms in place, as previously referenced in the section titled 'Centre Responsibilities', which include:
- the approach the centre will use to prevent and identify AI misuse in each of the subjects including coursework or non-examined assessment that it delivers, including the approach taken for any private candidates.
 - the process to follow where there are concerns about AI misuse before the student's work is authenticated. In this situation, the centre is responsible for determining next steps and a teacher/assessor should not refer the work to the awarding organisation for a decision.
- 5.5 Those who work with the students on a regular basis and are familiar with their ability and standard of work are usually best-placed to make determinations about the misuse of AI although the relevant awarding organisation is available to provide advice and guidance to help the centre where needed.
- 5.6 To support students in preventing AI use, teachers should:
- Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders;
 - Where appropriate, allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each student's whole work with confidence;
 - Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages;
 - Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident that the student understands the material;
 - Consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work;
 - 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;
 - Issue 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.

Section 6: Preventing AI misuse and indicators of AI use

- 6.1 When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the student.
- 6.2 Where the work is made up of writing, the teacher can make note of the following characteristics or consider potential indicators of AI misuse:
- Spelling and punctuation – for example a default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations;
 - Grammatical usage – Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered;
 - Writing style and tone;
 - Vocabulary- for example a default use of language or vocabulary which might not accord with the qualification level;
 - Complexity and coherency;

- General understanding and working level - A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work;
- 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;
- The mode of production (i.e., whether handwritten or word-processed);
- 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 this;
- 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 student them self, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected;
- 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;
- The submission of student 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 and 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 candidate's usual style.

6.3 Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions.

6.4 Teachers should be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content.

Section 7: Private candidates

7.1 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.

7.2 Further guidance on authenticating student work can be found in the JCQ Instructions for conducting coursework (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/coursework/>).

Section 8: Automated detection

8.1 Automated detection AI chatbots, as large language models, produce content by 'guessing' the most likely next word in a sequence. This means that 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>)
- Scribbr ([AI Detector - Trusted AI Checker for ChatGPT, Copilot & Gemini](#))
- GPTZero (<https://gptzero.me/>)
- Sapling (<https://sapling.ai/ai-content-detector>)

8.2 These tools can be used to check student work and help verify concerns about its authenticity. **However, student work remains the intellectual property of the student. Before submitting any student work to an external AI detection platform, teachers must ensure that appropriate student and, where required,**

parental consent has been obtained. Uploading student work to third party platforms without consent may constitute a breach of copyright and data protection obligations.

- 8.3 AI detection tools are not definitive proof of malpractice. As they assess the predictability of language, AI generated content that has been edited by a student may receive a lower likelihood score. In addition, so called AI humanising tools e.g., **Humanize AI** or **Humanize AI: Undetectable Text Converter by Noiz**, are designed to make AI generated text appear more natural, which can reduce the reliability of detection outcomes.
- 8.4 The quality and accuracy of detection tools varies. Outcomes can be influenced by the specific AI model used, the proportion of AI to human generated content, the nature of the prompt, and factors such as a student's level of proficiency in English. Both generative AI and detection technologies continue to evolve. Staff should ensure they understand the capabilities and limitations of any tool before relying on its output.
- 8.5 In instances where misuse of AI is suspected it can be helpful to use more than one detection tool to provide an additional source of evidence about the authenticity of student work.
- 8.6 The use of detection tools, where used, should form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of students' work; all available information should be considered when reviewing any malpractice concerns.
- 8.7 Teachers know their students' typical style, vocabulary and standard of work. Professional judgement remains central. AI detection tools may inform that judgement, but they must not replace it.

Section 9: Reporting AI misuse or potential misuse

- 9.1 If your suspicions are confirmed and the student has not signed the examination board's declaration of authentication, you do not need to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation. Steps to resolve such incidents are detailed in Spalding High School's *Examination and AI Assessment* policies and should be reported to the Headteacher and/or Examination Officer in the first instance.
- 9.2 Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own. The Head of Centre, the Headteacher, has the responsibility for ensuring that students do not submit inauthentic work.
- 9.3 If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation. The procedure is detailed in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>).

Section 10: Potential Awarding Organisation actions

- 10.1 The JCQ awarding organisations have staff that are appropriately trained in the identification of malpractice and have established procedures for reporting and investigating suspected malpractice.
- 10.2 If AI misuse is suspected by an awarding organisation's moderator or examiner, or if it has been reported by a student or member of the public, full details of the allegation will usually be relayed to the centre.
- 10.3 The relevant awarding organisation will liaise with the Head of Centre regarding the next steps of the investigation and how appropriate evidence will be obtained.
- 10.4 The awarding organisation will then consider the case and, if necessary, impose a sanction in line with the sanctions given in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>).
- 10.5 The sanctions applied to a student committing plagiarism and making a false declaration of authenticity range from a warning regarding future conduct to disqualification and the student being barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time.
- 10.6 Awarding organisations will also take action, which can include the imposition of sanctions, where centre staff are knowingly accepting, or failing to check, inauthentic work for qualification assessments.

