Joint Council for Qualifications CIC

REVISION ONE

AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications

For the attention of Heads of Centre, Teachers and Assessors

Effective from September 2026
Published on: September 2026
Revision one: November 2026

Produced on behalf of:

AQA Questions matter | CAMBRIDGE OCR | cea Rewarding Learning | City & Guilds | NCFE | Pearson | wjec cbac

©JCQ CIC 2026

Executive summary

As the use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools becomes more widespread, there is increased potential for AI misuse by students. It is important that centres continue to maintain and evolve the measures they have in place to prevent AI misuse and mitigate the associated risks. To maintain the integrity of assessments, it is essential that students submit their own independent work for assessment and that centres have robust arrangements in place to authenticate work or to identify potential malpractice. In cases where students are found to have breached the rules by using AI to produce work and then passing it off as their own, they will have committed malpractice, for which appropriate sanctions will be imposed.

This document highlights the regulations that apply in relation to AI use in assessments and provides guidance to help teachers and assessors in centres.

This document emphasises the following requirements:

- In accordance with paragraph 5.3(k) of the **JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres**, teachers and assessors must only accept work for qualification assessments which is the students' own;
- Students must be given the document *Information for Candidates: AI (Artificial Intelligence and Assessments)* before they start work on their non-examination assessment.
- Students who misuse AI to the extent that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice in accordance with JCQ regulations and could attract severe sanctions;
- Students and centre staff must be aware of the risks of students using AI, as well as the implications of using AI themselves in marking, and must be clear about what constitutes malpractice;
- Students must ensure 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 clearly identified and relevant sources acknowledged by the student. Students must understand that, if they are unable to demonstrate they have independently met the marking criteria, they 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);
- Centres must have robust procedures in place to ensure that work can be confidently authenticated;
- Where teachers, assessors or centre staff 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 document refers to AI tools and AI detection tools as they existed at the time of publication. The JCQ awarding organisations understand that AI tools and AI detection tools are quickly evolving, so are continuing to monitor developments in this area and will update this document 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.

Additional support materials for teachers and students are listed below and can be found on the JCQ website.

Malpractice – Joint Council for Qualifications

AI and Assessments: a quick guide for students

Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments: a summary for teachers

AI and Assessments: a teacher presentation for students

Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments: a presentation for teachers

Contents

1. Which assessments do the regulations and guidance apply to? 1

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

3. What is AI misuse by students? 4

4. Centre responsibilities 5

5. Acknowledging AI use 8

6. AI use and marking 10

7. Preventing AI misuse in assessments 11

8. Identifying misuse in assessments 13

9. Reporting 18

10. Awarding Organisation actions 19

Appendix A: AI misuse examples 20

Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work 23

Appendix C: Extracts from JCQ regulations and guidance relevant to use of AI 26

Key changes since last version

Section	Paragraph	Summary of change
	Executive Summary	Updated to reflect the increasing prevalence and sophistication of AI tools, strengthen references to authentication and malpractice prevention and to clarify that sanctions may apply where AI-generated work is presented as a student's own.
	Executive Summary	Added requirement that students must be provided with the *Information for Candidates: AI (Artificial Intelligence and Assessments)* document before commencing non-examination assessment work.
1	Which assessments do the regulations and guidance apply to?	Added guidance on the risks posed by concealed and wearable technology, including smart glasses, which could provide access to AI tools or other unauthorised resources during assessments.
2	What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments?	Expanded explanation of AI tools to reflect current technologies and their wider capabilities, including embedded AI within commonly used software and productivity tools.
2	What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments?	Added guidance on the limitations of AI-generated content, including inaccuracies, hallucinations, bias and invented sources.
2	What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments?	Added guidance on privacy and safeguarding considerations associated with the use of AI tools.
2	What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments?	Added examples of AI tools commonly available to students and clarified that references to products or services do not constitute endorsement by JCQ.
3	What is AI misuse by students?	Expanded examples of AI misuse to include the use of AI for planning, structuring, guidance, spelling, punctuation, grammar support and translation where not appropriately acknowledged.
3	What is AI misuse by students?	Strengthened guidance on acknowledging AI use and clarified that students must be able to demonstrate that submitted work remains their own independent work.

Section	Paragraph	Summary of change
4	Centre responsibilities	Strengthened requirements relating to centre malpractice policies and authentication arrangements, including annual review of relevant policies.
4	Centre responsibilities	Clarified that centre approaches to managing AI misuse should cover all qualifications that include non-examination assessments or coursework components.
4	Centre responsibilities	Expanded guidance on raising student awareness of the risks of AI misuse and the potential consequences of malpractice before assessment work begins.
4	Centre responsibilities	Added guidance on engaging parents/carers in supporting centre approaches to preventing AI misuse and raising awareness of associated risks.
4	Centre responsibilities	Strengthened expectations relating to staff understanding of AI technologies, AI detection tools and emerging student use of AI.
4	Centre responsibilities	Added requirement for centres to restrict access to online AI tools on devices being used for examinations where such access is not permitted.
4	Centre responsibilities	Added requirement for students undertaking non-examination assessments to be issued with the *Information for Candidates: AI (Artificial Intelligence and Assessments)* document.
4	Centre responsibilities	Added requirement for centres to have a process in place for handling suspected AI misuse before candidate authentication and submission of work.
5	Acknowledging AI use	Clarified that AI used for planning, structuring, guidance or supporting assessment production must be appropriately acknowledged.
5	Acknowledging AI use	Expanded guidance on evidencing AI use, including retention of prompts, AI-generated outputs and explanations of how AI has been used.
5	Acknowledging AI use	Added requirement to retain original versions of work where AI tools have directly modified student content.

Section	Paragraph	Summary of change
5	Acknowledging AI use	Updated examples of acceptable AI acknowledgements and references to reflect current AI tools and services.
6	AI Use and Marking	Section restructured to distinguish between marking student work where AI use has been acknowledged and the use of AI tools to support marking activities.
6	AI Use and Marking	Added guidance clarifying that students must not be rewarded for work generated by AI where this prevents them from independently demonstrating the knowledge, skills or understanding required by the assessment criteria.
6	AI Use and Marking	Added guidance requiring assessors to retain clear records where acknowledged AI use has influenced mark or grade decisions.
6	AI Use and Marking	Added guidance on the use of AI tools to support marking. Where their use is permitted by the centre, AI tools may support marking activities but must not be used as the sole marker. A human assessor must review the work in its entirety and remains responsible for the mark or grade awarded.
7	Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments	Clarified that centres must have subject-specific arrangements to prevent and identify AI misuse across qualifications containing coursework or non-examination assessments, including arrangements for private candidates.
7	Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments	Added guidance clarifying that concerns about suspected AI misuse identified prior to authentication should be managed through centre procedures and do not require referral to the awarding organisation.
7	Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments	Expanded recommended staff training to include practical experience of AI tools, understanding AI outputs, investigation of suspected misuse and awareness of AI capabilities and limitations.
7	Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments	Added guidance encouraging centres to provide dedicated student awareness sessions covering acceptable and unacceptable AI use, acknowledgement requirements and malpractice consequences.

Section	Paragraph	Summary of change
7	Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments	Added guidance on retaining evidence of the assessment production process, including drafts, plans, notes, version histories and other evidence demonstrating authenticity.
7	Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments	Added references to digital tools and platforms that can support authentication through version history and development tracking.
7	Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments	Added recommendations encouraging increased use of supervised work, structured discussions with students and other authenticity checks during assessment production.
7	Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments	Added guidance encouraging centres to design assignments and tasks that are topical, current and less susceptible to AI-generated responses where appropriate.
8	Identifying Misuse in Assessments	Significantly expanded guidance on identifying possible AI misuse through staff expertise, comparison with previous student work and ongoing monitoring of assessment production.
8	Identifying Misuse in Assessments	Added a new section on staff training, including practical exercises to improve understanding of AI-generated content and investigation techniques.
8	Identifying Misuse in Assessments	Added guidance on retaining and reviewing diagnostic samples of student work to support authenticity checks.
8	Identifying Misuse in Assessments	Added guidance on ongoing authenticity monitoring through supervised sessions, retention of intermediate versions and regular discussions with students.
8	Identifying Misuse in Assessments	Introduced a substantially expanded set of indicators that may suggest AI misuse, grouped into themes including style and voice, language and register, content and accuracy, localisation, provenance and performance anomalies.

