



The Sutton Academy

Controlled Assessment Policy

Now including JCQ 'AI' (Artificial Intelligence) Guidance

Status	Non-Statutory
Responsible Trustees' Committee	ALT
Date last approved by TB	Not Applicable
Responsible Person	Mr P Blakemore
To Review Date	November 2027
Last Amended Date	November 2025

Controlled Assessments

Outlining Staff Responsibilities

Academy Leadership Team

- Accountable for the safe and secure conduct of controlled assessments. Ensure assessments comply with JCQ guidelines and awarding bodies' subject-specific instructions.
- At the start of the academic year, begin coordinating with heads of department/subject to schedule controlled assessments. (It is advisable that controlled assessments be spread throughout the academic years of key stage 4).
- Map overall resource management requirements for the year. As part of this resolve:
 - clashes/ problems over the timing or operation of controlled assessments.
 - issues arising from the need for particular facilities (rooms, IT networks, time out of Academy etc.)
- Ensure that all staff involved have a calendar of events
- Create, publish and update an internal appeals policy for controlled assessments.

Faculty Leaders

- Propose the awarding body and specification for external examinations to Head teacher.
- Ensure that at least 40% of overall assessment (controlled and/or external assessment) is taken in the exam series in which the qualification is certificated, to satisfy the terminal assessment requirement in accordance with the awarding body specification.
- Standardise internally the marking of all teachers involved in assessing an internally assessed component.
- Ensure that individual teachers understand their responsibilities with regard to controlled assessment.
- Ensure that individual teachers understand the requirements of the awarding body's specification and are familiar with the relevant teachers' notes, and any other subject specific instructions.
- Where appropriate, develop new assessment tasks or contextualize sample awarding body assessment tasks to meet local circumstances, in line with awarding body specifications and control requirements.

Teaching Staff

- Understand and comply with the general guidelines contained in the JCQ publication *Instructions for conducting controlled assessments*.
- Understand and comply with the awarding body specification for conducting controlled assessments, including any subject-specific instructions, teachers' notes or additional information on the awarding body's website.
- Supply to the exams office details of all unit codes for controlled assessments.
- Obtain confidential materials/tasks set by awarding bodies in sufficient time to prepare for the assessment(s) and ensure that such materials are stored securely at all times.
- Supervise assessments (at the specified level of control). Undertake the tasks required under the regulations, only permitting assistance to students as the specification allows.
- Ensure that students and supervising teachers sign authentication forms on completion of an assessment.
- Mark internally assessed components using the mark schemes provided by the awarding body. Submit marks through the exams office to the awarding body when required, keeping a record of the marks awarded.
- Retain candidates' work securely between assessment sessions (if more than one).
- Post-completion, retain candidates' work securely until the closing date for enquiries about results. In the event that an enquiry is submitted, retain candidates work securely until the outcome of the enquiry and any subsequent appeal has been conveyed to the Centre.
- Ask the appropriate special educational needs coordinator (SENCO) for any assistance required for the administration and management of access arrangements.

Exams Office Staff

- Enter students for individual units, whether assessed by controlled assessment, external exam or on-screen test, before the deadline for final entries.
- Enter students' 'cash-in' codes for the terminal exam series.
- Where confidential materials are directly received by the exams office, to be responsible for receipt, safe storage and safe transmission, whether in CD or hard copy format.
- Download and distribute mark sheets for teaching staff to use, and collect and send mark sheets to awarding bodies before deadlines.

- On the few occasions where controlled assessment cannot be conducted in the classroom arrange suitable accommodation where controlled assessment can be carried out, at the direction of the senior leadership team.

Additional Educational Needs Coordinator

- Ensure access arrangements have been applied for.
- Work with teaching staff to ensure requirements for support staff are met.

GCSE Specifications - Controlled Assessments

Risk Management Policy

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff Responsible to ensure risks/issues do not occur
	Forward planning	Action	
Timetabling			
Assessment schedule clashes with other activities	Plan/establish priorities well ahead (e.g. start of academic year) for all subjects or lines of learning	Plan dates in consultation with Academy calendar – negotiate with other parties	FL / Exams Staff
Too many assessments close together across subjects or lines of learning	Plan assessments so they are spaced over the duration of the course	Space assessments to at least allow candidates some time between assessments	FL / Exams Staff
Accommodation			
Insufficient space in classrooms for candidates	Once group sizes are known at the start of the year, flag instances where regular classroom space may not be suitable to conduct controlled assessment	Use more than one classroom or multiple sittings where necessary	FL / Class Teacher
Insufficient facilities for all candidates	Careful planning ahead and booking of rooms / centre facilities		FL / Class Teacher

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff Responsible to ensure risks/issues do not occur
	Forward planning	Action	
Downloading awarding body set tasks			
IT system unavailable on day of assessment	Download tasks well ahead of scheduled assessment date in all cases	Book IT equipment well ahead and download tasks before scheduled date of assessment	FL / Class Teacher
Teaching staff/assessors unable to access task details	Test secure access rights ahead of schedule every year and every session	Ensure teaching staff/assessors have access rights for correct area of awarding body secure extranet sites ahead of time	FL / Class Teacher
Loss of task details in transmission	Download tasks well ahead of scheduled assessment date	Report loss to awarding body for replacement; download again	FL / Class Teacher
Absent candidates			
Candidates absent for all or part of assessment (various reasons)	Plan alternative session(s) for candidates		FL / Class Teacher
Candidates have a scheduling clash for exams or assessment (possibly offsite on consortium teaching)	Always consider candidate timetables well ahead and decide on priorities in advance to scheduling clashes	Check before booking the date; provide an alternative date, where necessary and consult awarding body procedures for dealing with timetabling clashes N.B. retakes of controlled assessment are limited	FL / Exams Staff

