

Malpractice Policy

Date of policy	September 2026
Date of next review	September 2027
Staff responsible	Assistant Headteacher
Reference	Staff shared area/staff development/school policies AC
Governor/School policy	School

This policy is reviewed and updated annually to ensure that any malpractice, including AI misuse at Severn Vale School is managed in accordance with current requirements and regulations. Reference in the policy to **GR** and **SMPP** relate to relevant sections of the current JCQ publications **General Regulations for Approved Centres** and **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**.

What is malpractice and maladministration?

‘Malpractice’ and ‘maladministration’ are related concepts, the common theme of which is that they involve a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This policy uses the word ‘malpractice’ to cover both ‘malpractice’ and ‘maladministration’ and it means any act, default or practice which is:

- a breach of the Regulations
- a breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered
- a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification

which:

- gives rise to prejudice to candidates
- compromises public confidence in qualifications
- compromises, attempts to compromise or may compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of any qualification or the validity of a result or certificate
- damages the authority, reputation or credibility of any awarding body or centre or any officer, employee or agent of any awarding body or centre (SMPP 1)

Candidate malpractice

‘Candidate malpractice’ means malpractice by a candidate in connection with any examination or assessment, including the preparation and authentication of any controlled assessments, coursework or non-examination assessments, the presentation of any practical work, the compilation of portfolios of assessment evidence and the writing of any examination paper. (SMPP 2)

Centre staff malpractice

‘Centre staff malpractice’ means malpractice committed by:

- a member of staff, contractor (whether employed under a contract of employment or a contract for services) or a volunteer at a centre; or
- an individual appointed in another capacity by a centre such as an invigilator, a Communication Professional, a Language Modifier, a practical assistant, a prompter, a reader or a scribe (SMPP 2)

Suspected malpractice

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

Purpose of the policy

Severn Vale School has in place a written malpractice policy which covers all qualifications delivered by the centre. It details how candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments, how suspected malpractice issues should be escalated within the centre and reported to the relevant awarding body (GR 5.3)

General principles

In accordance with the regulations Severn Vale School will:

- Take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after examinations have taken place (GR 5.11)
- Inform the awarding body immediately of any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice or maladministration, involving a candidate or a member of staff, by completing the appropriate documentation (GR 5.11)
- As required by an awarding body, gather evidence of any instances of alleged or suspected malpractice (which includes **maladministration**) in accordance with the JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice - Policies and Procedures** and provide such information and advice as the awarding body may reasonably require (GR 5.11)

Responsibilities

Governors

Governors will:

- Ensure this policy is applied appropriately by the Headteacher.
- Review the Malpractice Policy annually with the Headteacher.

Headteacher

The Headteacher will:

- Notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice. The only exception to this is candidate malpractice discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments where the offence relates to the content of candidate work. If staff malpractice is discovered in coursework or non-examination assessments, the Headteacher must inform the awarding body immediately, regardless of whether the authentication forms have been signed by the candidate/s.
- Be accountable for ensuring that the centre and centre staff comply, at all times, with the awarding body's instructions regarding an investigation.
- Ensure that, where a candidate is a child or an adult at risk and is the subject of a malpractice investigation, the candidate's parent/carer/appropriate adult is kept informed of the progress of the investigation.
- Delegate the gathering of information to the SLT member with the responsibility for exams.
- Ensure there is no conflict of interest which might compromise the investigation.
- Respond speedily and openly to all requests for an investigation into an allegation of malpractice. This will be in the best interests of centre staff, candidates and any others involved.
- Make information requested by an awarding body available speedily and openly.
- Co-operate with an enquiry into an allegation of malpractice and ensure that their staff do so also, whether the centre is directly involved in the case or not.
- Ensure staff members and candidates are informed of their individual responsibilities and rights, as set out in this document.

- Forward any awarding body correspondence and evidence to centre staff and/or provide staff contact information to enable the awarding body to do so.
- At all times comply with data protection law.
- Pass on to the individuals concerned any warnings or notifications of sanctions and ensure compliance with any requests made by the awarding body as a result of a malpractice case.

