



Title:	Malpractice, Maladministration Policy and Procedure
Internal Reference:	L4L-GY-043
Approved by:	Sara Morris
Issue Date:	September 2020
Version No:	V1.a
Review Date:	September 2022

Learning4Life-GY

Malpractice, Maladministration Policy and Procedure

Scope

This policy and procedure provides details the steps that Learning4life-GY will take to report an actual or suspected occurrence of malpractice, maladministration or plagiarism and informs those who receive the information how they should proceed.

This policy is aimed at learners or students at Learning4life-GY who are registered on regulated qualifications, and who are involved in suspected or actual cases of malpractice and/ or maladministration.

This policy also applies to staff who are suspected of being involved in such cases. It is also for use by our staff to ensure that they deal with all malpractice and maladministration investigations in a consistent manner.

It sets out the steps that Learning4life-GY, and learners must follow when reporting suspected or actual cases of malpractice and/or maladministration and our responsibilities in dealing with such cases.

Learning4life-GY responsibility

It is important that all Learning4life-GY staff involved in the management, delivery, assessment and quality assurance of regulated qualifications, and learners, are fully aware of the contents of the policy and that Learning4life-GY have arrangements in place to prevent and investigate instances of malpractice and or maladministration.

A failure to report suspected or actual cases of malpractice and/or maladministration cases or have in place effective arrangements to prevent such cases, may lead to sanctions being imposed by Learning4life-GY Directors (see staff handbook for further details). Staff must also work in ways that reduce the risk of incidents of malpractice or maladministration occurring by engaging in teaching, learning and assessment that promotes good quality study skills including accurate referencing.

Should an investigation be undertaken at Learning4life-GY, the Quality Manager must:

- Ensure that the investigation is carried out by competent investigators who have no personal involvement in the incident or interest in the outcomes
- Ensure that the investigation is carried out in an effective, prompt, and thorough manner and that the investigators look beyond the immediate reported issues, to assure that learning4life-GY arrangements are appropriate for all qualifications.
- Respond in a timely manner and in an open way, to all requests relating to the allegation and/or investigation.
- Cooperate and ensure their staff cooperate fully with any investigation and/or request for information.

Definitions:

- Malpractice – in breach of regulation, unethical, negligent, or immoral behaviour, which does or could compromise the process of assessment, the integrity of regulated qualifications, or the validity of a result or certificate. It

could also damage the reputation, credibility, and authority of NOCN, the Delivery Partner and/or Learning4life-gy and their employees. This could include for example; a learner cheating in an exam, or a professional person falsifying or tampering with results or assessment/ quality assurance records. Staff or other Learning4life-gy representatives and/or learners can carry out malpractice.

Examples of centre malpractice include:

- Insecure storage of assessment instruments and marking guidance.
- Misuse of assessments, including inappropriate adjustments to assessment decisions or externally set assessments
- Failure to comply with requirements for accurate and safe retention of learner evidence, assessment, and internal quality assurance records.
- Excessive direction from assessors to learners on how to meet the assessment criteria, learning outcomes or national standards.
- Deliberate falsification of records to claim certificates.

Examples of staff malpractice include:

- A breach of security (e.g. failure to keep exam material secure, tampering with coursework etc.)
- Deception (e.g. manufacturing evidence of competence, fabricating assessment or internal quality assurance records.)
- The provision of improper assistance to learners (e.g. permitting the use of a reasonable adjustment over and above the extent permitted by the Awarding Organisation's policy, prompting learners in assessment by means of signs or verbal or written prompts).
- Failure to adhere to regulations/ Awarding Organisation stated requirements.

Examples of learner malpractice include:

- Plagiarism – failure to acknowledge sources properly and/or the submission of another person's work as if it were the learner's own
- Collusion with others when an assessment must be completed by individual learners.
- Copying from another learner (including using ICT to do so)
- Personation – assuming the identity of another learner or having someone assume your identity during an assessment
- Inclusion of inappropriate, offensive, discriminatory, or obscene material in assessment evidence, **coursework, non-examination assessments and portfolios**. This includes vulgarity and swearing that is outside of the context of the assessment, or any material of a discriminatory nature (including racism, sexism, and homophobia).
- Inappropriate behaviour during an assessment or examination that causes disruption to others. This includes shouting and/or aggressive behaviour or language and having an unauthorised electronic device that causes disruption in the examination room
- Frivolous content – producing content that is unrelated to the examination paper/questions in scripts or coursework.
- Unauthorised aids – physical possession of unauthorised materials (including mobile phones, MP3 players, notes, etc) in the examination room.

There may be other examples of malpractice that may undermine the integrity of qualifications.