--	--	--	--

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff Responsible to ensure risks/issues do not occur
	Forward planning	Action	
Control levels for task taking			
Assessment is undertaken under incorrect level of control (time, resources, supervision and collaboration)	Ensure teaching staff/assessors know what level is applicable and understand what is involved. Provide training if required	Seek guidance from the awarding body	Class Teacher
Supervision			
Student study diary/plan not provided or completed*	Ensure teaching staff/assessors are aware of the need for study diary/plans to be completed early in course	Ensure candidates start, continue and complete study diary/plans that are signed after every session	Class Teacher
Teaching staff/assessors do not understand supervision of controlled assessment is their responsibility	Ensure teaching staff/assessors understand nature of controlled assessments and their role in supervision		FL / Class Teacher
Suitable supervisor has not been arranged for an assessment where teaching staff/assessors are not supervising	A suitable supervisor must be arranged for any controlled assessment where a teacher/assessor is not supervising, in		FL / Class Teacher

	line with the awarding body specification.		
--	--	--	--

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff Responsible to ensure risks/issues do not occur
	Forward planning	Action	
Task setting			
Teaching staff/assessors fail to correctly set tasks	Ensure teaching staff/assessors understand the task setting arrangements as defined in the awarding body specification**	Seek guidance from the awarding body	FL / Class Teacher
Assessments have not been moderated as required in the awarding body specification	Check specification and plan required moderation appropriately	Seek guidance from the awarding body	FL / Class Teacher
Security of materials			
Assessment tasks not kept secure before assessment	Ensure teaching staff understand importance of task security	Request/obtain different assessment tasks	FL
Candidates' work not kept secure during or after assessment	Define appropriate level of security, in line with awarding body requirements, for each department as necessary	Take materials to secure storage	FL / Class Teacher
Insufficient or insecure storage space	Look at provision for suitable storage early in the course	Find alternative spaces	FL / Class Teacher

** All tasks whether set by the awarding body or the centre/consortium must be developed in line with the requirements of the specification.

Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff Responsible to ensure risks/issues do not occur
	Forward planning	Action	
Deadlines			
Deadlines not met by candidates	Ensure all candidates are briefed on deadlines/penalties for not meeting them	Mark what candidates have produced by deadline and seek guidance from awarding body on further action.	FL / Class Teacher
Deadlines for marking and/or paperwork not met by teaching staff/ assessors	Ensure teaching staff/assessors are given clear deadlines (prior to awarding body ones) to complete marking/paperwork so the exams office can process and send off marks ahead of AB deadlines	Seek guidance from awarding body	FL / Class Teacher
Authentication			
Candidate fails to sign authentication form	Ensure all candidates have authentication forms to sign and attach to work when it is completed before handing in	Find candidate and ensure form is signed	FL / Class Teacher
Teaching staff/assessors fail to complete authentication forms or leave before completing authentication	Ensure teaching staff/assessors understand importance of authentication forms and the requirement of a signature	Return form to staff for signature. Ensure forms are signed as work is marked, not at end of season	FL / Class Teacher
Example risks and issues			
Example risks and issues	Possible remedial action		Staff Responsible to ensure risks/issues do not occur
	Forward planning	Action	

Marking			
Teaching staff/assessors interpret marking descriptions incorrectly	Ensure appropriate training and practicing of marking. Plan for sampling of marking during the practice phase.	Arrange for remarking. Consult awarding body specification for appropriate procedure	FL / Class Teacher
Centre does not run standardisation activity as required by the awarding body	Plan against the requirements for standardisation for the awarding body when and how this activity will be conducted.	Check with the awarding body whether a later standardisation event can be arranged.	FL / Class Teacher

What does this policy affect?

This policy affects the delivery of subjects of reformed GCE and GCSE qualifications which contain a component(s) of non-examination assessment.

“The regulator’s definition of an examination is very narrow and in effect any type of assessment that is not ‘externally set and taken by candidates at the same time under controlled conditions’ is classified as non-examination assessment (NEA). ‘NEA’ therefore includes, but is not limited to, internal assessment. Externally marked and /or externally set practical examinations taken at different times across centres are classified as ‘NEA’.”

Purpose of the policy

The purpose of this policy, as defined by JCQ, is to:

- cover procedures for planning and managing non-examination assessments.
- define staff roles and responsibilities with respect to non-examination assessments.
- manage risks associated with non-examination assessments.

What are non-examination assessments?

Non-examination assessments measure subject-specific knowledge and skills that cannot be tested by timed written papers.

There are three assessment stages and rules which apply to each stage. These rules often vary across subjects. The stages are:

- **Task Setting**
- **Task Taking**
- **Task Marking**

Key Responsibilities for non-examination assessments

Key responsibilities are outlined in the table below.

		Teacher	Faculty Leader	Examinations Officer
Task Setting		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Select tasks from a choice provided by the awarding body OR designs tasks where this is permitted by criteria set out within the subject specification.• Make candidates aware of the criteria used to assess their work		
Task Setting	Issuing of tasks		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Determine when set tasks are made available by the awarding body .• Identify date(s) when tasks should be taken by candidates.• Access set tasks in sufficient time to allow planning, resourcing an teaching and ensures that materials are stored securely at all times.• Ensure requirements for legacy specification tasks and new specification tasks are distinguished between.	