Section	Paragraph	Summary of change
8	Identifying Misuse in Assessments	Added new guidance on prompt inference and output matching to support investigation of suspected AI misuse.
8	Identifying Misuse in Assessments	Expanded guidance on discussions with candidates where centre staff have concerns regarding authenticity.
8	Identifying Misuse in Assessments	Updated guidance on AI detection software, including revised examples of available tools and expanded explanation of their strengths and limitations.
8	Identifying Misuse in Assessments	Strengthened guidance emphasising that AI detection tools should only form part of a holistic assessment of authenticity and must not be relied upon in isolation.
8	Identifying Misuse in Assessments	Added guidance on stylometric tools that compare candidate work with a body of known writing to support authenticity investigations.
8	Identifying misuse in assessments	Added guidance on AI watermarking and metadata, including tools that may help identify AI-generated content and the limitations of relying on the presence or absence of embedded markers.
8	Identifying misuse in assessments	Expanded and repositioned guidance relating to private candidates, including the need for appropriate centre arrangements for the delivery and authentication of non-examination assessment or coursework.
9	Reporting	Clarified the distinction between concerns identified before and after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication. Added guidance on reporting confirmed or suspected malpractice using the JCQ/M1 form and on the steps centres must follow when gathering information, including informing the candidate of the allegation and evidence and allowing them to provide a statement.
10	Awarding Organisation Actions	References updated throughout the document to clarify the role of awarding organisations in investigating reported cases of malpractice and determining outcomes where appropriate.
Appendix A	AI Misuse Examples	Appendix updated and expanded to include additional examples of AI misuse across a range of qualifications and assessment contexts.

Section	Paragraph	Summary of change
Appendix B	Exemplification of AI Use in Marking Student Work	Updated the worked examples to align with the revised guidance on acknowledged AI use, independent achievement of the assessment criteria and the recording of marking decisions.
Appendix C	Additional guidance on identifying AI misuse in assessments	We have removed appendix C and are working on more dynamic ways to signpost to helpful resources.
Appendix C (Previously Appendix D)	Extracts from JCQ Regulations and Guidance Relevant to the Use of AI	Updated the extracts from relevant JCQ regulations and guidance to reflect current requirements relating to AI use, referencing and acknowledgement, retention of prompts and outputs, authentication, marking and malpractice reporting.

1. Which assessments do the regulations and guidance apply 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 will not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments, although, when a student is allowed to use a laptop or similar device for exams, care must be taken to ensure they have no access to AI tools (see paragraphs 14.20-14.27 of the *Instructions for conducting examinations* document. Centre staff must also remain vigilant to, and prohibit, the use of concealed or wearable technology (e.g. smart glasses/watches), which could enable access to AI tools or other unauthorised resources via wireless connection, such as Bluetooth (see paragraph 18.4(e) of the ***JCQ Instructions for conducting examinations*** document).

There are some assessments in which access to the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages. The majority of these assessments will be non-examination assessments (NEAs), coursework and internal assessments for General Qualifications (GQs) and Vocational and Technical Qualifications (VTQs).

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

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

AI use in this context refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments contributing to the award of qualifications.

When properly acknowledged and referenced, AI use is permitted, although students cannot be credited for any work they produce for assessment which is not their own, so the benefit to them of using AI is likely to be limited and they risk committing malpractice.

Generative AI tools are systems which generate new content such as text, images, audio, video, computer code, documents or other content in response to user prompts, questions, uploaded materials or spoken instructions (as opposed to non-generative, or traditional, AI tools, which generally analyse existing data but do not generate new content). Modern AI tools, including general-purpose chatbots and AI features embedded within everyday software, can perform a wide and rapidly expanding range of tasks and are increasingly able to work through multi-step tasks and act on a user's behalf with limited input. AI tools can complete tasks, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Answering subject-specific questions across the curriculum and showing step-by-step working
- Reasoning through multi-step problems and revising answers in response to follow-up questions
- Analysing, summarising, paraphrasing and restyling text
- Authoring extended writing to a specified length, structure, tone or assessment objective or performance level
- Reading uploaded materials, such as task briefs, mark schemes, source booklets or photographs of notes, and producing a tailored response
- Generating, explaining and debugging computer code
- Translating and transcribing in near real time
- Generating ideas, plans, outlines or research directions
- Holding spoken, real-time conversations, including coaching a student live while they work
- Acting 'agentically' by planning and carrying out extended tasks across multiple steps
- Operating from within everyday productivity tools, such as word processors, browsers and mobile devices, without being invoked by visiting a separate AI service

The use of AI tools may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments. One major risk is committing malpractice through AI misuse, for which serious sanctions can apply.

It is important that teachers and students are aware that the range of AI tools and their capabilities is expanding quickly and that there are limitations to their use. AI tools can produce answers that appear convincing, but are factually incorrect, out of date, biased or "hallucinated", i.e. false or fabricated sources and information. They may generate unsafe, offensive or age-inappropriate content, or guidance that would be harmful to act on.

Use of AI also raises important privacy and safeguarding considerations, as anything a student pastes or uploads may be processed on third-party servers and potentially used to train future models or used in ways that the student is not aware of. Any lists of certain suppliers of AI-related products in this document are for information purposes only and do not constitute an endorsement by JCQ. It is each centre's or individual's responsibility to investigate and verify any suppliers they use, including any terms and conditions which govern the sale or use of the supplier's products. Furthermore, the lists provided are not exhaustive.

Whilst new tools appear all the time, AI tools available include, but are not limited to:

- Multimodal chatbots (capable of multi-stage reasoning, producing text, images, documents etc.)
- ChatGPT (**https://chatgpt.com**)
- Claude (**https://claude.ai/**)
- Gemini (**https://gemini.google.com/**)
- Microsoft Copilot (**https://copilot.microsoft.com**)
- Perplexity (**https://www.perplexity.ai**)

Homework and subject-specific tools

- Brainly, Gauth, Photomath, Question AI, Quizlet, Socratic, Symbolab

AI embedded in everyday software

- Apple Intelligence, Google Workspace AI, Grammarly, Microsoft 365 Copilot

Images

- Adobe Firefly, DALL·E, Google Images, Midjourney, Stable Diffusion

Video

- Kling, Pika, Runway, Sora, Veo

3. What is AI misuse by students?

In accordance with paragraph 5.3(k) of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres* (**https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/**), students must submit work for assessments which is their own. This applies to both internal and private candidates.

Student work submitted for assessment must be in their own words and not copied or paraphrased from another source, such as an AI tool, and must reflect their own independent work. Students must demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding, as required for the qualification in question and set out in the qualification specification. This includes demonstrating their performance in relation to the assessment objectives for the subject relevant to the question/s or other tasks students have been set.

The requirements for students are set out in the documents:

- ***JCQ Information for candidates – Non-examination assessments***
- ***JCQ Information for candidate – Coursework assessments***
- ***JCQ Information for candidates AI (Artificial Intelligence and assessments)***

Although AI is increasingly used in the workplace, students must develop and demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding when completing qualification assessments, rather than relying on AI.

Students must be able to demonstrate the final submission is the product of their own independent work and critical 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 AI-generated content such 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 fully acknowledge use of AI tools, including when they have been used in the preparation and production of work, as a source of information, guidance, planning or to structure the work.
- Failing to appropriately acknowledge the use of AI tools for spelling, punctuation and grammar.
- Using translation tools to translate work initially produced in a different language into English.

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 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 may be found in 'Appendix A: AI misuse examples' at the end of this document.

4. Centre responsibilities

In accordance with paragraph 5.3(k) of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres* (**https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/ general-regulations/**), the head of centre is responsible for having arrangements in place to ensure that students' centre-assessed work is produced, authenticated and marked in accordance with the awarding bodies' instructions. This applies to all candidates, including private candidates.

This means that centres **must** have agreed policies and procedures relating to assessment in place which effectively monitor and check that the work a student submits for assessment is their own. Centres must ensure these also address the risks associated with AI misuse.