Assistant Head with responsibility for exams

The Assistant Head with responsibility for exams will:

- Ensure staff are aware of what malpractice and maladministration including the misuse of AI are. This will include sharing this policy annually with staff.
- Ensure students are aware of what malpractice and maladministration including the use and misuse of AI are.
- Share appropriate JCQ information, through assemblies and other means.
- Under the direction of the Headteacher, carry out any investigation relating to malpractice, maladministration and misuse of AI.
- Complete relevant forms where appropriate.
- Communicate with candidates, parents/carers and/or staff regarding any concerns raised with malpractice, maladministration and misuse of AI.
- Share evidence of malpractice before submitting to awarding body.
- Communicate malpractice decision outcome and how a candidate can appeal a decision.

Exams officer

The Exams Officer will:

- Review and present to the Assistant Head with responsibility for exams any updates required to this policy annually.
- Ensure all invigilators have appropriate training and are aware of what is Malpractice, including their roles and responsibilities regarding reporting suspected Malpractice.
- Support an invigilator through the process of an alleged or suspected malpractice event to ensure all steps are followed and recorded correctly.
- Ensure teachers have been informed of their roles and responsibilities as outlined in this policy, including ensuring any updates to the policy are communication clearly and in a timely manner.
- Support a teacher through the process of an alleged or suspected malpractice event to ensure all steps are followed and recorded correctly.

Class Teachers

Class Teachers will:

- Inform students at the start of any coursework or NEA what is meant by malpractice, giving clear examples, making clear reference to the JCQ guidelines.
- Inform students at the start of any coursework or NEA what is meant by AI misuse, making clear reference to the JCQ guidelines.
- Will inform the exams officer/ Assistant Head with responsibility for exams when malpractice is suspected, providing the student details and supporting evidence.
- Ensure work accepted is authentically the students own work by routinely reviewing work for malpractice and the use and misuse of AI through:
 - Use of Impero (where appropriate) in lessons to watch what candidates are doing and monitoring candidates use of copy/paste and AI generators.
 - Use of AI checkers when it is believed it might not be a student's work.

- Use the AI function on students' work to check throughout the completion of coursework/NEA.

Students

Students will not:

- Submit work which is not their own.
- Make available their work to other candidates through any medium.
- Allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material.
- Assist other candidates to produce work.
- Use AI, books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution.
- Misuse AI.
- Submit work that has been word processed by a third person without acknowledgement.
- Include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material.

Preventing malpractice and misuse of AI – Informing candidates

Severn Vale School has in place robust processes to prevent and identify malpractice, as outlined in section 3 of the JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures**. (SMPP 4.3). This includes ensuring staff involved in the delivery of assessments and examinations understand the requirements for conducting these as specified in the following JCQ documents and any further awarding body guidance: **General Regulations for Approved Centres 2023-2024; Instructions for conducting examinations (ICE) 2023-2024; Instructions for conducting coursework 2023-2024; Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments 2023-2024; Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments 2023-2024; A guide to the special consideration process 2023-2024; Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures 2023-2024; Plagiarism in Assessments; AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications; A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes 2023-2024 (SMPP 3.3.1)**

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

Students will be informed by their class teachers at the start of their GCSE course regarding the rule of malpractice including the use of AI in coursework/non-examination assessments (NEA). This will be reinforced in year group assemblies throughout KS4.

AI use in Assessments:

Staff will read the Malpractice policy including the Artificial intelligence (AI) Misuse Guidance Exams 2025-26 – (appendix 2 of the malpractice policy) which outlines guidance of AI, use of AI and misuse in students work. JCQ support resources will be used to support teachers understanding and prevent AI misuse, to support students to better understand the rules for use of AI in assessments, resources such as Information Sheet for Teachers, Senior Leader Presentation for Teachers, Poster for Students, Teacher Presentation for Students.

Identification and reporting of malpractice

Escalating suspected malpractice issues

Once suspected malpractice is identified, **any member of staff at the centre must report it using the appropriate channels** (SMPP 4.3). Should malpractice be suspected the class teacher should inform the exams officer and provide the student details with supporting evidence. The exams officer will then pass the details to the AHT Exams who will then follow the JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures guidance, including communicating the suspected malpractice or misuse of AI to the Head of Centre.

Reporting suspected malpractice to the awarding body

- The Head of Centre will notify the appropriate awarding body immediately of all alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice, using the appropriate forms, and will conduct any investigation

and gathering of information in accordance with the requirements of the JCQ publication **Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures** (SMPP 4.1.3).