- Maladministration – activity, neglect, default, or other practices that results in Learning4life-gy or learner not complying with the specific requirements for delivery of qualifications. This would include incompetent or dishonest managements or administration of exams or assessments. This could include for example; poor invigilation, incorrect recording examination or assessment results or issuing incorrect certificates.
- Plagiarism – someone deliberately falsifying records or using work in their assessment that is not their own but is presented as if it were their own – if plagiarism is detected before a declaration of authentication is signed, then this need not be reported to NOCN and should be dealt with under the Learning4life-GY disciplinary policy.

Procedure

- When Learning4life-GY identifies that suspected or actual malpractice, maladministration, or plagiarism (MMP) has occurred (about a Learner or staff member) the awarding body must be notified immediately by the Quality Manager.
- When the incident concerns a learner, the Quality Manager will ascertain whether the learner has signed a declaration of authentication. If the learner has not signed, the Learning4life-GY disciplinary policy will be followed. Where the declaration of authentication has been signed an MMP Form must be completed and submitted to NOCN at assurance@nocn.org.uk by read receipt email.
- If asked to conduct an investigation the Quality Manager will undertake the following steps:
 1. Inform staff and learners of their rights (unless the NOCN Head of Assurance informs that this is not appropriate given the circumstances)
 2. Send acknowledgement to all interested parties within 7 working days and confirmation that an investigation will be conducted where necessary. To ensure a fair and thorough process is followed, the duration of the investigation will depend on the nature and severity of the allegation, or the complexity of the responses required.
 3. Aim to provide an outcome within 28 days, however this may take longer, and we will advise all parties concerned of the likely revised timescales.
 4. Conduct a fair, reasonable, and legally compliant investigation, ensuring that all relevant evidence is considered without bias. The investigation will be based around the following broad objectives:
 - To establish the facts relating to allegations / complaints to determine whether any irregularities have occurred
 - To identify the cause of the irregularities and those involved
 - To establish the scale of the irregularities and whether other qualifications may be affected
 - To evaluate any action already taken

- To determine whether remedial action is required to reduce the risk to current registered learners and to preserve the integrity of the qualification
 - To ascertain whether any action is required in respect of certificates already issued
 - To obtain clear evidence to support any sanctions to be applied, in accordance with our sanctions policy
 - To identify any adverse patterns or trends.
5. The investigation may involve a request for further information from relevant parties and/or interviews with those involved in the investigation. In any interviews carried out with the person accused of MMP, they can choose to be accompanied by a representative, this could be a colleague, parent, peer, trade union representative or third party.
 6. The Quality Manager will ensure that all material collected as part of the investigation is kept secure. All records and original documentation concerning a completed investigation that ultimately leads to sanctions will be retained for a period of no less than 5 years. If an investigation leads to invalidation of certificates, or criminal or civil prosecution, all records and original documentation related to the case will be retained until the case and any appeals have been heard and for five years thereafter.
 7. Learning4life-GY reserve the right to withhold a learner's, and/or cohorts, results for all qualifications and/or units they are studying at the time of the notification/ investigation.
 8. If appropriate, we may find that the complexity of the case or a lack of cooperation from the staff member or learner means that we are unable to complete an investigation. In such cases, we will consult with the relevant regulatory authority to determine how best to progress the matter.
 9. Where a member of Learning4life-GY staff is under investigation we may suspend them or move them to other duties until the investigation is complete.
 10. Throughout the investigation the Scrutiny Panel (Governing body) will work with the Quality Manager to oversee the work of the investigation team to ensure that due process is being followed, appropriate evidence has been gathered and reviewed and for liaising with and keeping informed relevant external parties.

Investigation report

If Learning4life-GY believe that there is sufficient evidence to implicate an individual in malpractice and/or maladministration we will:

- Inform them by writing of the allegation
- Inform them of the evidence we found to support our judgement
- Inform them that information in relation to the allegation and investigation may be, or has been, shared with the awarding body and other relevant bodies.
- Provide them with an opportunity to consider and respond to the allegation and our findings
- Inform them of the appeals policy should they wish to appeal against the decisions.

After an investigation, we will produce a draft report for the parties concerned to check for factual accuracy. Any subsequent amendments will be agreed between parties concerned and Learning4life-GY. The report will cover the following areas:

- Identify where the breach, if any, occurred
- Confirm the facts of the case (and any mitigating factors if relevant)
- Identify who is responsible for the breach (if any)
- Contain supporting evidence where appropriate (e.g. written statements)
- Confirm an appropriate level of remedial action to be applied

We will make the final report available to the regulatory authorities and other external agencies as required.