Other relevant regulations include:

- Paragraph 5.3(z) of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres* (**https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/**) requires centres to have a malpractice policy in place and available for inspection, covering AI use (what it is, when it may be used and how it should be acknowledged, the risks of using AI, what AI misuse is and how this will be treated as malpractice). Paragraph 3.3 of the *JCQ malpractice policies and procedures* requires that centres **must** take all reasonable steps to prevent malpractice. This policy **must** be reviewed annually by a member of the centre senior leadership team.
- Paragraph 5.3(z) of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres* (**https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/**) requires centres to have a written policy in place and available for inspection, regarding the management of non-examination assessments, including controlled assessments and coursework, which includes details of how candidates' work will be authenticated. This policy **must** be reviewed annually by a member of the centre senior leadership team.
- Section 7 of the *JCQ Instructions for conducting coursework*, section 6 of the ***JCQ Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (Vocational and Technical Qualifications)*** and paragraphs 4.1 and 4.6 and section 9 of the *JCQ Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments* explain the supervision and authentication requirements.

To ensure compliance with the regulations, teachers, assessors and other staff **must**:

- regularly review the use of AI in qualification assessments and agree with their approach to managing use of AI by students in their school, college or exam centre. Ensure this covers all qualifications offered by your centre which include NEA or coursework.
- ensure students (including private candidates) understand, before they start work on their qualification assessments, the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI and the possible serious consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment. In doing so, they may wish to use the JCQ support materials referenced in the Executive Summary.
- make students (including private candidates) aware, before they start work on their qualification assessments, of the centre's approach to plagiarism, AI misuse and the consequences of malpractice.
- consider how to best to gain the support of parents/carers on the centre's approach to preventing AI misuse in assessments, and to ensure they are aware of the risks and possible serious consequences for students when AI is misused.
- not accept, without further investigation, work which staff suspect has been produced from AI tools without proper acknowledgement or is otherwise plagiarised. Accepting such work encourages the spread of this practice and is likely to constitute staff malpractice, which can attract sanctions.

- and centres **must**:
    - Explain to students (including private candidates) before they start work on their qualification assessments, and as they produce their work, the importance of submitting work that is a result of their own independent efforts for assessments, and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice;
    - Regularly review the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy (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, how it should be acknowledged, how teachers will authenticate work, the steps to be taken if AI misuse is identified);
    - Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students must reference appropriately (including websites);
    - Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students must acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse (see the below section on 'Acknowledging AI use');
    - Ensure the malpractice policy, including the use of AI in assessments, is communicated appropriately to, and understood by relevant centre staff and students;
    - Ensure teachers and assessors are familiar with AI and AI detection tools, associated risks and how these tools are being used by learners, taking reasonable steps to keep this understanding up to date. AI tools, associated risks (see the 'What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments' and the 'What is AI misuse');
    - Where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, ensure that teachers and relevant centre staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access where this is prohibited;
    - Ensure access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices being used for exams;
    - Ensure that before each student starts work on their qualification assessments they are issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ *Information for Candidates* (**www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information- for-candidates-documents**) document; (Note: a new document *Information for Candidates AI (Artificial intelligence and assessments)* was published in October 2025. This new document **must** be issued to students undertaking non-examination assessment from September 2026.)
    - Reinforce to students the significance of their declaration where they confirm the work they submit is their own, the consequences of a false declaration and they have understood and followed the requirements for the subject;
    - Remind students that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice (see the 'Awarding Organisation actions' section below and the examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations in 'Appendix A: AI misuse examples' at the end of this document);
    - Ensure teachers are aware they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work (see 'AI use and marking' section below);
    - Ensure teachers and Heads of Department understand that they **must** authenticate and submit for assessment to the awarding organisation only work they are confident is the student's own;
    - Ensure arrangements are in place for all candidates' work to be authenticated by a member of centre staff. If work is to be authenticated by a third party, then they must ensure this arrangement has a third-party agreement in place, as outlined in paragraph 3.1 of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres;*

- Have a process in place for teaching staff to follow where misuse of AI is suspected before the student has signed the declaration form, as this does not need reporting to the awarding organisation and must be dealt with by the centre directly.

5. Acknowledging AI use

It is essential 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 also 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 must ensure they independently verify the AI-generated content and reference the sources they have used.

When students acknowledge their use of AI and explain clearly how they have used it, teachers and assessors can decide whether that use was appropriate in the context of the assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

It is important to note that not all use of AI tools produces output that is submitted as assessment content. Where a student has used AI to plan, structure or otherwise assist them in producing their content, they are expected to provide evidence of what AI outputs have been used in the production of submitted material (i.e. students will need to retain copies of the prompts they have given the AI tool and of what is has produced. See the excerpts from the *Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessment (vocational and technical qualifications)* below).

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information or guidance, student acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated. For example:

- GPT 5.5 (https://chatGPT.com) 01/07/2026
- Claude Opus 4.8 (Claude Desktop) 01/07/2026
- Grammarly (Microsoft Word) 01/07/2026

The student must retain a copy of the prompt(s) used and the AI-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. Where AI tools or agents modify student work directly, the student must also retain copies of the original work prior to any modification.

This **must** be included 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. If this is not submitted, but 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 must take action to assure themselves the work is the student's own. Where the teacher/assessor cannot assure themselves, they must follow their centre's internal procedures and the published guidance for assessment.

Further guidance is set out in the *JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments* document (see link below).

- *Instructions for conducting coursework* **Coursework assessments – 2026-2027 – Joint Council for Qualifications)**
- *The Information for Candidates documents* **Non-examination assessments 2026-2027 – Joint Council for Qualifications**
- ***Information for candidates AI (Artifical Intelligence and assessments)***

The JCQ guidance for teachers on referencing may be found in the following:

- *Plagiarism in Assessments* (**https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/**)

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

a) Students are reminded that referencing, poor acknowledgement, paraphrasing or copying sections of text **from any source** may constitute malpractice and could 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 are also reminded that, if they use AI and 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.

6. AI use and marking

Marking Student work where AI has been used and acknowledged

When marking student work in which AI use has been acknowledged and there are no concerns of AI misuse, the assessor must still ensure the student is not rewarded if they have used AI tools such that they have not independently met the marking criteria. Depending upon the marking criteria or grade descriptors being applied, the assessor may need to take into account the student's 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 may be found in 'Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work'.

Using AI to support the marking of student work

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 the work in its entirety and determine the mark it warrants using their own professional human judgment, regardless of the outcomes of an AI tool. The assessor remains responsible for the mark/grade awarded.

7. 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 information 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 the work they accept for assessment and mark is the student's own work. They are required to confirm this during the assessment process and, if they have doubts, must follow their centre's internal procedures and published guidance for assessment.

Centres must have mechanisms in place, as previously referenced in section 4, titled 'Centre Responsibilities', which include:

- the approach the centre will use to prevent and identify AI misuse in each of the subjects, incorporating coursework or non-examined assessment that it delivers, including the approach taken for any private candidates.
- the process to follow where there are concerns about AI misuse before the student's work is authenticated. In this situation, the centre is responsible for determining next steps and a teacher/assessor should not refer the work to the awarding organisation for a decision.

Those who work with the students on a regular basis and are familiar with their ability and standard of work are usually best-placed to make determinations about the misuse of AI, although the relevant awarding organisation is available to provide advice and guidance to help the centre where needed.

Centres may consider a range of actions to spread awareness of the requirements and prevent the misuse of AI:

- Provide staff training, including:
    - the centre's AI policy;
    - hands-on practice with AI tools (including agentic and multi-stage models) to build awareness of their capabilities, familiarity with AI-generated output, and experience of producing and critically reviewing AI-generated content;
    - how to investigate the potential use of AI where it is suspected;
- Run sessions for students, including private candidates, on the distinction between acceptable and unacceptable AI use, how to acknowledge AI use where it is permitted and the consequences of AI misuse.
- Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;
- Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and provide reminders;
- Allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be completed in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate all of each student's work with confidence;
- Ensure teachers have enough time to review NEA and coursework carefully and have conversations with students;
- Examine and retain intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure work is underway in a planned and timely manner and work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages; this could include work, drafts, plans and evidence of process (e.g., handwritten notes, version history);

- Use an environment for work production that tracks the progress of the work to help demonstrate authenticity and retains a viewable version history, such as Turnitin Clarity, Microsoft 365, Google Workspace for Education, Draftback;
- Introduce classroom activities that draw on the knowledge and understanding developed during the course so teachers can be confident that students have genuinely engaged with the material;
- Engage students, including private candidates, in short verbal discussions about their work at various stages of its production, to ascertain they understand it and it reflects their own independent work;
- 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.

