

Centre Malpractice Policy: Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Exams and Assessments

1. Purpose

This policy defines acceptable and unacceptable uses of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in exams and assessments, safeguarding academic integrity and ensuring compliance with JCQ regulations and awarding body requirements.

2. Scope

This policy applies to:

- **Students** undertaking any assessment at the centre (internal or external).
 - **Staff** involved in teaching, assessing, quality assurance, invigilation, and administration.
 - **Visitors and contractors** engaged in assessment-related work on behalf of the centre.
-

3. Definition of AI

For the purposes of this policy, **AI** includes technologies that generate, transform, summarize, analyze, or support the creation of content, such as:

- **Generative AI** (e.g., large language models, image/audio/video generators).
 - **Assistive AI** (e.g., grammar/style tools, code assistants).
 - **Assessment AI** (e.g., automated marking, invigilation/proctoring analytics).
 - **Adaptive systems** that tailor content or difficulty based on user responses.
-

4. Permitted Use

- **Controlled Exams (invigilated, on-site or remote):**
AI **must not** be used unless explicitly permitted as a **reasonable adjustment** or specified by the awarding body. Any approved use must be recorded in the exam access arrangements and invigilation report.
- **Coursework / NEA / Internal Assessments / Portfolio Work:**
Limited AI support may be permitted **only** when all of the following are met:
 - The awarding body's specification allows it.

- The **nature and extent** of AI use is **fully declared**.
 - AI outputs are **not** presented as the student's own original ideas, analysis, or evaluation.
 - Sources and human-authored synthesis are clearly evidenced.
 - **Permitted examples (when allowed and declared):**
 - Idea brainstorming and planning prompts.
 - Language support (grammar, spelling, readability).
 - Summaries to **locate** sources (with human verification and proper referencing).
 - Code linting or syntax hints (where specifications allow), with commented attribution.
-

5. Risks Associated with AI Use

- **Plagiarism / Misrepresentation:** AI outputs may be reused, unattributed, or passed off as original.
 - **Hallucinations / Inaccuracy:** AI may produce fabricated citations or incorrect facts.
 - **Bias / Stereotyping:** Outputs may contain unfair bias or harmful assumptions.
 - **Over-reliance:** Erodes independent thinking, evaluation, and authentic skill demonstration.
 - **Data Protection:** Inputting personal or confidential data into third-party tools may breach GDPR/centre policies.
 - **Detection & Consequences:** Undeclared or prohibited use may be detected by markers, quality assurance, or analytics and treated as malpractice.
-

6. Declaration and Transparency

Students must complete the **AI Use Declaration** (see template) for any assessed work in which AI was used. Declarations must:

- Specify **which tools** were used and **how**.
- Distinguish between **assistive** use (e.g., grammar support) and **generative** content.

- Include **citations** or **appendices** for any directly incorporated AI outputs (screenshots or prompts/output excerpts where feasible).

Failure to declare AI use where it has occurred will be treated as **suspected malpractice**.

7. AI Misuse: Classification and Handling as Malpractice

7.1 Classification

AI misuse is classified under **Candidate Malpractice**, **Staff Malpractice**, or **Centre Maladministration** depending on who is responsible:

- **Candidate Malpractice (Students)**
 - **Unauthorised use during controlled conditions** (e.g., using AI in an exam without explicit permission).
 - **Presenting AI output as original work** (e.g., essays, code, images) without declaration or proper attribution.
 - **Fabricated references/citations** created or “hallucinated” by AI.
 - **Failure to declare** material AI assistance where the specification requires disclosure.
 - **Collusion via AI** (e.g., using a shared AI workspace to co-author individual assignments).
 - **Circumventing assessment intent** (e.g., using AI to produce critical analysis/evaluation that should be the student’s own).
- **Staff Malpractice**
 - **Improper assistance** (e.g., using AI to re-write a student’s work beyond permissible feedback).
 - **Inconsistent or undisclosed use of AI** in internal assessment design/marketing that compromises fairness.
 - **Inadequate authentication** of student work when AI risk is apparent.
- **Centre Maladministration**
 - **Lack of policy/controls** around AI when required by awarding bodies.
 - **Systemic failure** to inform learners and staff of rules, or to apply them consistently.

- **Failure to report** suspected cases as required by awarding bodies.

7.2 Severity Indicators

Sanctions are proportionate to severity and intent, considering:

- **Assessment conditions** (controlled vs. non-controlled).
- **Extent and impact** of AI-generated content on the assessed outcomes.
- **Intent** (deliberate deception vs. misunderstanding after guidance).
- **History** (repeat vs. first-time).
- **Mitigation** (prompt self-disclosure, cooperation, remedial learning).