Task Setting	Supervision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where candidates may work in groups, keeps a record of each candidates contribution. • Ensure candidates understand and comply with the regulations in relevant JCQ documents information for candidates. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check the awarding body's subject-specification requirements ensuring candidates take tasks under the required conditions and supervision arrangements. • Ensure there is sufficient supervision to enable the work of a candidate to be authenticated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure candidates are aware of the JCQ documents information for Candidates - Non-Examination Assessment and information for Candidates - Social Media.
---------------------	--------------------	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure the work that an individual candidate submits for assessment is his/her own. 	
Task Setting	Advice and Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise candidates on relevant aspects before candidates begin working on a task. • When reviewing candidates' work, unless prohibited by the specification, provides oral and written advice at a general level to candidates. • Allow candidates to revise and re-draft work after advice has been given at a general level. • Record any assistance given beyond general advice and take it into account when marking the work or submit it to the external examiner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to the awarding body's specification to determine where word and time limits apply / are mandatory. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When work has been assessed, ensure candidates are not allowed to revise it. 		
Task Setting	Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure conditions for any formally supervised sessions are understood and followed by candidates. • Ensure candidates understand that they are not allowed to augment notes and resources between formally supervised sessions. • Ensure that where appropriate to include references, candidates keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to the awarding body's specification and / or associated documents to determine if candidates have restricted / unrestricted access to resources when planning and researching their tasks. • Ensure conditions for any formally supervised sessions are known and put in place 	

Task Setting	Collaboration and group work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unless stated otherwise in the awarding body's specification, and where appropriate, allow candidates to collaborate when carrying out research and preparatory work. • Ensure that it is possible to attribute assessable outcomes to individual candidates. • Ensure that where an assignment requires written work to be produced, each candidate must write up his or her own account of the assignment. • Assess the work of each candidate individually. 		
Task Taking	Authentication Procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where required by the awarding body's specification: • ensure candidates sign a declaration confirming the work they submit for final assessment is their own unaided work; • sign the teacher declaration of authentication confirming the requirements have been met. • Keep signed candidate declarations on file until the deadline for enquiries about results has passed or until any 		

		appeal, malpractice or other results enquiry has been completed, whichever is later.		
--	--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide signed candidate declarations where these may be requested by a JCQ Centre Inspector. • Where there may be doubt about the authenticity of the work of a candidate or if malpractice is suspected, follow the authentication procedure and malpractice information in the JCQ NEA instructions and inform the Exams Manager. 		
--	--	---	--	--

Task Taking	Presentation of work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruct candidates to present work as detailed in JCQ NEX instructions unless the awarding body's specification gives different subject specific instructions. • Instruct candidates to add their candidate number, centre 		
--------------------	-----------------------------	--	--	--

		number and the component code of the assessment as a header / footer on each page of their work.		
--	--	--	--	--

Task Taking

Keeping materials secure

- When work is being undertaken by candidates under formal supervision, ensure work is securely stored between sessions (if more than one session).
 - When work is submitted by candidates for final assessment, ensure work is securely stored.
 - Where candidates are producing artefacts (e.g. Art and Design, you must ensure work is stored in a classroom, studio or workshop which is locked or supervised from the end of one session to the start of the next
 - When work is submitted by candidates for final assessment, ensure work is securely stored.
 - Where candidates are producing artefacts (e.g. Art and Design, you must ensure work is stored in a classroom, studio or workshop which is locked or supervised from the end of one session to the start of the next.
 - Take sensible precautions when work is taken home for marking.
 - Remind candidates of the need to keep their own work secure at all times and not to share
- Store internally assessed work, including the sample returned after awarding body moderation, securely until the closing date for enquires about results or until the outcome of an enquiry or any subsequent appeal has been conveyed to the centre.
 - Liaise with the IT Manager to ensure that appropriate arrangements are in place to restrict access between sessions to candidates work where work is stored electronically.
 - Liaise with IT Manager to ensure that an effective back up strategy is employed that an up to date archive of candidates' evidence is maintained.

		<p>completed or partially completed work on-line, on social media or through any other means.</p> <p>.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Task Marking</p>	<p>Conduct of externally assessed work</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaise with the Exams Manager regarding arrangements for the conduct of any externally assessed non-examination components of a specification. • Liaise with the Visiting Examiner where this may be applicable to any externally assessed component. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arrange timetabling, rooming and invigilation where this is applicable to any externally assessed non-examination component of a specification. • Conduct the externally assessed component within the window specified by the awarding body. • Conduct the externally assessed component according to the JCQ publication Instructions for conducting examinations.
<p>Task Marking</p>	<p>Submission of work</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the attendance register to a Visiting Examiner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the attendance register to the Head of Subject where the component may be assessed by a Visiting Examiner. • Ensure the awarding body's attendance register for any externally assessed component is completed. Correctly to show candidates who are present and any who may be absent • Where candidates' work must be despatched to an awarding body's examiner, ensure the completed attendance register accompanies the work. • Keep a copy of the attendance register until after the deadline for

				<p>enquires about results for the exam series.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Package the work as required by the awarding body and attach the examiner address label. • Despatch the work to the awarding body's instructions by the required deadline.
Task Marking	Marking and annotation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark candidates' work in accordance with the marking criteria provided by the awarding body. • Annotate candidates' work as required to facilitate internal standardisation of marking and enable external moderation to check that marking is in line with the assessment criteria. • Inform candidates of their marks which could be subject to change by the awarding body moderation process. 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure candidates are informed in a timely manner to enable an internal appeal to be submitted by a candidate and the outcome known before final marks are submitted to the awarding body. 		