Section 11: Policy review date

- 11.1 This policy refers to AI tools and AI detection tools as they were at the time of publication; the JCQ awarding organisations continue to monitor developments in this area and this policy will be updated in line with this guidance when appropriate, but no less than annually.

Appendix A

Awarding body contacts

Centres can contact the relevant awarding body for more advice and guidance when marking work for a particular qualification.

AQA

Tel: 0800 197 7162

Tel: +44 161 696 5995 (outside the UK)

Email: eos@aqa.org.uk

Website: www.aqa.org.uk/contact-us

CCEA

Tel: 02890 261 200

Email: info@ccea.org.uk

Website: www.ccea.org.uk/contact

City & Guilds

Tel: 0844 543 0033

Email: learnersupport@cityandguilds.com

Email: general.enquiries@cityandguilds.com

Website: www.cityandguilds.com/help/contact-us

NCFE

Email: customersupport@ncfe.org.uk

Tel: 0191 239 8000

Website: <https://www.ncfe.org.uk/contact-us>

OCR

Tel: 01223 553 998

Email: support@ocr.org.uk

Website: www.ocr.org.uk/contact-us

Pearson

Tel: 0845 618 0440

Webform: <http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/forms/contact-the-team.html>

Website: <http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/contact-us.html>

WJEC/CBAC

Tel: 02920 265 000

E-mail: info@wjec.co.uk

Website: <http://www.wjec.co.uk/home/about-us/useful-contacts/>

JCQ AI and Assessments
CIC **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

Appendix C: AI Misuse Examples

The following are anonymised examples from recent malpractice cases involving the misuse of AI tools. Please note that although specific subjects are identified in the examples below, the circumstances described, and the associated actions and sanctions could be applied to any qualification as appropriate. We have chosen the following so as to give examples which cover a range of different contexts, including where centres have reported AI misuse concerns and where awarding body assessment personnel have identified potential issues. The final example is an example of what can go wrong when word processors have not been correctly set up for examinations.

Example 1

Plagiarism – AI misuse

Awarding body: AQA

Qualification: A Level History NEA

A centre reported that the teacher for A Level History had concerns relating to two candidates' NEA submissions. The concerns were that multiple sections were inconsistent with other parts of the candidates' work and the candidates' usual level and style of writing.

The centre used AI detection software to follow up on the teacher's concerns. The centre's review identified the following.

Candidate A: The AI detection software identified the work as being highly likely to have been generated by AI. This candidate admitted using ChatGPT to generate a guideline for their own work and claimed that they had accidentally submitted the guideline instead of their own work.

Candidate B: The AI detection software identified the work as being potentially generated by AI, and likely a combination of AI and human input. This candidate admitted using ChatGPT for some of the content of their work, for both the improvement of their own work as well as the creation of entirely new content.

The centre reported both candidates to the awarding body and provided confirmation that the candidates had been issued all relevant 'information for candidates' documents and that the candidates had signed the declaration of authenticity to declare that the work completed was their own.

Both candidates were found to have committed malpractice. Candidate A was disqualified from the A Level History qualification and candidate B received a loss of all marks gained for the A Level History NEA component.

Example 2

Awarding body: Pearson

Qualification: Extended Project P301

During a regular review of work for the purposes of identifying potential AI misuse, a candidate's Extended Project submission was identified by detection software as containing several unreferenced sections of AI generated content. A further manual evaluation of the submission concluded that multiple sections of the work included extensive indicators associated with generative AI. Upon contacting the centre, the candidate declined to provide a statement explaining the concerns, and the case was referred to Pearson's Malpractice Committee for consideration.

Following a careful review of the available evidence, the Malpractice Committee found the candidate to be in breach of the JCQ AI Use in Assessments guidance which defines as malpractice "copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own" and "failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information".

The Malpractice Committee determined that, as the result of the malpractice, the candidate be disqualified from the qualification.

Example 3

Awarding body: OCR

Qualification: Cambridge Nationals Enterprise and Marketing

The moderator raised concerns of suspected plagiarism in a unit of the above qualification, due to a lack of referencing seen within candidates' work.

Through using Turnitin, two candidates were identified who may have potentially used AI tools, or Large Language Models (LLMs), to generate content for at least one Learning Objective. These included explanations of different business terms and financial analyses.

