Joint Council for Qualifications CIC

REVISION ONE

AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications

Guidance for Teachers & Assessors

Published on: 26 April 2023
Revision one: 2 February 2024

Produced on behalf of:

AQA cea Rewarding Learning City & Guilds NCFE OCR Oxford Cambridge and RSA Pearson WJEC CBAC

©JCQ CIC 2024

Executive summary

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 in centres of best practice in this area, applying it in the context of AI use.

The guidance 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/exams-office/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.

This guidance refers to AI tools and AI detection tools as they were at the time of publication; the JCQ awarding organisations are continuing to monitor developments in this area and will update this guidance when appropriate. Examples of candidate AI misuse cases and marking candidate work where AI tools have been used can be found in **appendices A** and **B** to this document.

This document was first published on 26 April 2023. It was amended on 2 February 2024.

Contents

The assessments this guidance applies to 1

What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments? 2

What is AI misuse? 4

Centre engagement with and discussion of AI 5

Acknowledging AI use 6

AI use and marking 7

Preventing AI misuse in assessments 8

Identifying misuse 9

Reporting 11

Awarding Organisation actions 12

Appendix A: AI misuse examples 13

Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student works 15

The assessments this guidance 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.

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 & Technical Qualifications (VTQs). 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 evolving quickly but there are still 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://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/**)

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/**)

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate music. These include:

- Soundraw (**https://soundraw.io/**)
- wavtool (**https://wavtool.com/**)
- Musicfy (**https://create.musicfy.lol/**)

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?

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/exams-office/general-regulations/**), 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. 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.

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

- 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.

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (**https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/**). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of *'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism'* include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations can be found in **Appendix A: AI misuse examples** at the end of this document.

Centre engagement with and discussion of AI

Centres should already have agreed policies and procedures relating to assessment 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 in qualification assessments and agree their approach to managing students' use of AI in their school, college or exam centre. Centres must 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. They should also 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:

a) 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;

b) 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;

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

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

e) Ensure that 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 using it in assessments?** and **What is AI misuse?** sections);

f) 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;

g) Consider whether students should be required to sign a declaration that they have understood what AI misuse is, and that it is forbidden in the learning agreement that is signed at enrolment in some centres;

h) 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**);

i) 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;

j) 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 A: AI misuse examples** at the end of this document); and

k) 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).

Acknowledging AI use

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/**), 25/01/2024. The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.

This must be submitted with the work 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. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own. Further guidance on ways this could be done are set out in the JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments guidance document (see link below).

The JCQ guidance on referencing can be found in the following:

- *Plagiarism in Assessments* (**https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/**)
- *Instructions for conducting coursework* (**https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Coursework_ICC_22-23_FINAL.pdf**)
- The Information for Candidates documents (**https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents**)

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

a) 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;

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 (examples of how to implement this can be found in **Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work** at the end of this document).

AI use and 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 that if the student has used AI tools such that they have not independently met the marking criteria, they are not rewarded. 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. 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.

Examples of how to take into account the acknowledged use of AI tools when marking can be found in **Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work** at the end of this document.

Centres 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 centres do permit AI tools to be 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.

Preventing AI misuse in assessments

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 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/**). 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):

a) Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;

b) Ensure that 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 done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each student's whole work with confidence;

e) 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;

f) 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;

g) 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;

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.

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.

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. 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.

Private candidates

Verifying the authenticity of work submitted by private candidates can be more challenging for centres, given that they may not have a good understanding of the standard the student is currently working at. Before accepting work for assessment, teachers/assessors must take steps to ensure it is the student's own independent work. This may involve 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 that 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 might not accord with the qualification level*

c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected~

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 might be notable for some subjects

f) Instances of incorrect/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 this

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.

*Please be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages, registers 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 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:

- Turnitin AI writing detection (**https://www.turnitin.com/solutions/topics/ai-writing/ai-detector/**)
- Copyleaks (**https://copyleaks.com/ai-content-detector**)
- GPTZero (**https://gptzero.me/**)
- Sapling (**https://sapling.ai/ai-content-detector**)

These can 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. Spending time getting to know how the detection tools work will help teachers and assessors understand what they are and aren't capable of.

AI detection tools, including those listed above, employ a range of detection models which can 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 can 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 should 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.

Reporting

If your suspicions are confirmed and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, your centre doesn't need to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation. Steps to resolve such incidents should be detailed in the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy. These should include ensuring that students are aware of what malpractice is, how to avoid malpractice, how to properly reference sources and acknowledge AI tools, etc.

Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own. Ultimately 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. The procedure is detailed in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (**https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/**).

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

Examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations can be found in **Appendix A: AI misuse examples** at the end of this document.

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.

Appendix A: AI misuse examples

Introduction

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.

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.

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.

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.

Awarding body: AQA
Qualification: GCSE Religious Studies

A candidate's word processed exam script was escalated to the malpractice team by the examiner marking it because they had identified frequent American spellings and they felt the highly sophisticated language and concepts it contained were not consistent with GCSE level work.

The candidate's word processed script was reviewed using AI detection software which returned a high probability score for the use of AI. The candidate was asked to provide a statement, in which they denied the use of AI.

After consideration of the evidence gathered, it was decided that the candidate had breached examination conditions and used AI for the production of answers in their examination. The candidate received a loss of all marks gained for a component. Post-results, it was also concluded by the centre that the candidate's marks and grades were not consistent with expectation or previous attainment. Following the outcome of this case and the disparity in performance flagged by the centre, all of the candidate's assessments were processed through AI detection software which showed multiple components were affected. The outcome was that the candidate received a loss of all marks gained for the affected components.

The candidate's word processor had not been correctly set up. Internet access should have been disabled for the word processor, which would have prevented this malpractice from occurring. As part of the investigation, the awarding body sought to ensure that such incidents could not recur. The centre gave details of the steps that would be taken to prevent a recurrence of this issue, which included the re-training of invigilators on word processor set up.

Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work

Introduction

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	17-24	**Explains analysis and attempts evaluation** • 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.

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.

Awarding body: Pearson
Qualification: BTEC Level 3 National Extended Diploma in Business

A student has produced work for unit 1: Exploring Business. The student has produced work of a good standard in which they have compared two different businesses in some depth. The candidate has used a range of sources and AI tools which have been appropriately cited within the work. In the work the student has assessed the relationship with stakeholders by the two companies, analysed the two organisations' structures, discussed the effects of the business environment on the companies – including their response to recent and potential future changes in the market, and reviewed the importance of innovation and entrepreneurship in the success of one of the companies.

The assessor to whom the work has been submitted carefully reviews the assessment criteria for unit 1, which are as follows:

Assessment criteria		
Pass	**Merit**	**Distinction**
Learning aim A: Explore the features of different businesses and analyse what makes them successful		
A.P1 Explain the features of two contrasting businesses. **A.P2** Explain how two contrasting businesses are influenced by stakeholders.	**A.M1** Assess the relationship and communication with stakeholders of two contrasting businesses using independent research.	**AB.D1** Evaluate the reasons for the success of two contrasting businesses, reflecting on evidence gathered.
Learning aim B: Investigate how businesses are organised		
B.P3 Explore the organisation structures, aims and objectives of two contrasting businesses.	**B.M2** Analyse how the structures of two contrasting businesses allow each to achieve its aims and objectives.	
Learning aim C: Examine the environment in which businesses operate		
C.P4 Discuss the effect of internal, external and competitive environment on a given business. **C.P5** Select a variety of techniques to undertake a situational analysis of a given business.	**C.M3** Assess the effects of the business environment on a given business.	**C.D2** Evaluate the extent to which the business environment affects a given business, using a variety of situational analysis techniques.

Assessment criteria		
Pass	**Merit**	**Distinction**
Learning aim D: Examine business markets		
D.P6 Explore how the market structure and influences on supply and demand affect the pricing and output decisions for a given business.	**D.M4** Assess how a given business has responded to changes in the market.	**C.D3** Evaluate how changes in the market have impacted on a given business and how this business may react to future changes.
Learning aim E: Investigate the role and contribution of innovation and enterprise to business success		
E.P7 Explore how innovation and enterprise contribute to the success of a business.	**E.M5** Analyse how successful the use of innovation and enterprise has been for a given business.	**E.D4** Justify the use of innovation and enterprise for a business in relation to its changing market and environment.

The assessor is content that the work meets all Pass, Merit and Distinction criteria. However, the assessor is aware that in the section in which the student discusses how one of the businesses might react to future changes in the business environment, the student has relied upon the use of an AI tool (appropriately acknowledged, with the input and output from the AI tool submitted together with the assignment) and has not independently demonstrated their own understanding beyond this. The assessor therefore cannot award criterion D.D3 and, as the work has not met all Distinction assessment criteria (which is required to achieve an overall Distinction grade), the work is awarded a Merit grade overall.

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 standards verification.

Awarding body contacts

Centres and assessors 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/