Task Marking	Internal Standardisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicate on work (or cover sheet) the date of marking. • Mark to common standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that internal standardisation of marks across assessors and teaching groups takes place as required and to sequence. Liaise with Quality Assurance (QA) Lead / Lead Internal Verifier as appropriate. 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure candidates are informed in a timely manner to enable an internal appeal to be submitted by a candidate and the outcome known before final marks are submitted to the awarding body. 		
Task Marking	Internal Standardisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicate on work (or cover sheet) the date of marking. • Mark to common standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that internal standardisation of marks across assessors and teaching groups takes place as required and to sequence. Liaise with Quality Assurance (QA) Lead / Lead Internal Verifier as appropriate. 	

Task Marking

Submission of marks and work for moderation

- Input and submit marks online via the awarding body secure extranet site, keeping a record of the marks awarded to the external deadline.
- Where the online mark system is not available, provide marks to the Exams Manager by the internal deadline.
- Where responsible for marks input, ensure checks are made that marks for any additional candidates are submitted and ensure mark input is checked before submission to avoid transcription errors.
- Liaise with Exams Manager to obtain a possible extension to the deadline should extenuating circumstances arise.
- Submit the requested sample of candidates' work to the Exams Team by the internal deadline, keeping a record of the work submitted.
- Ensure the moderator is provided with authentication of candidates' work, confirmation that internal standardisation has been undertaken and any other

- Contact the relevant Awarding Body to request an extension to the external deadline where necessary.
- Where responsible for marks input, ensure checks are made that marks for any additional candidates are submitted and ensure mark input is checked before submission to avoid transcription errors.
- Submit the requested samples of candidates' work to the moderator by the awarding body deadline and record this information on the tracking log spreadsheet.
- Ensures that for portal moderation:
 - work is dispatched by the awarding body.
 - moderator label(s) provided by the awarding body are affixed to the packaging
 - proof of dispatch is obtained and kept on file until the successful issue of final results

			subject-specific information where this may be required.	
--	--	--	---	--

Task Marking	Storage and retention of work		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep a record of names and candidate numbers whose work was included in the moderation sample. • Retain all marked candidate' work (including any sample returned after moderation) under secure conditions until after the deadline for enquiries about results or until any appeal, malpractice of other results enquiry has been completed. • Take steps to protect any work stored electronically from corruption and have a back-up procedure in place. • Retain evidence of work where retention may be a problem (e.g. photos, audio or video recordings). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure any sample returned after moderation is logged and returned to the Head of Subject for secure storage and required retention.
Task Marking	External moderation - feedback		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check moderator reports and ensure that any remedial action, if necessary, is undertaken before the next examination series. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribute moderator to Heads of Department. • Take remedial action where feedback may relate to centre administration.

<p>Task Marking</p>	<p>Special consideration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand that a candidate may be eligible for special consideration in assessments in certain situations where a candidate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is absent • produces a reduced quantity of work; • work has been lost • Liaise with the Exams Manager when special consideration may need to be applied for. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to the JCQ publication A Guide to the special consideration process. • Where a candidate is eligible, submit an application for special consideration via the awarding body's secure extranet site by the deadline. • Where applicable for special consideration via the awarding body's secure extranet site is not applicable, submit the required form to the awarding body by the deadline. • Keep required evidence on file to support the application.
<p>Task Marking</p>	<p>Malpractice</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aware of the JCQ Notice to Centres - Teaching sharing assessment material and candidates' work. • Ensure candidates understand the JCQ document information for candidates - non - examination assessments. • Ensure candidates understand the JCQ document information for candidates - social media. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gathers initial facts about the issue and inform CMT. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue an electronic copy of the JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments 32017-18 to the Head of Centre. • Issue the JCQ Notice to Centres - Teachers sharing assessment material and candidates' work to Heads of Department. • Issue copies of the relevant JCQ information for candidates documents to students. • Where required, support the Head

				of Centre in investigating and reporting incidents of suspected malpractice.
Task Marking	Enquires about results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide advice and guidance to candidates on their results. • Support the Exams Manager in collecting candidate consent where required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide relevant support to subject tutors making decisions about enquiries and results. • Provide the Exams Manager with the original sample or relevant sample of candidates' work for an enquiry about results by the internal deadline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be aware of the individual post-results services available for externally assessed and internally assessed components of non-examination assessments as detailed in the JCQ publication Post Results Services, information and guidance for centres. • Provide post-results services information on relevant staff and candidates. • Ensure any requests for post-results services that are available to non-examination assessments are submitted online via the awarding body secure extranet site by the deadline. • Collect candidate consent where required.

The following also have roles in the operation of non-examination assessment.

Head of Centre

- Ensure that the centre's non-examination assessment policy is fit for purpose.
- Ensure that any alleged, suspected or actual incident of malpractice is fully investigated, following procedures in the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments 2017-18.
- Ensure the centre's internal appeals procedures clearly detail the procedure to be followed by candidates (or their parents/carers) appealing against internally assessed marks.

Senior Leaders

- Ensure the correct conduct of non-examination assessments which comply with JCQ NEA instructions and awarding body subject-specific instructions.
- Ensure the college calendar records assessment schedules by the start of the academic year if appropriate.