If it was an independent / third party that notified us of the suspected or actual case of malpractice and / or maladministration we may also inform them of the outcome, normally within 7 working days of making our decision. In doing so we may withhold some details if to disclose such information would breach a duty of confidentiality or any other legal duty.

If it is an internal investigation against a member of our staff the Directors will agree the report with the relevant internal managers and appropriate internal disciplinary procedures may be implemented. In some circumstances the police or other external authorities may need to be alerted.

Investigation Outcomes

If the investigation confirms that malpractice or maladministration has taken place, we will consider what action to take to:

- Minimise the risk to the integrity of certification now and in the future
- Maintain public confidence in the delivery and awarding of qualifications
- Discourage others from carrying out similar instances of malpractice or maladministration
- Ensure there has been no gain from compromising our standards.

The action we may take includes (this list is indicative only and is not meant to form an exhaustive list):

- Impose actions with specified deadlines to address the instance of malpractice / maladministration and to prevent it from reoccurring such as:
 - Undertaking additional / increased visits to the staff member to provide them with a greater level of support and / or monitoring depending on their needs and performance
 - Requiring specific Learning4life-gy personnel to undergo additional training and/or scrutiny if there are concerns about their ability to undertake their role in the delivery of qualifications effectively
 - Not permitting specific Learning4life-gy personnel to be involved in the delivery or assessment of qualifications (e.g. not permitting an individual to invigilate assessments)

- Altering the way, and the period in which, Learning4life-GY receives assessment materials if there are concerns around their ability to maintain the security and confidentiality of such materials
- Appointing independent invigilators to observe an assessment if there are concerns around the arrangements and/or Learning4life-GY is unable to resource particular assessments
- Appointing independent assessors to undertake assessments if there are concerns around the arrangements or resource level.
- Impose sanctions, these will be communicated in accordance with the Disciplinary Policy along with the rationale for the sanction(s) selected
- Take action against a learner in relation to proven instances of malpractice and/or maladministration such as some or all of the following:
 - Issuing a written warning that if the offence is repeated further action may be taken
 - Loss of all marks / credits for the related work/unit
 - Disqualification from the unit(s)/qualification
 - Placing a ban from taking any further qualifications with us (e.g. for a set period of time).
- In cases where certificates are deemed to be invalid, inform the regulatory authorities why they are invalid and any action to be taken for reassessment and / or for the withdrawal of the certificates. We will also let the affected learners know the action we are taking and that their original certificates are invalid and ask where possible to return the invalid certificates. We will also amend our database so that duplicates of the invalid certificates cannot be issued to show that the original awards are invalid
- Implementing disciplinary or dismissal procedures against staff if they have been found to be responsible / involved in the malpractice and/or maladministration
- Amend aspects of our qualification development, delivery and awarding arrangements and if required assessment and / or monitoring arrangements and associated guidance to prevent the issue from reoccurring
- Inform relevant third parties of our findings in case they need to take relevant action
- Carry out additional, related investigations if we suspect the issue may be more widespread

In proven cases of malpractice and / or maladministration, Learning4life-GY reserves the right to charge the learner for any resits and reissuing of certificates and / or additional quality assurance activities / monitoring visits. The fees for which will be the current awarding body prices for such activities at the time of the investigation.

In addition to the above, the Quality Manager will record any lessons learnt from the investigation and pass these onto relevant internal colleagues to help prevent the same instance of malpractice and / or maladministration from reoccurring.

If the relevant party(ies) wishes to appeal against our decision to impose sanctions, please refer to our Appeals Policy.

AI Misuse

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?

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.

Learning4life-gy engagement with and discussion of AI

Learning4life-gy will ensure that the risks associated with AI misuse are addressed through the school's policies and procedures.

Teachers, assessors and other staff must discuss the use of AI in qualification assessments and agree their approach to managing students' use of AI. Starting on induction day, Learning4life-gy staff members will 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. Learning4life-gy will communicate with parents to make them aware of the risks and issues and ensure they support the school's approach.

Learning4life will:

1. 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.

2. Update the school'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.
3. Ensure that the malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students should reference appropriately (including websites).
4. 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).
5. 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).
6. Ensure that, where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, teachers and relevant staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access where this is prohibited.
7. 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.
8. 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).
9. 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.
10. Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice.
11. Ensure that teachers are aware they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work.

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 Learning4life-gy'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/examsoffice/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.

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.

Learning4life-gy 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 Learning4life-gy 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

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-inassessments---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:

1. Restricting access to online AI tools on Learning4life-gy devices and networks.
2. Ensure that access to online AI tools is restricted on Learning4life-gy devices used for exams.
3. Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders.

4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. Issuing tasks for Learning4life-gy-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 themselves, 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/aiwriting/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 Principal 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 Principal 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.

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.