7.3 Investigation Process

1. Initial Identification

- Triggered by marker concerns, similarity/forensics flags, inconsistent capability, AI detection indicators (treated as **clues**, not sole evidence), or invigilator reports.

2. Evidence Gathering

- Collect: drafts/versions, prompts and outputs (if available), system logs, access records, invigilation notes, and student statement.
- Consider viva voce/oral authentication or supervised redrafting where appropriate.

3. Notification & Safeguards

- Inform the candidate/staff member in writing of the suspicion, process, and right to be heard.
- Maintain confidentiality and impartiality; avoid prejudging AI detector results.

4. Panel Review

- Conducted by a designated malpractice lead and at least one independent member.
- Apply awarding body rules and centre policy consistently; document rationale.

5. Outcome & Sanctions

- Decide on classification (no case / academic offence / referral).

- Apply proportionate sanctions (see 7.4).
- Inform parties in writing; record centrally.

6. Reporting

- **Report to awarding body** without delay where required (especially controlled assessments, certification impacting work, or suspected staff/centre issues).
- Cooperate with any external investigation.

7. Appeals

- Provide written appeal routes and timelines in line with centre and awarding body procedures.

7.4 Indicative Sanctions (Candidates)

- **Low-level** (misunderstanding, minimal impact): Formal warning; resubmission under supervision; academic integrity training.
- **Moderate** (undeclared assistive use affecting outcomes): Mark penalty; disallowance of affected section/task; resit opportunity.
- **High** (unauthorised AI in exam; substantial AI-authored work): Disqualification from component/qualification; bar from future entries as per awarding body rules.

7.5 Staff/Centre Sanctions

- **Staff:** Retraining, formal warning, removal from assessment duties, referral to HR/awarding body.
- **Centre:** Action plan, enhanced monitoring, withdrawal of approval for specific components, or sanctions per awarding body.

7.6 Evidence Principles

- AI detection tools **may inform** but **do not constitute** sole evidence. Decisions must rest on a **holistic evidence base** (drafts, logs, interviews, comparison with known work, supervised re-performance).

8. Staff Responsibilities

- Teach and regularly **remind** learners about acceptable AI use and declaration requirements.

- Design assessments that **authenticate learning** (e.g., process marks, drafts, oral defences, in-class components).
 - Use proportionate checks (draft reviews, version history, targeted vivas).
 - Escalate concerns promptly via the centre’s malpractice lead.
-

9. Record-Keeping & Reporting

- Maintain secure records of investigations, evidence, decisions, and communications for the timeframe required by awarding bodies.
 - Report suspected malpractice to awarding organisations **as required** (especially post-authentication incidents), and retain all requested materials.
-

10. Compliance References

- JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (current year).
- JCQ Instructions for Conducting Examinations (ICE).
- JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures.
- Relevant Awarding Body Specifications and Malpractice Policies.
- Centre Data Protection and GDPR Policies.

Note: Where this policy and awarding body rules differ, **awarding body/JCQ requirements take precedence.**

AI Use Declaration Form (Student)

Student Name: _____

Candidate Number: _____

Qualification/Unit: _____

Teacher/Assessor: _____

Submission Date: _____

A. Tools Used (tick all that apply)

- Generative text AI (e.g., chatbot)
- Image/video/audio generation
- Code assistant
- Grammar/spell/style tool

Summarisation/search assistant

Other: _____

B. Purpose of Use (describe briefly)

- _____
- _____

C. Attribution & Sources

- I have cited and/or included an appendix with relevant AI prompts and key outputs where used: Yes No (explain) _____

D. Student Statement

I confirm that:

- AI was used only as described above and in line with the centre policy and the awarding body specification.
- AI-generated content has **not** been presented as my original analysis, evaluation, or final output where this is prohibited.
- All sources are acknowledged, and factual claims are verified by me.

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Malpractice Decision & Reporting Template (Internal Use)

- Case ID: _____ Date opened: _____
- Type: Candidate Staff Centre
- Assessment context: Controlled Non-controlled
- Summary of concern: _____
- Evidence list (drafts, logs, prompts/outputs, invigilation notes, viva notes):

-
- Panel members & date: _____
 - Finding: No case Academic offence Refer to awarding body
 - Sanction (if any) & rationale: _____
 - Candidate/staff notified on: _____ Appeal deadline: _____
 - Reported to awarding body (if applicable) on: _____

Optional Annex: Student Guidance (One-Page Summary)

- **Do:** Use AI to plan, check grammar, or brainstorm **if allowed**—and **declare** it.
- **Don't:** Paste AI content as your own; use AI in exams; trust AI citations without checking.
- **If unsure:** Ask your teacher/assessor **before** using AI