Bishop Challoner

Catholic College

Artificial Intelligence Policy

(Exams)

2025 – 2026

Introduction

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) for General Qualifications, coursework and internal assessments. This document is primarily intended to provide guidance in relation to these assessments.
The guidance emphasises the following requirements:

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/general-regulations/), all work submitted for qualification assessments must be the student's own.

- Students who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations, and may attract severe sanctions.

- Students and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice.

- Students must make sure that work submitted for assessment is demonstrably their own. If any sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified by the student, and they must understand that this will not allow them to demonstrate that they have

independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded (please see the Acknowledging AI Use section below).

- Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the student's own (in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres).

- Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of student work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI, but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate and take appropriate action.

AI Misuse

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the students' 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 pupil'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.

Communication with Students

Bishop Challoner Catholic College will clearly communicate the policy to students through course materials, exam instructions and regular class \ assembly briefings. We will emphasise the consequences of using unauthorised AI, such as disqualification, failure, or disciplinary action.

Detection Measures

Potential indicators of AI use

If you see the following in students' work, it may be an indication that they have misused AI:

- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations.

- A default use of language or vocabulary which might not appropriate to the qualification level.

- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected. Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors).

- A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects.

- Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.

- A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work.

- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this.

- A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected.

- A lack of specific local or topical knowledge.

- 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.

- The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability.

- The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten.

- 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, variety or to overcome its output limit.

- The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content.

- Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the student's usual style.

Please be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages and levels of proficiency when generating content. However, some AI tools will produce quotations and references.

Prevention Strategies

Outline strategies for preventing unauthorised AI use, including:

- Invigilation during exams.
- Randomised question pools to discourage sharing.
- Automated detection from online programs such as OpenAI Classifier, GPTZero
- Use of secure exam platforms with AI detection capabilities.
- Designing coursework assignments that require critical thinking and personalised responses.

Reporting and Investigation

If your suspicions are confirmed and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, the centre doesn't need to report the malpractice to the appropriate awarding organisation. We can resolve the matter prior to the signing of the declarations.

Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own. Ultimately the Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring that students do not submit inauthentic work.

If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed, the case must be reported to the relevant awarding organisation. The procedure is detailed in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/malpractice/).

Consequences

If AI misuse is suspected by a teacher, or if it has been reported by a student or member of the public, it must be reported immediately. The relevant awarding body will liaise with the Head of Centre regarding the next steps of the investigation and how appropriate evidence will be obtained.

The awarding body will then consider the case and, if necessary, impose a sanction in line with JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (https://www.jcq. org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/).

The sanctions applied to a student committing plagiarism and making a false declaration of authenticity range from a warning regarding future conduct to disqualification and the student being barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time.

Awarding organisations will also take action, which can include the imposition of sanctions, where centre staff are knowingly accepting, or failing to check, inauthentic work for qualification assessments.

Student Support

Bishop Challoner Catholic College will provide resources for students to understand the policy and the importance of academic integrity. We will also offer guidance on how to avoid inadvertently using unauthorised AI.

Compliance with JCQ Regulations

Bishop Challoner Catholic College are fully committed to complying with JCQ regulations and guidelines regarding the prevention of unauthorised AI use.

Review and Continuous Improvement

Bishop Challoner Catholic College are fully committed to regular reviews of the policy to adapt to evolving technologies and emerging best practices.