- The Head of Centre will ensure that where a candidate who is a child/vulnerable adult is the subject of a malpractice investigation, the candidate's parent/carer/ appropriate adult is kept informed of the progress of the investigation (SMPP 4.1.3).
- Form JCQ/M1 will be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of candidate malpractice. Form JCQ/M2 will be used to notify an awarding body of an incident of suspected staff malpractice/maladministration (SMPP 4.4, 4.6).
- Malpractice by a candidate discovered in a controlled assessment, coursework or non-examination assessment component prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication need not be reported to the awarding body but will be dealt with in accordance with the centre's internal procedures. The only exception to this is where the awarding body's confidential assessment material has potentially been breached. The breach will be reported to the awarding body immediately (SMPP 4.5).
- If, in the view of the investigator, there is sufficient evidence to implicate an individual in malpractice, that individual (a candidate or a member of staff) will be informed of the rights of accused individuals (SMPP 5.33).
- Once the information gathering has concluded, the Head of Centre will submit a written report summarising the information obtained and actions taken to the relevant awarding body, accompanied by the information obtained during the course of their enquiries (5.35).
- The awarding body will decide on the basis of the report, and any supporting documentation, whether there is evidence of malpractice and if any further investigation is required. The Head of Centre will be informed accordingly (SMPP 5.40).
- Throughout any malpractice investigation, Severn Vale School will ensure that the candidate's established needs and normal ways of working—such as access arrangements, communication preferences, or support strategies are maintained, inline with the updated Appendix 11 of the JQC **Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures 2026**.

Communicating malpractice decisions

Before submitting any JCQ M1 form to the awarding body, Severn Vale School will provide the candidate with all evidence relating to the allegation. The candidate will be given the opportunity to review and respond to this evidence. The centre will record this process and confirm completion on the M1 checklist, in accordance with JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures (2026).

Once a decision has been made, it will be communicated in writing to the Head of Centre as soon as possible. The Head of Centre will communicate the decision to the individuals concerned and pass on details of any sanctions and action in cases where this is indicated. The Head of Centre will also inform the individuals if they have the right to appeal. (SMPP 11.1)

Appeals against decisions made in cases of malpractice

Severn Vale School will:

- Provide the individual with information on the process and timeframe for submitting an appeal, where relevant
- Refer to further information and follow the process provided in the JCQ publication **A guide to the awarding bodies' appeals processes**

APPENDIX 1:

Acknowledging AI Use:

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 should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used. In addition to the above, where students use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. This will allow 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.

Misuse of AI constitutes malpractice as defined in JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures. 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 the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

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

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

Students will be made 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. They will be made aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.

APPENDIX 2:

Artificial intelligence (AI) Misuse Guidance Exams 2025-26

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. Centres will already have established measures in place to ensure that students are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice. This guidance reminds teachers and assessors of best practice in this area, applying it in the context of AI use.

The guidance emphasises the following requirements:

- All work submitted for qualification assessments must be 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.
- Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the students' own
- 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. The JCQ awarding organisations are continuing to monitor developments in this area and will update this guidance when appropriate.

The assessments this guidance applies to is when 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 will be unaffected by developments in AI tools as students will not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments. 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) for General Qualifications, coursework and internal assessments. This document is primarily intended to provide guidance in relation to these assessments.

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

AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications. While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice.

Teachers and students should also be aware that AI tools are still being developed and there are often limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content. AI chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. Users can ask follow-up questions or ask the chatbot to revise the responses already provided. AI chatbots respond to prompts based upon patterns in

the data sets (large language model) upon which they have been trained. They generate responses which are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate.

AI chatbots can complete tasks such as the following:

- Answering questions
- Analysing, improving, and summarising text
- Authoring essays, articles, fiction, and non-fiction
- Writing computer code
- Translating text from one language to another
- Generating new ideas, prompts, or suggestions for a given topic or theme
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or formality

AI chatbots currently available include:

- ChatGPT (<https://chatgpt.net/chatgpt-login/>)
- Jenni AI (<https://jenni.ai>)
- Jasper AI (<https://www.jasper.ai/>)
- Writesonic (<https://writesonic.com/chat/>)
- Bloomai (<https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom>)
- Google Bard

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

- Midjourney (<https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/>)
- Stable Diffusion (<https://stablediffusionweb.com/>)
- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (<https://openai.com/dall-e-2/>)

The use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments.