8. Identifying misuse in assessments

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

Staff Training

JCQ recommends that centres provide staff with opportunities to become familiar with generative AI tools and to practise generating content with different AI models so they can better understand their capabilities and outputs.

This section has been revised.

Training sessions for centre staff might include:

- hands-on practice with a range of AI tools, including agentic and multi-stage models, to build awareness of their capabilities and outputs;
- tips on how to investigate the suspected use of AI in candidate work.

It may be useful to give teachers the opportunity to:

- repeat a prompt using the same model, comparing the outputs and similarities;
- run the same prompt through different models (for example, ChatGPT, Claude and Gemini), comparing the outputs across tools;
- use an awarding organisation task brief from a previous year, series, or sample assessment materials as the prompt, to see how AI performs against material candidates have produced for assessment.

Retention of a diagnostic sample of work and 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. Teachers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom or under supervised conditions. Where the work is made up of writing, it is possible to make note of the following characteristics:

- Spelling and punctuation
- Grammatical usage
- Writing style and tone
- Vocabulary
- Complexity and coherence
- General understanding and working level
- The mode of production (i.e. whether handwritten or word-processed)

Ongoing review

- Supervised sessions
- Keep intermediate versions
- Regular discussions

Potential indicators of AI misuse

Style and voice

- a change in language style, vocabulary or tone compared with the student's previous work, or within a single piece;
- an absence of the student's own voice, including personal examples, first-hand reflection or the characteristic quirks and errors seen in their classwork.

Language and register

- a default use of language or vocabulary which may not accord with the qualification level (though be aware AI tools may be instructed to employ different languages, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content);
- The inclusion of overused AI words and phrases, or excessive or overblown rhetorical framings;
- structural over-signposting, such as formulaic openers, the repetition of concluding statements or overarching essay structures within a single piece (often a sign of AI being prompted to extend its output beyond its usual length limits) or unusually uniform sentence length and rhythm;
- overly verbose or hyperbolic language that is not typical of the student;
- uniform paragraphs.

Content and accuracy

- responses that are polished but generic, lacking detail relating to a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected;
- an absence of local, topical or task-specific knowledge where this would be expected;
- strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive writing;
- references that cannot be found or verified, or quotations that cannot be traced to their stated source;
- a lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected;
- a lack of reference to, or incorrect references to, events, people or facts that have changed since the AI tool's training data was compiled;
- content, terminology, methods or framing that diverge from what has been taught on the course, for example drawing on a different educational tradition or qualification level from the one the student is being assessed against.

Localisation and default behaviours

- the default or inconsistent use of American spelling, currency, terminology or other localisations;
- the inadvertent inclusion of AI-generated warnings, disclaimers or provisos about the limits or hypothetical nature of the output;
- incorrect or inconsistent use of first- and third-person perspective where generated text has been left unaltered.

Format and provenance

- missing notes, plans or evidence of iterative development where these would normally be expected;
- version history showing a single large insertion of finished text rather than progressive drafting;

- document properties or timestamps inconsistent with the student's usual working pattern;
- mismatched formatting suggestive of copy-paste from an external source;
- unusual structural or textual similarities across the work of multiple candidates;
- the submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten.

Performance anomalies

- work significantly above the student's typical attainment level without clear progression or supporting evidence.

Prompt Inference and Output Matching

Although AI models generally do not typically generate identical responses when given the same prompt repeatedly, they often produce outputs with similar themes, structure and wording. If a centre suspects that a candidate has used AI without acknowledgement, it is possible to deduce the likely prompt the candidate might have entered. This enables comparison between the structure and wording of the AI-generated response and the candidate's submitted work.

In order to reverse-engineer the prompt used, consider:

- Prompting for information relating to a specific area of a task: "Summarise X in a neutral academic tone."
- Providing the specific instructions from a task: "Demonstrate that you understand what it means to be an entrepreneur by developing an action plan..."
- Asking for a complete response to a whole task document attached to the prompt (e.g. task.pdf).

Candidate discussion

If teachers are uncertain about whether AI was used in a candidate's work, they may want to speak directly with the candidate:

- Upon questioning, a candidate might show limited comprehension of the subject, struggle to explain important concepts, methods or conclusions when asked to elaborate.
- Teachers can also employ occlusion, or 'Cloze' tests by reading a partial sentence from the candidate's work and asking the candidate to complete it, or by prompting them to confirm which word comes next in a sentence.
- Teachers may also ask the candidate to talk them through the work, or how they approached producing it, including previous versions.

Automated detection

AI models generate content by predicting likely patterns in language based on the data they have been trained on, which can result in writing that appears more consistent or uniform than typical human writing. Several programs and services use this difference to analyse written content and determine whether it is statistically more like examples of AI-written or human-written text, for example:

This section has been revised.

- Pangram (**https://www.pangram.com/**)
- Copyleaks (**https://copyleaks.com/ai-content-detector**)
- Turnitin AI writing detection (**https://www.turnitin.com/solutions/topics/ai-writing/ai-detector/**)

These may be used as part of the evidence considered when authenticating student work. However, it should be noted that the above tools will give lower scores for AI-generated content which has been subsequently amended by students.

AI detection tools, including those listed above, employ a range of detection models which 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). As such, whilst these tools can indicate a likelihood of AI use, they can produce both false positives and false negatives.

The use of detection tools **must** form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of students' work; all available information must be considered when reviewing any malpractice concerns. Teachers are generally best placed to assess the authenticity of submitted work because they know their students and their usual standard of work.

The list of certain suppliers of AI-related products is for information purposes only and does not constitute endorsement by JCQ. It is each centre's responsibility to investigate and verify any suppliers they use, including the capacity and limitations of the supplier's product and any terms and conditions which govern the sale or use of the supplier's products. The list provided is not exhaustive.

Stylometric Tools

Rather than looking for AI use directly, stylometric tools compare a piece of work against a body of the student's known writing to assess whether the two share the same linguistic footprint. This makes them useful not only for AI-related concerns but also where it is suspected the student has asked someone else to produce the work for them.

Tools include:

- Turnitin Authorship
- StrikePlagiarism (author profile)
- Authentext

AI Watermarking and Metadata

Several providers embed watermarks and/or metadata, which can identify their content as being AI-generated. Tools to detect this embedded information include:

- OpenAI/ChatGPT - **https://openai.com/research/verify/** (images and audio)
- Google - **https://deepmind.google/models/synthid/** (images, audio, text and video)

Whilst these tools can be useful, not all providers embed such markers. The absence of a watermark or metadata is therefore not proof that AI tools have not been used.

Private candidates

Verifying the authenticity of work submitted by private candidates can be more challenging for centres, given they may not have a good understanding of the standard the student is currently working at. Before accepting entries from a private candidate for a subject that includes NEA or coursework, the centre must consider the steps they will take that will enable the teachers/assessors to ensure the work submitted for assessment is the student's own independent work. This may involve requiring the student to undertake some of the work under supervision, a review of the student's portfolio of evidence across a range of qualifications and a short discussion with the student regarding their work. Arrangements must be put in place either for work to be authenticated by a member of centre staff or, if work is to be authenticated by a third party, then a third-party agreement must be put in place, as outlined in paragraph 3.1 of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres*.

Private candidates must have arrangements in place with a centre to enter them for the qualification and oversee the delivery of their non-exam assessment or coursework before the candidate starts work on any NEA or coursework. This will enable the centre to put the appropriate arrangement in place for the delivery and authentication of the candidate's NEA or coursework.