Quality Assurance (QA) Lead / Lead Internal Verifier

- Confirm with Heads of Department that appropriate awarding body forms and templates for non-examination assessments are used by subject tutors and candidates.
- Ensure appropriate procedures are in place to internally standardise / verify the marks awarded by subject tutors in line with awarding body criteria.
- Ensure appropriate centre-devised templates are provided to capture / record relevant information given to candidates by subject tutors.
- Ensure appropriate centre-devised templates are provided to capture / record relevant information is received and understood by candidates.
- Where not provided by the awarding body, ensure a centre-devised template is provided for candidates to keep a detailed record of their own research, planning, resources etc.

Practical Skills Endorsement for the A Level Sciences designed for use in England

Head of Centre

- Provide a signed declaration as part of the National Centre Number Register Annual Update, that all reasonable steps have been or will be taken to ensure that all candidates at the centre have had, or will have, the opportunity to undertake the prescribed practical activities.

Head of Department

- Confirm understanding of the Practical Skills Endorsement for the A Level Sciences designed for use in England which can be found in the JCQ document Instructions for Conducting Non-Examination Assessments 2017-18.
- Undertake training provided by the awarding body on the implementation of the practical endorsement.
- Disseminate information to Subject Tutors ensuring the standards can be applied appropriately.
- Liaise with all relevant parties in relation to arrangements for and conduct of the monitoring visit.
- Inform the Exams Manager to apply for an exemption where a candidate cannot access the practical endorsement due to a substantial impairment.

Subject Tutor

- Ensure all the requirements in relation to the endorsement are known and understood.
- Ensure the required arrangements for practical activities are in place.
- Provide all the required centre records.
- Ensure candidates provide the required records.
- Provide any required information to the Head of Department regarding the monitoring visit.
- Assess candidates using Common Practical Assessment Criteria (CPAC).
- Follow the awarding body's instructions for the submission of candidates Pass or Not Classified assessment outcome.

Exams Manager

- Follow the awarding body's instructions for the submission of candidates Pass or Not Classified assessment.

Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language specifications designed for use in England

Head of Centre

- Provide a signed declaration as part of the National Centre Number Register Annual Update, that all reasonable steps have been or will be taken to ensure that all candidates at the centre have had, or will have, the opportunity to undertake the Spoken Language endorsement.

Lead Internal Verifier

- Ensure the appropriate arrangements are in place for internal standardisation of assessments.

Head of Department

- Confirm understanding of the Spoken Language Endorsement for GCSE English Language specifications designed for use in England.
- Ensure the required task setting and task taking instructions are followed by Subject Tutors.
- Ensure Subject Tutors assess candidates, either live or from recordings, using the common assessment criteria.
- Ensure for monitoring purposes, audio-visual recordings of the presentations of a sample of candidates are provided.

Subject Tutor

- Ensure all the requirements in relation to the endorsement are known and understood.
- Follow the required task setting and task taking instructions.
- Assess candidates, either live or from recordings, using the common assessment criteria.
- Provide audio-visual recordings of the presentations of a sample of candidates for monitoring purposes.
- Follow the awarding body's instructions for the submission of grades (Pass, Merit, Distinction or Not Classified) and the storage and submission of recordings.

Exams Manager

- Follow the awarding body's instructions for the submission of grades and the storage and submission of recordings.

Management of issues and potential risks associated with non-examination assessments

Issue/Risk	Centre actions to manage issue / mitigate risk	Action by
Task setting		
Awarding body set task: IT failure / corruption of task details where set task details accessed from the awarding body online	<p><i>Awarding body key date for accessing / downloading set task noted prior to start of course.</i></p> <p><i>IT systems checked prior to key date.</i></p> <p><i>Alternative IT system used to gain access.</i></p> <p><i>Awarding body contacted to request direct email of task details.</i></p>	ICT Support PBE LWN
Centre set task: Subject Tutor fails to meet the assessment criteria as detailed in the specification	<p><i>Ensure that subject tutors access awarding body training information, practice materials etc.</i></p> <p><i>Sample assessment criteria in the centre set task</i></p>	PBE
Candidates do not understand the marking criteria and what they need to do to gain credit	<p><i>A simplified version of the awarding body's marking criteria described in the specification that is not specific to the work of an individual candidate or group of candidates is produced for candidates and checks made to ensure that they understand the criteria.</i></p>	PBE Subject Tutor
Subject teacher long term absence during the task setting stage	<p><i>See centre's exam contingency plan - Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle.</i></p>	
Issuing of tasks		

Task for legacy specification given to candidates undertaking new specification	<i>Ensure Heads of Department take care to distinguish between requirements / tasks for legacy specifications and requirements / tasks for new specifications. Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved.</i>	PBE LWN
Awarding body set task not issued to candidates on time	<i>Awarding body key date for accessing set task as detailed in the specification noted prior to start of course. Course information issued to candidates contains details when set task will be issued and needs to be completed by. Set task accessed well in advance to allow time for planning, resourcing and teaching.</i>	PBE Subject Tutor
The wrong task is given to candidates	<i>Ensure course planning and information taken from the awarding body's specification confirms the correct task will be issued to candidates. Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved.</i>	PBE LWN
Subject teacher long term absence during the issuing of tasks stage	<i>See centre's exam contingency plan - Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle.</i>	
Task taking		
Supervision		
Planned assessments clash with other centre or candidate activities	<i>Assessment plan identified for the start of the course. Assessment dates / periods included in centre wide calendar.</i>	PBE LWN