One candidate admitted to using ChatGPT in the later parts of their coursework as they had not understood some of the questions and felt that assistance from their teacher was "too infrequent". They stated that their logic was that it was no different to asking a teacher for advice as the AI tool would take information from across the internet and since they were asking specific questions, the 'reply' from the AI tool would be the same as getting teacher advice and feedback.

The other candidate admitted that they had used an AI tool to generate content for their work but couldn't remember which sections of work had been their own.

Although the cohort had been told about plagiarism and how to avoid it, there had been no specific mention of AI tools - despite AI misuse being a form of plagiarism.

Based on the evidence provided by the centre, it was determined that the two candidates would receive zero marks for the affected Learning Objectives.

Appendix D: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work

The following are examples of how the JCQ *AI Use in Assessments* guidance relating to students using AI tools such that they have not independently met the marking criteria can be applied by teachers and assessors, as per page 6 of the guidance: “b) Students should also be reminded that if they use AI so that they have not independently met the marking criteria they will not be rewarded.” In the below examples, students have not independently met the marking criteria because of their over reliance on AI tools.

Examples

Awarding body: Pearson

Qualification: A level History

A candidate has produced coursework for the NEA component of the qualification which is of a good standard. The candidate has used a range of sources and AI tools which have been appropriately cited within the work. The candidate has demonstrated some understanding of the topic, using generally correct and appropriate information. The candidate has also expressed an opinion on the topic at hand and has attempted some discussion of differing viewpoints. The work is clear and coherent but does lack depth.

The assessor marking the work at the centre consults the mark scheme for this component and identifies that the work is likely to attract marks which make it fall within Level 3. The mark scheme for this level is as follows:

Level	Mark	Descriptor						
Level 3		Explains analysis and attempts evaluation						
17-24		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A range of material relevant to the enquiry has been identified from reading and appropriately cited. Information has been appropriately selected and deployed to show understanding of the overall issue in question. A judgement on the question is related to some key points of view encountered in reading and discussion is attempted, albeit with limited substantiation. Contextual knowledge of some issues related to the debate is shown and linked to some of the points discussed. Analyses some of the views in three chosen works by selecting and explaining some key points and indicating differences. Explanation demonstrates some understanding of the reasons for differences. Attempts are made to establish valid criteria for evaluation of some arguments in the chosen works and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation. Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the conceptual focus of the enquiry, but material lacks range or depth. The answer is concise and shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence and precision. 						
		<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Low level 3: 17-18 marks</td> <td>Mid level 3: 19-21 marks</td> <td>High level 3: 22-24 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects and it is not concise.</td> <td>The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects or it is not concise.</td> <td>The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.</td> </tr> </table>	Low level 3: 17-18 marks	Mid level 3: 19-21 marks	High level 3: 22-24 marks	The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects and it is not concise.	The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects or it is not concise.	The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.
Low level 3: 17-18 marks	Mid level 3: 19-21 marks	High level 3: 22-24 marks						
The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects and it is not concise.	The qualities of Level 3 are displayed, but material is less convincing in some aspects or it is not concise.	The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed.						

Having carefully considered the descriptors and the candidate's work, the assessor considers that the work is of a high level 3 standard, worth 22-24 marks. However, for the section in the work in which the candidate discusses some key points and differences between three historical resources, the candidate has relied solely upon an AI tool. This use has been appropriately acknowledged and a copy of the input to and output from the AI tool has been submitted with the work. As the candidate has not independently met the marking criteria they cannot be rewarded for this aspect of the descriptor (i.e. the third bullet point above). The assessor therefore places the work in the mid-level 3 category, awarding 20 marks.

The assessor ensures this decision regarding the student's AI use and its impact on marking is clearly recorded. This provides feedback to the student and provides clarity in the event of an internal appeal or the work being selected for moderation.

Appendix E: Student Declaration Form

Spalding High School

Artificial Intelligence Declaration 2025 / 2026

- In accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres, all work submitted for qualification assessments must be your own work and teachers must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be that.
- If you are found to have misused AI and the work you submit for assessment is not your own you will have committed malpractice which is a form of plagiarism.
- If it is shown that material has been falsified, plagiarised, or you have otherwise attempted to obtain an unfair advantage for yourself or others, you must understand that it can lead to papers being marked down or being disqualified.
- You must make sure that work you submit for assessment is your own. If any sections of your work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified and you must understand that this will not allow you to demonstrate that you have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded.

Declaration (please tick the box)

- I understand and declare that this work is my own work
- I can confirm I have had the correct use of AI explained to me
- I can confirm I have had the consequences of using AI explained to me

Student Name: _____

Signed: _____

Date: _____