Further guidance on authenticating student work can be found in the ***JCQ Instructions for conducting coursework.***

If AI misuse is suspected

If teachers suspect potential AI misuse at any stage during the production of the work they **must**:

a) Consider any necessary steps to investigate the potential misuse and gather evidence, which may include:

   i) Attempting to recreate the work, or a portion of it, with AI by inferring the prompt for comparison.

   ii) Conducting a face-to-face meeting with the student to test understanding and clarify the process followed.

   iii) Comparing the work with previous work and reviewing drafts.

b) Record the concerns clearly, including specific examples.

c) Refer the matter to your examinations officer or senior leader in line with your centre's malpractice policy.

9. Reporting

If a student has not signed the declaration of authentication, centres do not have to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation. Steps to resolve such incidents **must** be detailed in the centre malpractice/plagiarism policy. These steps **must** include:

- ensuring 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 is responsible for making sure that the centre has appropriate arrangements in place to ensure student work accepted for assessment is authentic.

If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed by the student, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation.

Candidate malpractice is reported to the awarding organisations using the JCQ/M1 form. When gathering information to submit to the awarding organisation, centres **must** ensure that they follow the steps set out in paragraph 5.33 in relation to the rights of the individual where malpractice is suspected. In cases of suspected AI misuse this includes:

- that the student is informed of the allegation against them;
- that they are made aware of all evidence that has been obtained during the investigation which supports the allegation; this should include allowing access to a copy of the work;
- allowing the student to produce a statement responding to the concerns to be submitted to the awarding organisation.

The full procedure for gathering information and reporting malpractice is detailed in the ***JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures.***

10. Awarding Organisation actions

The JCQ awarding organisations ensure 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 raised by or reported to an awarding organisation, full details of the allegation will usually be relayed to the centre. The relevant awarding organisation will liaise with the head of centre regarding the next steps of the investigation and how appropriate evidence will be obtained. The awarding organisation will then consider the case and, if necessary, impose a sanction in line with the sanctions given in the ***JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures***. The sanctions applied to a student committing plagiarism and making a false declaration of authenticity range from a warning regarding future conduct to disqualification and the student being barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time. A comprehensive list of student sanctions can be found in **https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/**

Examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations may 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 knowingly accept or fail to conduct appropriate checks on 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. The following have been chosen to give examples which cover a range of different contexts, including where centres have reported AI misuse concerns and where awarding organisation assessment personnel have identified potential issues. The fourth example highlights what can go wrong when word processors have not been correctly set up for examinations.

Plagiarism – AI misuse

Awarding organisation: AQA
Qualification: A level History NEA

A centre reported one of its teachers 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 levels and styles 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 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 the improvement of their own work and for the creation of entirely new content.

The centre reported both candidates to the awarding organisation and provided confirmation that the candidates had been issued all relevant 'information for candidates' documents and 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 organisation: 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 unacknowledged sections of AI-generated content. A further evaluation of the submission concluded 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* document, 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, as the result of the malpractice, the candidate should be disqualified from the qualification.

Awarding organisation: AQA
Qualification: GCSE Religious Studies

A candidate's word processed exam script was reported 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 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 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.

Following an investigation, it was found that 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 organisation 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.

Awarding organisation: Cambridge OCR
Qualification: A level Art and Design

A candidate was suspected of having AI-generated content from DeepL, an AI-powered translation tool, in their sketchbook for A level Art and Design. The Deputy Head of the centre explained that the candidate's approach involved researching in their own language and then translating all of this into English. The candidate admitted they used DeepL to translate source material into their sketchbook and were aware that this was not allowed for their assessment. By translating their work in this way, the candidate effectively called into question the overall authenticity of the work. From that point onward, it became unclear what ideas, knowledge and understanding presented were entirely their own.

The teacher reported that while reviewing the candidate's work, they identified several sections with writing inconsistencies. Through their own internal analysis, the centre estimated 98% of the content to be influenced by AI. The candidate explained that most of their academic materials were in their own language, which caused difficulties in their work. They assumed that DeepL would be a reliable and accurate translator for their needs. However, they were unaware that it utilised AI support. Despite checking DeepL's website, they did not realise the seriousness of using AI at the time and would have avoided translation software had they known. The centre stated that candidates were made fully aware of the rules and regulations around AI use leading up to the assessment.

The *JCQ Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessments* prohibit candidates from using the internet or other sources without acknowledgment. It is evident that the candidate breached the assessment regulations by not acknowledging and referencing the use of an AI-powered translation tool in their work. Furthermore, the candidate was aware of the implications, as the centre had, on multiple occasions, provided guidance on referencing and AI. Additionally, the candidate signed a declaration of authenticity form confirming that the work submitted was their own, which included that they had clearly referenced any sources and AI tools they had used. In view of the above and in accordance with the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures* document, the candidate was sanctioned with a loss of marks which resulted in zero marks being awarded for the component.

Awarding organisation: WJEC
Qualification: Level 3 Diploma in Criminology, Unit 3 controlled assessment

During a centre's internal moderation process and prior to work being submitted to WJEC moderation, an assessor/teacher at the centre suspected that part of the work presented was not entirely the candidate's own.

It was suspected by the assessor that certain assessment criteria within the work did not match the work produced within other assessment criteria produced by the candidate.

With this particular qualification, candidates are permitted to take a folder of general notes into the assessment based on prior research for an unseen assignment brief.

When comparing the assessment criteria of concern to the notes the candidate took into the assessment, it was found that the candidate had copied their notes word for word, and they were identified as being generated by AI. The candidate had not referenced the source as AI-generated and had not declared it.

On receipt of the candidate's work WJEC conducted further checks of the work via an AI detection tool, which provided evidence to confirm the centre's suspicion.

The checks of the candidate's full body of work did not detect any further AI-generated content elsewhere.

As part of the investigation, the candidate confirmed that they had used an AI tool for one section of their notes only, due to rushing to prepare their notes prior to the assessment taking place.

Following a careful review of the available evidence, WJEC determined that the candidate was in breach of the assessment requirements and JCQ *AI Use in Assessments* document, 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".

WJEC decided that as a result of the AI misuse being confined to one assessment criteria, the candidate received a penalty of loss of marks for a section. The impact of this resulted in the candidate not obtaining the overall qualification, as all assessment criteria for the unit must be met and a minimum number of marks must be achieved in each of the assessment criteria to gain the qualification.

Appendix B: Exemplification of AI use in marking student work

Introduction

The following are examples of how the JCQ *AI Use in Assessments* document relating to students using AI tools can be applied by teachers and assessors when students have not independently met the marking criteria, as per page 8 of this document: "b) Students are also reminded if they use AI they have not independently met the marking criteria, therefore they will not be rewarded."

The following list of examples is not exhaustive and is not intended to cover all potential scenarios. It is provided for guidance purposes only.

In the below examples, students have not independently met the marking criteria because of their over-reliance on AI tools.

Examples

Awarding organisation: 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 referenced and acknowledged 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 referenced and acknowledged. 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 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 organisation: 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 referenced and acknowledged within the work. In the work, the student has assessed the relationship with stakeholders of 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 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.	**D.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.

Appendix C: Extracts from JCQ regulations and guidance relevant to the use of AI

For ease of reference, this appendix draws together information from different JCQ documents relevant to preventing AI misuse. You do not need to read the full appendix nor does it represent any new information. The aim is to help you easily access applicable information in the extracts below. These explain the responsibilities of centre staff and candidates which are relevant to managing the use of AI.