As noted above, they 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 chatbots often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. Some AI chatbots have been identified as providing dangerous and harmful answers to questions and some can also produce fake references to books/ articles by real or fake people.

What is AI misuse – definition, risk and malpractice

As has always been the case, students must submit work for assessments which is their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words, and isn't copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work.

Students are expected to 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.

Any use of AI which means students have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice. While AI may become an established tool at the workplace in the future, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it's important for students' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI. Students should develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying. AI tools must only be used when the conditions of the

assessment permit the use of the internet and where the student is able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

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

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

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures. The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of 'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism' include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years.

Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Centre engagement with and discussion of AI

Policies and procedures relating to assessment are in place to ensure the authenticity of assessments. Centres must now ensure that these can also address the risks associated with AI misuse.

Teachers, assessors and other staff must:

- discuss the use of AI and agree their approach to managing students' use of AI in their school, college or exam centre.
- make students aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI
- make students aware of 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.

Centres should consider communicating with parents to make them aware of the risks and issues and ensure they support the centre's approach.

Centres should do the following:

- 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 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 and how it should be acknowledged) – most simply by referencing this document.
- Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students should reference appropriately (including websites).
- Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse.
- Ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools

- Consider whether students should be required to sign a declaration and that they have understood what AI misuse is
- Ensure that each student is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates.
- 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

Acknowledging AI use – When and how AI can be used in exams and assessments

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. 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 should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content and then reference the sources they have used.

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

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated.

- For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2023.

The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a noneditable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.

This must be submitted with the work so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used.

Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should act to assure themselves that the work is the student's own.

Further guidance on ways this could be done are set out in the JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments guidance document.

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

- Students being reminded that, as with any source, poor referencing, paraphrasing and copying sections of text may constitute malpractice, which can 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 should also be reminded that if they use AI so that they have not independently met the marking criteria they will not be rewarded.

Other ways to prevent misuse

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.

Teachers and assessors must be assured that the work they accept for assessment and mark is authentically the student's own work. They are required to confirm this during the assessment process. To prevent misuse, education and awareness of staff and students is likely to be key.

Here are some actions which should be taken (many of these will already be in place in centres as these are not new requirements):

- Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks.
- Ensure that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams
- Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders.
- Where appropriate, allocating 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 stage.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

Identifying misuse

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

When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the student. Where the work is made up of writing, one can 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)

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

Potential indicators of AI use: If you see the following in student work, it may be an indication that they have misused AI:

- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations.*
- A default use of language or vocabulary which might not be appropriate to the qualification level.*
- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected.
- Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors).
- A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects.
- Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.
- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work.
- 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 themselves, 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, 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

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

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 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:

- OpenAI Classifier (<https://openai.com/blog/new-ai-classifier-for-indicating-ai-written-text/>)
- GPTZero (<https://gptzero.me/>)
- The Giant Language Model Test Room (GLTR) (<http://gltr.io/dist/>)

In addition, the JCQ awarding organisations are aware that AI detection will shortly be added to the existing tool Turnitin Originality (<https://www.turnitin.com/products/originality>). This tool features an AI review of a student's work, reviewing a portfolio of evidence and, we understand, will indicate the likelihood of AI use. These tools could 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, as they base their scores on the predictability of words, will give lower scores for AI-generated content which has been subsequently amended by students. The quality of these detection tools can vary and AI and detection tools will continue to evolve. The use of detection tools 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.

Reporting

If your suspicions are confirmed and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, your centre doesn't need to report the malpractice to the appropriate awarding organisation. You can resolve the matter prior to the signing of the declarations.

Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own.

The Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring that students do not submit inauthentic work.

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.

Awarding Organisation actions

The JCQ awarding organisations ensure that their staff, moderators and examiners are appropriately trained in the identification of malpractice and have established procedures for reporting and investigating suspected malpractice.

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. 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.

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. 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. Awarding organisations will also act, which can include the imposition of sanctions, where centre staff are knowingly accepting, or failing to check, inauthentic work for qualification assessments.