Rooms or facilities inadequate for candidates to take tasks under appropriate supervision	<i>Timetabling organised to allocate appropriate rooms and IT facilities for the start of the course. Staggered sessions arranged where IT facilities insufficient for number of candidates. Appropriate rooming organised for written based tasks.</i>	PBE & LWN
Insufficient supervision of candidates to enable work to be authenticated	<i>Ensure subject tutors receive a copy of the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments. Ensure subject tutors are aware of any other specific instructions detailed in the awarding body's specification in relation to the supervision of candidates. Confirm subject tutors understand their role and responsibilities as detailed in the centre's non-examination assessment policy.</i>	PBE & LWN
A candidate is suspected of malpractice prior to submitting their work for assessment	<i>Instructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (chapter 9 Malpractice) are followed.</i>	PBE & LWN

	<i>An internal investigation and where appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are followed.</i>	
Access arrangements were not put in place for an assessment where a candidate is approved for arrangements	<i>Special consideration for the candidate is to be applied for following the JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process.</i>	PBE & LWN

Advice and feedback		
Candidate claims appropriate or no advice and feedback not given by subject tutor prior to starting on their work	<i>Departments to have a process is in place for subject tutors to record information provided to candidates before work begins as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures. Regular monitoring of subject teacher completed records and sign-off to confirm monitoring activity Full records kept detailing all information and advice given to candidates prior to starting on their work as appropriate to the subject and component</i>	PBE
A third party claims that assistance was given to candidates by the subject tutor over and above that allowed in the regulations and specification	<i>An investigation is conducted; candidates and subject tutor are interviewed and statements recorded where relevant. Where appropriate, a suspected malpractice report is submitted to the awarding body</i>	PBE Head of Centre
Candidate does not reference information from published source or does not set out references as required.	<i>Candidate is advised at a general level to reference information before work is submitted for formal assessment. Candidate is again referred to the JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments. Candidate's detailed record of his / her own research, planning, resources etc. is regularly checked to ensure continued completion</i>	Subject Tutor
Candidate joins the course late after formally supervised task taking has started	<i>A separate supervised session(s) is arranged for the candidate to catch up as appropriate.</i>	Subject Tutor
Candidate moves to another centre during the course	<i>Awarding body guidance is sought to determine what can be done depending on the stage at which the move takes place</i>	PBE & LWN

An excluded pupil wants to complete his / her non examination assessment(s)	<i>The awarding body specification is checked to determine if the specification is available to a candidate outside mainstream education. If so, arrangements for supervision, authentication and marking are made separately for the candidate.</i>	PBE & LWN
Resources		
A candidate augments notes and resources between formally supervised sessions	<i>Preparatory notes and the work to be assessed are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions. Where memory sticks are used by candidates, these are collected in and kept secure between formally supervised sessions Where work is stored on the centre's network, access for candidates is restricted between formally supervised sessions</i>	Subject Tutor
A candidate fails to acknowledge sources on work that is submitted for assessment	<i>Candidate's detailed record of his / her own research, planning, resources etc. is checked to confirm all the sources used, including books, websites and audio/visual resources. Awarding body guidance is sought on whether the work of the candidate should be marked where candidate's detailed records acknowledges sources appropriately. Where confirmation is unavailable from candidate's records, awarding body guidance is sought and / or a mark of zero is submitted to the awarding body for the candidate</i>	Subject Tutor PBE & LWN Head of Department / PBE & LWN

Word and time limits		
A candidate is penalised by the awarding body for exceeding word or time limits	<i>Where limits are for guidance only, candidates are discouraged from exceeding them. Penalties are explained in advance to the student.</i>	Subject Tutor
Collaboration and group work		
Candidates have worked in groups where the awarding body specification states this is not permitted	<i>Awarding body specification has been checked to determine if group work is permitted. Awarding body guidance sought where this issue remains unresolved</i>	PBE & LWN
Authentication procedures		
A teacher has doubts about the authenticity of the work submitted by a candidate for internal assessment	<i>Candidates have been issued with the current JCQ documents - Information for candidates: non-examination assessments</i>	PBE & LWN
Candidate plagiarises other material	<i>The candidate's work is not accepted for assessment A mark of zero is recorded and submitted to the awarding body</i>	PBE & LWN

Candidate does not sign their authentication statement/declaration	<i>Candidates have been issued with the current JCQ document Information for candidates: non-examination assessments. Declaration is checked for signature before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment</i>	PBE & LWN Subject Tutor
Subject Tutor not available to sign authentication forms	<i>Ensure a centre-wide process is in place for subject tutors to sign authentication forms at the point of marking candidates work as part of the centre's quality assurance procedures; if not available then HOD to complete</i>	PBE Subject Tutor
Presentation of work		
Candidate does not fully complete the awarding body's cover sheet that is attached to their worked submitted for formal assessment	<i>Cover sheet is checked to ensure it is fully completed before accepting the work of a candidate for formal assessment.</i>	Subject Tutor
Keeping materials secure		
Candidates work between formal supervised sessions is not securely stored	<i>Subject Tutors are aware of and follow current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments. Regular monitoring ensures subject tutor use of appropriate secure storage.</i>	PBE & LWN PBE & LWN
Adequate secure storage not available to subject tutor	<i>Adequate / sufficient secure storage is available to subject tutor prior to the start of the course. Alternative secure storage sourced where required.</i>	PBE NMH