Note that these are extracts only and do not reflect the full guidance and regulations, which can be accessed via the following links:

General Regulations for Approved Centres

Instructions for Conducting Examinations

Instructions for Conducting Coursework

Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessments (GCE & GCSE Specifications)

Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (Vocational and Technical Qualifications) – Joint Council for Qualifications

General Regulations for Approved Centres

Section	Content	Who is it for
5.3k	It is the responsibility of the Head of Centre to ensure that their centre: has in place arrangements to co-ordinate and standardise all marking of centre-assessed components and to ensure that candidates' centre-assessed work is produced, authenticated and marked, or assessed and quality assured in accordance with the awarding bodies' instructions. **This applies to both internal and private candidates.**	Centre staff
5.3x	It is the responsibility of the Head of Centre to ensure that their centre: has in place the following policies for inspection that **must** be reviewed and updated annually: • a malpractice policy which covers all qualifications delivered by the centre with reference to the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures. The policy **must** detail how candidates are informed and advised to avoid committing malpractice in examinations/assessments and how suspected malpractice issues should be escalated within the centre and reported to the relevant awarding body. It **must** also acknowledge the use of AI (e.g. what AI is, when it may be used and how it should be acknowledged, the risks of using AI, what AI misuse is and how this will be treated as malpractice); • a policy regarding the management of non-examination assessments, including controlled assessments and coursework, which includes details on how candidates' work will be authenticated with reference to the JCQ documents Instructions for conducting coursework and Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments. (For CCEA GCSE centres this would be a written controlled assessments policy.)	Centre staff
5.9e	The centre will: conduct all examinations/assessments governed by these regulations in accordance with the following JCQ documents: *Access Arrangements and Reasonable Adjustments, Instructions for conducting coursework, Instructions for conducting examinations, Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments*	Centre staff
5.11a	The centre will: take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice (which includes maladministration) before, during and after assessments have taken place	Centre staff

Instructions for Conducting Examinations		
Section	**Content**	**Who is it for**
14.25	A word processor: f. must be used to produce work under secure conditions, otherwise the candidate's script may not be accepted; g. must not be used to perform skills which are being assessed; h. must not give the candidate access to other applications such as a calculator (where prohibited in the examination), email, the internet, social media sites, spreadsheets; j. must not have any predictive text software or an automatic spelling and grammar check enabled unless the candidate has been permitted a scribe (a scribe cover sheet must be completed), or the awarding body's specification permits the use of automatic spell checking; m. must not include AI tools	Candidate and centre staff

Instructions for Conducting Coursework		
Section	**Content**	**Who is it for**
3.1	All coursework submitted for assessment **must** be the candidate's own work.	Candidate
5.1	In many subjects, candidates will use source material, including the internet and AI, when carrying out their coursework. However, candidates **must not** copy such material and claim it as their own work. Source material **must** be appropriately credited and referenced.	Candidate
5.2	If candidates use material from a source or generated from a source which is not their own work, they must indicate the particular part/element/phrase and state where it came from. Candidates must give detailed references even where they paraphrase the original material. A reference from a printed book or journal should show the name of the author, the year of publication and the page number. For example: (Morrison, 2000 p 29). For material taken from the internet, the reference should show the date when the material was taken and used and must show the precise web page, not simply the search engine used to locate it. This can be copied from the address line. For example: http://news.bbc. co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/october/28/newsid_2621000/2621915.stm downloaded 5 February 2027. Where AI has been used, the reference must show the name of the AI tool used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/ blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2027. Candidates should also acknowledge the sources used by the AI tool in generating the content. Where AI is used, candidates must retain a copy of the question(s)/prompt(s) used to generate the AI content as well as the AI-generated content itself 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 candidate's work for final assessment so that the teacher can review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. If this is not submitted and the teacher suspects the candidate has used AI tools, they will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for the next steps and assure themselves that the work is the candidate's own. Centres must also refer to the following JCQ documents which can be found on the JCQ website: *JCQ Malpractice, JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications, JCQ Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments A summary for teachers, JCQ AI and Assessments: A quick guide poster for students, JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments.*	Candidate

Instructions for Conducting Coursework		
Section	**Content**	**Who is it for**
6.1	Candidates must not: • submit work which is not their own; • make their work available to other candidates through any medium; • allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material; • assist other candidates to produce work; • use AI tools, books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution; • misuse AI (as defined in the JCQ document *AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications*); • submit work that has been word-processed by a third person without acknowledgement; • include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material. These prohibitions mean that candidates must not publicise their work by posting it on social media or by any other electronic means. They must be made aware of the JCQ document *Information for candidates – Social Media*: **https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents** Candidates are allowed to lend books or other resources to one another, provided these are not used as part of their own independently sourced material.	Candidate
6.2	If irregularities in coursework are discovered prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication (see paragraph 7.1), this should be dealt with under the centre's internal procedures and does not need to be reported to the awarding body. The only exceptions to this are where the offence relates to a breach of the conditions of the assessment, e.g. possession of notes, communication with other candidates or where the awarding body's confidential assessment material has been breached. In such a case, the breach must be reported to the awarding body. Details of any work which is not the candidate's own must be recorded on the authentication form supplied by the awarding body or in another appropriate place.	Centre staff
6.3	If irregularities in coursework are identified by a centre after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, the Head of Centre must submit full details of the case to the relevant awarding body immediately.	Centre staff
6.7	Heads of centre and appropriate senior leaders **must** ensure that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing coursework are aware of the potential for malpractice. Teaching staff must be reminded that failure to report allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself. Teaching staff **must**: • be vigilant in relation to candidate malpractice and be fully aware of the published regulations; • escalate and report any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice to the head of centre or directly to the awarding body, following the centre's whistleblowing procedures where relevant.	Centre staff

Instructions for Conducting Coursework		
Section	**Content**	**Who is it for**
7.1	Each candidate (candidate being defined as someone for whom an entry is in place for the unit or qualification) must sign a declaration when submitting their coursework to their teacher for final assessment. Electronic signatures are acceptable. This is to confirm that the work is their own and that any assistance given and/or sources used have been acknowledged. **Ensuring that they do so is the responsibility of the centre**. Centres **must** record marks of **'0'** (zero) if candidates cannot confirm the authenticity of work submitted for assessment. Teachers **must not** assess work which has not been properly authenticated. All work must be properly authenticated prior to submission to the awarding body. Centres **must** record a mark of **'0'** (zero) if the candidate cannot confirm the authenticity of work submitted for assessment.	Candidate and centre staff
7.2	Teachers **must** confirm that all of the work submitted for assessment was completed under the required conditions and that they are satisfied the work is solely that of the individual candidate concerned. If they are unable to do so, the work **must not** be accepted for assessment. All teachers **must** sign the declaration of authentication after the work has been completed. Electronic signatures are acceptable. Failure to sign the authentication statement may delay the processing of the candidate's results. **If, during the external moderation process, it is found that the work has not been properly authenticated, the awarding body will set the mark(s) awarded by the centre to '0' (zero).**	Centre staff
7.3	The teacher should be sufficiently aware of the candidate's standard and level of work to be able to identify if the coursework submitted appears to be beyond that candidate's ability.	Centre staff
7.4	In most centres, teachers are familiar with candidates' work through class and homework assignments. Where this is not the case, teachers should take steps to ensure they can confidently authenticate candidates' work. Examples of this could include candidates completing some work under direct supervision and/or regular discussions with teachers regarding their work.	Centre staff
7.5	In all cases, some direct supervision is necessary to ensure that the coursework submitted can be confidently authenticated as the candidate's own.	Centre staff
7.6	If teachers have reservations about signing the authentication statements, the following points of guidance should be followed: • if it is believed that a candidate has received additional assistance and this is acceptable within the guidelines for the relevant specification, the teacher should award a mark which represents the candidate's unaided achievement. The authentication statement **must** be signed and information given on the relevant form; • if the teacher is unable to sign the authentication statement of a particular candidate, then the candidate's work cannot be accepted for assessment. A mark of **'0'** (zero) **must** be submitted; • if malpractice is suspected, a member of the senior leadership team **must** be consulted about the procedure to be followed.	Centre staff

Instructions for Conducting Coursework		
Section	**Content**	**Who is it for**
8.1	When marking coursework, teachers **must** pay close attention to the requirements of the specification. Teachers should note that it is their responsibility to award marks for coursework in accordance with the marking criteria detailed in the awarding body's specification and subject-specific associated documents. Teachers **must** show clearly how the marks have been awarded in relation to these marking criteria. The centre's marks **must** reflect the relative attainment of all the candidates. Teachers **must not** use artificial intelligence as the sole means of marking candidates' work Teachers **must** review all the work in its entirety and determine the mark it warrants using their own professional judgement regardless of the outcomes of an AI tool. The teacher remains responsible for the mark/ grade awarded. This is subject to any further guidance published by the regulators.	Centre staff
Appendix 2 – Information for candidates – coursework assessments		
	You can demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of a subject by using information from sources or generated from sources which may include the internet and AI. Remember, though, information from these sources may be incorrect or biased. You **must** take care how you use this material - you **cannot** copy it and claim it as your own work. The regulations state that: 'the work which you submit for assessment **must** be your own'; Where AI has been used has been used, your reference must show the name of the AI tool used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai. com/blog/ chatgpt/), 25/01/2027. You should also acknowledge the sources used by the AI tool in generating the content. You must retain a copy of the question(s)/prompt(s) used to generate the AI content as well as the AI-generated content itself for reference and authentication purposes in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how you used it. This must be submitted with your work for final assessment so that your teacher can review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. **Don't be tempted to use any prepared or generated online solutions and try to pass them off as your own work – this is cheating**. Electronic tools used by awarding bodies can detect this sort of copying. Plagiarism involves taking someone else's words, thoughts, ideas or outputs and trying to pass them off as your own. **It is a form of cheating which is taken very seriously**.	Candidate
Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessments (GCE & GCSE Specifications)		
	How do the awarding bodies monitor the management of non-examination assessments in centres? Awarding bodies require each centre to have a non-examination assessment policy in place to: • cover procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessments; • define staff roles and responsibilities for non-examination assessments; • manage risks associated with non-examination assessments; • detail how candidates' work will be authenticated	Centre staff

Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessments (GCE & GCSE Specifications)		
Section	**Content**	**Who is it for**
4.1 Supervision	Centres must ensure that candidates understand what they need to do to comply with the regulations for non-examination assessments. This is outlined in the JCQ document *Information for candidates – non-examination assessments*: **http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents** Centres must ensure that candidates: • understand that information from all sources must be referenced, including the use of AI and the sources resulting in the AI-generated content; • receive guidance on setting out references and are made aware of the centre's policy on the use of AI; • are aware that they must not plagiarise other material, including AI-generated content. Where appropriate to the component being assessed, the following arrangements apply unless the awarding body's specification says otherwise. Invigilators and display of the JCQ Unauthorised items and JCQ Warning to candidates posters are not required. Candidates do not need to be directly supervised at all times. The use of resources, including the internet, is not tightly prescribed. Centres must always check the subject-specific requirements issued by the awarding body. The centre must ensure that: • there is sufficient supervision of every candidate to enable work to be authenticated; • the work an individual candidate submits for assessment is their own. Work may be completed outside of the centre without direct supervision, provided the centre is confident that the work produced is the candidate's own. Candidates may normally: • have unlimited access to electronic and printed resources; • use the internet without restriction; • work in groups. Where candidates work in groups, the teacher should keep a record of each candidate's contribution so that it is possible to attribute assessable outcomes to individual candidates (see section 4.5).	Centre staff

Section	Content	Who is it for
4.3 Resources	**What resources are allowed?** In many subjects, candidates will use source material, including the internet and AI tools, when researching and planning their tasks Candidates normally have unrestricted access to resources. However, candidates must not copy such material and claim it as their own work. Source material must be appropriately credited and referenced. Centres must refer to the JCQ document *AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications*: **http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice** as well as the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation published by the awarding bodies and the regulator. Some subjects require candidates to produce the work for assessment in formally supervised sessions. Unless the awarding body's specification says otherwise, for all formally supervised sessions: • the use of resources is always tightly prescribed and normally restricted to the candidate's preparatory notes; • access to the internet is not permitted; • candidates are not allowed to use their own computers or other electronic devices, e g mobile phones. **Are candidates allowed to introduce new resources between formally supervised sessions?** No. Candidates are not allowed to augment notes and resources between sessions. When work for assessment is produced over several sessions, the following material must be collected and stored securely at the end of each session (and not be accessible to candidates): • the work to be assessed; • preparatory work. Additional precautions need to be taken if the centre permits candidates to use computers to store work. This may involve collecting memory sticks for secure storage between sessions or restricting candidates' access to a specific area of the centre's IT network. **How should sources be acknowledged?** The work submitted for assessment must include references where appropriate. To facilitate this, each candidate should keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc. The record must include all the sources used, including books, websites, audio-visual resources and AI tools.	Candidate and centre staff

Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessments (GCE & GCSE Specifications)		
Section	**Content**	**Who is it for**
4.3 Resources (Continued)	If candidates use material from a source, or generated from a source which is not their own work, they must indicate the particular part, element or phrase and state where it came from. Candidates must give detailed references even where they paraphrase the original material. A reference from a printed book or journal should show the name of the author, the year of publication and the page number. For example: (Morrison, 2000 p 29). For material taken from the internet, the reference should show the date when the material was taken and used and must show the precise web page, not simply the search engine used to locate it. This can be copied from the address line. For example: http://news bbccouk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/october/28 newsid_2621000/2621915 stm downloaded 5 February 2027. Where AI has been used, the reference must show the name of the AI tool used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3 5 (https://openai com/blog/ chatgpt/), 25/01/2027. Candidates must also acknowledge the sources used by the AI tool in generating the content. Where AI is used, candidates must retain a copy of the question(s), prompt(s) used to generate the AI content and the AI-generated content itself 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 candidate's work for final assessment so that the teacher can review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used If this is not submitted and the teacher suspects the candidate has used AI tools, they will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for the next steps and assure themselves that the work is the candidate's own. Centres must also refer to the following JCQ documents, which can be found on the JCQ website: **https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/** *JCQ AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications* *JCQ Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments – A summary for teachers* *JCQ AI and Assessments: A quick guide poster for students JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments* Candidates must be familiar with the JCQ document *Information for candidates – non-examination assessments*: **http://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents**	Candidate and centre staff

Section	Content	Who is it for
4.6 Authentication procedures	**How is candidates' work authenticated?** Teachers must be sufficiently familiar with the candidate's general standard to judge whether the piece of work submitted is within their capabilities. All candidates must sign a declaration (see Appendix 4) to confirm that the work they submit for final assessment is their own unaided work. This must take place as soon as the candidate has completed the assessment. Teachers must sign a declaration of authentication after the work has been completed, confirming that: • the work is solely that of the candidate concerned; • the work was completed under the required conditions. Electronic signatures are acceptable. Typed names will be taken as being as binding as a handwritten signature. Signed candidate declarations must be kept on file until the deadline for requesting a review of results has passed or until any appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later. They may be subject to inspection by a JCQ Centre Inspector. What if the teacher has doubts about the authenticity of the work? If teachers cannot confirm that the work presented by a candidate is their own and has been completed, under the required conditions: • do not accept the candidate's work for assessment; • record a mark of **'0'** (zero) for internally-assessed work. If teachers are concerned that malpractice may have occurred or cannot authenticate the work for any other reason, they **must** inform a member of the senior leadership team (see section 9). If, during the external moderation process, it is found that the work has not been properly authenticated, the awarding body will take steps to determine the appropriate action, including potentially setting the mark(s) at **'0'** (zero).	Centre staff and candidate

Instructions for Conducting Coursework		
Section	**Content**	**Who is it for**
6.1 Marking and annotation	Teachers are responsible for marking work in accordance with the marking criteria detailed in the relevant specification and associated subject-specific documents. Teachers **must not** use AI as the sole or primary means of marking candidates' work. Teachers must review all the work in its entirety and determine the mark it warrants using their own professional judgement, regardless of the outcomes of an AI tool. The teacher remains responsible for the mark/grade awarded. This is subject to any further guidance published by the regulators.	Centre staff
9 Malpractice	A centre **must** take all reasonable steps to prevent malpractice, including the management and delivery of non-examination assessments. A malpractice policy must be in place which covers all qualifications delivered by the centre. The awarding body must be informed immediately of any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice. To prevent both candidate and centre malpractice, teachers **must** familiarise themselves with the JCQ document *Notice to Centres – Sharing NEA material and candidates' work*: **https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/coursework-nea/** For detailed guidance on dealing with suspected malpractice, centres should refer to the JCQ document *Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures*: **https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice** **Candidates must not:** • submit work which is not their own; • make their work available to other candidates through any medium; • allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material; • assist other candidates to produce work; • use books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution; • submit work that has been word processed by a third party without acknowledgement; • include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material. Candidates are allowed to lend books or other resources to one another, provided these are not used as part of their own independently sourced material. Candidates must not publicise their work, e g by posting it on social media. They must be made aware of the JCQ document *Information for candidates – Social Media*: **https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents** Heads of centre and senior leaders must ensure that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing work for assessment are aware of the potential for malpractice. Teaching staff **must** be reminded that failure to report allegations of malpractice, or suspected malpractice, constitutes malpractice in itself. **Teaching staff must**: • be vigilant in relation to candidate malpractice and be fully aware of the published regulations; • escalate and report any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice to the senior leadership team or directly to the awarding body.	Candidate and centre staff

Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessment (vocational and technical qualifications)		
Section	**Content**	**Who is it for**
3.1	All work submitted for assessment must be the candidate's own work.	Candidate
4.1	In many subjects, candidates may use source material, including the internet and AI tools, when completing their work. However, candidates must not copy such material and claim it as their own work.	Candidate
4.2	If candidates use material from a source or generated from a source which is not their own work, they must indicate the particular part/element/phrase and state where it came from. Candidates must give detailed references even where they paraphrase the original material. Where computer-generated content has been used (such as from an AI chatbot), the reference must show the name of the AI tool used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https:// openai.com/blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2027. Candidates should also reference the sources used by the AI tool in generating the content. Candidates 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 candidate's work for final assessment so that the teacher can review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. If this is not submitted and the teacher suspects the candidate has used AI tools, they will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for the next steps and assure themselves that the work is the candidate's own. Further guidance on how this can be done is set out in the JCQ document *Plagiarism in Assessments*. The document can be found on the JCQ website: **https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice**	Candidate
5.1	Candidates **must not**: • submit work which is not their own; • make their work available to other candidates through any medium; • allow other candidates to have access to their own independently sourced material; • assist other candidates to produce work; • use AI tools, books, the internet or other sources without acknowledgement or attribution; • misuse AI tools; • submit work that has been word processed by a third person without acknowledgement; • include inappropriate, offensive or obscene material. These prohibitions mean that candidates must not publicise their work by posting it on social media or by any other electronic means. They must be made aware of the JCQ document *Information for candidates – Social Media*: **https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents** Candidates are not prohibited from lending books or other resources to one another, provided these are not used as part of their own independently sourced material.	

Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessment (vocational and technical qualifications)		
Section	**Content**	**Who is it for**
5.2	If irregularities in coursework are discovered prior to the candidate signing the declaration of authentication, this should be dealt with under the centre's internal procedures and does not need to be reported to the awarding body. The only exceptions to this are where the offence relates to a breach of the conditions of the assessment, e.g. possession of notes, communication with other candidates or where the awarding body's confidential assessment material has been breached. In such a case, the suspected malpractice must be reported to the awarding body. Details of any work which is not the candidate's own must be recorded on the authentication form supplied by the awarding body or other appropriate place.	Centre staff
5.3	If irregularities in coursework are identified by a centre after the candidate has signed the declaration of authentication, the Head of Centre must submit full details of the case to the relevant awarding body immediately.	Centre staff
5.7	Heads of centre and appropriate senior leaders must ensure that those members of teaching staff involved in the direct supervision of candidates producing coursework are aware of the potential for malpractice. Teaching staff **must** be reminded that failure to report allegations of malpractice or suspected malpractice constitutes malpractice in itself. Teaching staff **must**: • be vigilant in relation to candidate malpractice and be fully aware of the published regulations; • escalate and report any alleged, suspected or actual incidents of malpractice to the head of centre or directly to the awarding body, following the centre's whistleblowing procedures where relevant.	Centre staff
6.1	It is the responsibility of the centre to ensure each candidate signs a declaration when submitting their work to their teacher for final assessment. This **must** take place as soon as the candidate has completed the assessment. Electronic signatures are acceptable. This is to confirm that the work is their own and that any assistance given and/or sources used have been acknowledged. Teachers **must not** assess work which has not been properly authenticated. All work **must** be properly authenticated prior to submission to the awarding body. Centres **must** record a mark of **'0'** (zero) if the candidate cannot confirm the authenticity of work submitted for assessment.	Centre staff and candidate
6.2	Teachers **must** confirm that all of the work submitted for assessment was completed under the required conditions and that they are satisfied the work is solely that of the individual candidate concerned. If they are unable to do so, the work **must not** be accepted for assessment. All teachers **must** sign the declaration of authentication after the work has been completed. Electronic signatures are acceptable. Failure to sign the authentication statement may delay the processing of the candidate's results.	Centre staff
6.4	Even if the awarding body's specification does not require direct supervision, teachers **must** take steps to ensure that candidates' work can be authenticated.	Centre staff
6.5	In most centres, teachers are familiar with candidates' work through class and homework assignments. Where this is not the case, teachers should take steps to ensure they can confidently authenticate candidates' work.	Centre staff

Section	Content	Who is it for
6.6	If teachers have reservations about signing the authentication statements, due to concerns regarding copying/plagiarism (including the use of AI tools) or collusion, the following points of guidance should be followed. **Minor concerns but within the guidelines of the awarding body's specification** • If it is believed that a candidate has received additional assistance and this is acceptable within the guidelines for the relevant specification, the teacher should award a mark which represents the candidate's unaided achievement. • The authentication statement must be signed and information given on the relevant form. **Some concerns which are not within the guidelines of the awarding body's specificatio**n • If it is believed that a candidate has received additional assistance that is not within the guidelines of the awarding body's specification (this may have been necessary to enable the candidate to progress), the work should either be omitted or no credit is given for the work. • The authentication statement must be signed and information given on the relevant form. **Major concerns which are not within the guidelines of the awarding body's specification** • If the teacher is unable to sign the authentication statement of a particular candidate, then the candidate's work cannot be accepted for assessment. A mark of **'0'** (zero) should be recorded for internally-assessed work. • If malpractice is suspected in any of the above scenarios, a member of the senior leadership team **must** be consulted about the procedure to be followed (see paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3).	Centre staff
7.1	When marking work, teachers **must** pay close attention to the requirements of the specification. Teachers should note that it is their responsibility to award marks in accordance with the marking/assessment criteria detailed in the awarding body's specification and associated subject-specific documents. Teachers **must** show clearly how the marks have been awarded in relation to the marking/assessment criteria. The centre's marks **must** reflect the relative attainment of all the candidates. Teachers **must not** use AI tools as the sole or primary means of marking candidates' work. Any use of AI should be complementary to the human marking process.	

Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessment (vocational and technical qualifications)		
Section	**Content**	**Who is it for**
Appendix 1	You can demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of a subject by using information from sources, or generated from sources, which may include the internet and AI tools. Remember, though, information from these sources may be incorrect or biased. You **must** take care how you use this material – you cannot copy it and claim it as your own work. Using information from published sources (including the internet) as the basis for your assignment is a good way to demonstrate your knowledge and understanding of a subject. You **must** take care how you use this material though – you cannot copy it and claim it as your own work. The regulations state that: '...the work which you submit for assessment **must** be your own'; 'you **must not** copy from someone else or allow another candidate to copy from you'. Where computer-generated content has been used (such as an AI chatbot), your reference **must** show the name of the AI tool used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2026. You should also reference the sources used by the AI tool in generating the content. You **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 you used it. This **must** be submitted with your work for final assessment so that your teacher can review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Plagiarism involves taking someone else's words, thoughts, ideas or outputs and trying to pass them off as your own. It could also include AI-produced material. Plagiarism is a form of cheating which is taken very seriously.	Candidate

Awarding organisation contacts

Centres and assessors can contact the relevant awarding organisation 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**

Cambridge OCR

Tel: 01223 553 998

Email: **support@ocr.org.uk**

Website: **www.ocr.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/customer-and-learner-support/contact-us/**

Pearson

Tel: 0845 618 0440

Webform: **https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/contact-us.html.html**

Website: **https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/home.html**

WJEC/CBAC

Tel: 02920 265 000

E-mail: **info@wjec.co.uk**

Website: **https://www.wjec.co.uk/home/about-us/useful-contacts/**