Task marking – externally assessed components		
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an acceptable reason	<i>Awarding body guidance is sought to determine if alternative assessment arrangements can be made for the candidate If not, eligibility for special consideration is explored and a request submitted to the awarding body where appropriate.</i>	Head of Department / Exams
A candidate is absent on the day of the examiner visit for an unacceptable reason	<i>The candidate is marked absent on the attendance register</i>	Head of Department
Task marking – internally assessed components		
A candidate submits little or no work	<i>Where a candidate submits no work, the candidate is recorded as absent when marks are submitted to the awarding body. Where a candidate submits little work, the work produced is assessed against the assessment criteria and a mark allocated appropriately; where the work does not meet any of the assessment criteria a mark of zero is submitted to the awarding body.</i>	Subject Tutor
A candidate is unable to finish their work for unforeseen reason	<i>JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process (chapter 5) is checked to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for shortfall in work.</i>	PBE & LWN
The work of a candidate is lost or damaged	<i>JCQ publication A guide to the special consideration process (chapter 5) is checked to determine eligibility and the process to be followed for lost or damaged work.</i>	PBE & LWN

Candidate malpractice is discovered	<p><i>Instructions and processes in the current JCQ publication Instructions for conducting non-examination assessments (chapter 9 Malpractice) are followed.</i></p> <p><i>Investigation and reporting procedures in the current JCQ publication Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments are followed.</i></p> <p><i>Appropriate internal disciplinary procedures are also followed.</i></p>	<p>Subject Tutor</p> <p>Head of Department</p> <p>Head of Centre</p>
A teacher marks the work of his / her own child	<p><i>A conflict of interest is declared by informing the awarding body that a teacher is teaching his / her own child at the start of the course. Marked work of said child is submitted for moderation whether part of the sample requested or not.</i></p>	PBE
An extension to the deadline for submission of marks is required for a legitimate reason	<p><i>Awarding body is contacted to determine if an extension can be granted.</i></p>	PBE & LWN
After submission of marks, it is discovered that the wrong task was given to candidates	<p><i>Awarding body is contacted for guidance.</i></p>	PBE & LWN

<p>A candidate wishes to appeal the marks awarded for their work by their teacher</p>	<p><i>Candidates are informed of the marks they have been awarded for their work prior to the marks being submitted to the awarding body. Candidates are informed that these marks are subject to change through the awarding body's moderation process.</i></p> <p><i>Candidates are informed of their marks prior to the internal deadline set by the Exams Manager for the submission of marks, to allow time for an internal appeal.</i></p> <p><i>Candidates are made aware of the centre's internal appeals procedures and timescale for submitting an appeal prior to the submission of marks to the awarding body.</i></p>	<p>PBE / Subject Tutor Subject Tutor</p> <p>PBE / Subject Tutor</p> <p>PBE & LWN</p>
<p>Deadline for submitting work for formal assessment not met by candidate</p>	<p><i>Records confirm deadlines given and understood by candidates.</i></p> <p><i>Depending on the circumstances, awarding body guidance sought to determine if the work can be accepted late for marking providing the awarding body's deadline for submitting marks can be met.</i></p> <p><i>Decision made (depending on the circumstances) if the work will be accepted late for marking or a mark of zero submitted to the awarding body for the candidate.</i></p>	<p>PBE / Subject Tutor</p> <p>PBE & LWN</p>
<p>Deadline for submitting marks and samples of candidates work ignored by Subject Tutor</p>	<p><i>Internal / external deadlines are published at the start of each academic year.</i></p> <p><i>Reminders are issued through Heads of Department as deadlines approach.</i></p>	<p>PBE & LWN</p>

	<i>Where appropriate, internal disciplinary procedures are followed.</i>	
Subject Tutor long term absence during the marking period	<i>See centre's exam contingency plan (Teaching staff extended absence at key points in the exam cycle).</i>	

1. The assessments 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 must not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments, **although care must be taken when a student is allowed to use a laptop or similar device for exams, to ensure they have no access to AI tools (see sections 14.20-14.27 of the *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-Examined 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, which contributes to the award of qualifications.

When properly referenced, this can be acceptable, 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 if AI is misused.

AI chatbots are AI tools which generate text in response to user prompts and questions. Users can ask follow-up questions or ask the chatbot to revise the responses already provided. AI chatbots respond to prompts based upon patterns in the data sets (large language model) upon which they have been trained. They generate responses which are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate. AI chatbots can complete tasks such as the following:

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

AI tools available include:

- ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com/auth/login>)
- Jenni AI (<https://jenni.ai>)
- Jasper AI (<https://www.jasper.ai/>)
- Writesonic (<https://writesonic.com/chat/>)
- Bloom AI (<https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom>)
- Gemini (<https://gemini.google.com/>)
- Claude (<https://claude.ai/>)
- Gauth (<https://gauthmath.com/>)
- Question AI (<https://questionai.com/>)
- Brainly (<https://brainly.com/>)

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

- Midjourney (<https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/>)
- Stable Diffusion (<https://stablediffusionweb.com/>)
- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (<https://openai.com/dall-e-2/>)
- Soundraw (<https://soundraw.io/>)
- Musicfy (<https://create.musicfy.lol/>)
- Runway (<https://runwayml.com/>)
- LTX Studio (<https://ltx.studio/>)

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 such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

The lists of certain suppliers of AI-related products 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. The lists provided are not exhaustive.

The use of AI tools may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments, not least the risk of committing malpractice, for which serious sanctions can apply. As also noted above, the tools have been developed to produce responses based upon the statistical likelihood of the language selected being an appropriate response and so the responses cannot be relied upon. AI tools often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. Some AI tools have been identified as providing answers to questions that can prompt inappropriate actions, and some can also produce fake references to books/articles.

3. What is AI misuse by students?

In accordance with section 5.3(k) of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/>), students must submit work for assessments which is their own. **This 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 candidates – Coursework assessments**

While AI is becoming a useful tool in the workplace, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, **it is important students develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying and do not rely on AI.**

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

AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own. Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own.
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content.
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations.
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information.
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools.
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

AI misuse constitutes malpractice as defined in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>). The malpractice sanctions available for the offences of 'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism' include disqualification and debarment from taking qualifications for a number of years. Students' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment 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 section 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:

- 5.3 (z) of the *JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/>) requires centres to have in place, and available for inspection, a malpractice policy which must cover 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). Section 3.3 of the JCQ malpractice policies and procedures requires that centres must take all reasonable steps to prevent malpractice.
- Section 7 of the JCQ *Instructions for conducting coursework* and 4.1, 4.6 and 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 their approach to managing use of AI by students in their school, college or exam centre.
- make students aware of the appropriate and inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment. In doing so, they may wish to use the JCQ support materials referenced in the Executive Summary.
- make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.
- consider how to best communicate with parents/carers to make them aware of the risks and issues and ensure they support the centre's approach.

and centres **must**:

- a) Explain to students 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;
- b) Regularly review the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy to acknowledge the use of AI (e.g. what it is, the risks of using it, what AI misuse is, how this will be treated as malpractice, when it may be used, how it should be acknowledged and **how teachers will authenticate work**);
- c) Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students must reference appropriately (including websites);
- d) 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**);
- e) Ensure teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools (see the **What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments** and the **What is AI misuse by students** sections);

- f) Ensure, where students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, teachers and relevant centre staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access where this is prohibited;
- g) Ensure each student is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JQC *Information for Candidates* (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents) document;
- h) 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;
- i) 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);
- j) Ensure teachers are aware they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work (see **AI use and marking** section below);
- k) Ensure teachers and Heads of Department are clear about their responsibility to only authenticate and submit work for assessment by the awarding organisation that they are confident is the student's own;
- l) 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 in 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 they know how to do this. Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments. If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students must ensure they independently verify the AI-generated content – and reference the sources they have used.

Students acknowledging the use of AI and showing clearly how they have used it allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether the use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

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

ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2025.

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

This must be 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).

The JCQ regulations for candidates on referencing may be found in the following:

- *Instructions for conducting coursework* (https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/Coursework_ICC_24-25_FINAL.pdf)
- *The Information for Candidates* documents (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents>)

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, as with any source, poor referencing, paraphrasing and copying sections of text 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 if they use AI they have not independently met the marking criteria therefore 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

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.

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, 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 the section titled 'Centre Responsibilities', which include:

- **the approach the centre will use to prevent and identify AI misuse in each of the subjects including 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.

To prevent misuse, education and awareness of staff and students is likely to be key. Here are some actions which could be taken (many of these will already be in place in centres as these are not new requirements):

- a) Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;
- b) Ensure access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams;
- c) Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders;
- d) Where appropriate, allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be completed in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate all of each student's work with confidence;
- e) Examine 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;
- f) Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident the student understands the material;
- g) Consider whether it is helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain they understand it and it reflects their own independent work;
- h) Do not accept, without further investigation, work which staff suspect has been taken from AI tools without proper acknowledgement or is otherwise plagiarised – doing so encourages the spread of this practice and is likely to constitute staff malpractice which can attract sanctions.
- i) Issuing tasks for centre-devised assignments which are, wherever possible, topical, current and specific, and require the creation of content which is less likely to be accessible to AI models trained using historic data.

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.

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 coherency
- General understanding and working level
- The mode of production (i.e. whether handwritten or word-processed)

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.

Further guidance on authenticating student work can be found in the JCQ *Instructions for conducting coursework* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/coursework/>).

Potential indicators of AI misuse

If the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication the student has misused AI:

- a) A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations.
- b) A default use of language or vocabulary which 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).
- c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected (though some AI tools will produce quotations and references).
- d) Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors).
- e) A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which may be notable for some subjects.

- f) Instances of incorrect and/or inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.
- g) A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work.
- h) A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended it.
- i) A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected.
- j) A lack of specific local or topical knowledge.
- k) Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected.
- l) The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output.
- m) The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten.
- n) The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth and variety or to overcome its output limit.
- o) The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content.
- p) Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.

Automated detection

AI tools, as large language models, produce content by 'guessing' the most likely next word in a sequence. This means AI-generated content uses the most common combinations of words, unlike humans who tend to use a variety of words in their normal writing. Several programs and services use this difference to statistically analyse written content and determine the likelihood that it was produced by AI, for example:

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

These may be used as a check on student work and/or to verify concerns about the authenticity of student work. However, it should be noted that the above tools will give lower scores for AI-generated content which has been subsequently amended by students, as they base their scores on the predictability of words. Spending time getting to know how the detection tools work will help teachers and assessors understand what they are and are not capable of.

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). In instances where misuse of AI is suspected it may be helpful to use more than one detection tool to provide an additional source of evidence about the authenticity of student work.

The use of detection tools, where used, should form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of students' work; all available information must be considered when reviewing any malpractice concerns. Teachers will know their students best and so are best placed to assess the authenticity of work submitted to them for assessment – AI detection tools can be a useful part of the evidence they can consider.

The list of certain suppliers of AI-related products is for information purposes only and does not constitute an endorsement by JCQ. It is each centre'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. The list provided is not exhaustive.

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 has the responsibility for ensuring students submit authentic work.

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. The procedure is detailed in the *JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>).

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* (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>). The sanctions applied to a student committing plagiarism and making a false declaration of authenticity range from a warning regarding future conduct to disqualification and the student being barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time.

Examples of AI misuse cases dealt with by awarding organisations 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 are knowingly accepting, or failing to check, inauthentic work for qualification assessments.