WOODBRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL

PLAGIARISM AND MALPRACTICE POLICY 2026 - 2027

The purpose of this policy is to ensure that staff, students and their parents are aware of the sanctions that can be implemented by either the centre or awarding bodies should:

- plagiarism be detected in a piece of work, either Non-Examined Assessment (NEA) or coursework
- malpractice be detected in a piece of work, either NEA, coursework or an examination unit

It is the responsibility of staff, students and parents to read and understand this policy.

This policy has been updated to acknowledge the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in line with the JCQ document "AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications".

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

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

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 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.

What is meant by plagiarism?

The Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) defines plagiarism as:

"Unacknowledged copying from, or reproduction of, third party sources or incomplete referencing (including the internet and artificial intelligence (AI) tools)"

This could include copying from published texts, either in print or from the internet, or copying pieces of work that have previously been submitted for examinations.

AI misuse, where a student submits work for qualification assessments using AI tools which is not their own, can be considered a form of plagiarism.

Plagiarism for the purpose of this document is restricted to those examination components where students undertake examination work in unsupervised conditions, such as coursework, pre-release work, or the production of research notes which can be used in the examination. It can also occur when students are allowed to annotate texts and take these into an examination.

What is meant by malpractice?

'Malpractice', which includes 'maladministration', involves a failure to follow the rules of an examination or assessment. This includes:

- a breach of the Regulation
- a breach of awarding body requirements regarding how a qualification should be delivered
- a failure to follow established procedures in relation to a qualification

There are many different instances where malpractice may be identified by either the centre or the awarding body. Examples of malpractice can include:

- collusion: working collaboratively with other students, beyond what is permitted
- copying from another student (including the use of IT to aid the copying)
- allowing work to be copied, e.g. posting written coursework on social networking sites prior to an examination/assessment
- the deliberate destruction of another student's work
- making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of controlled assessments, coursework or the contents of a portfolio, including the misuse of AI tools
- allowing others to assist in the production of NEA or coursework or assisting others in the production of NEA or coursework
- the misuse, or the attempted misuse, of examination and assessment materials and resources (e.g. exemplar materials), for example being in possession of confidential material in advance of the examination
- a breach of the instructions or advice of an invigilator, supervisor or the awarding body in relation to the examination or assessment rules and regulations
- failing to abide by the conditions of supervision designed to maintain the security of the examinations or assessments
- behaving in a manner so as to undermine the integrity of the examination
- exchanging, obtaining, receiving or passing on information (or the attempt to) which could be examination related by means of talking, electronic, written or non-verbal communication for written examinations
- disruptive behaviour or communicating in any way with other students in the examination room or during an assessment session (including the use of offensive language)
- any other act that is deemed to be malpractice as outlined in the JCQ Instructions for

Conducting Examinations (ICE) document, including bringing unauthorised items into the examination room or distracting other students

Student Responsibilities

In the context of NEA, coursework or an examination unit, students must not:

- submit work which is not their own
- lend work to other students or allow other students to copy their work
- allow other students to have access to their own independently sourced material
- assist other students 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
- copy or paraphrase sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer their own
- copy or paraphrase whole responses of AI-generated content
- use AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect their own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- fail to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information, or provide incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- submit work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies

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

Students who misuse AI will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations, and may attract severe sanctions. 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. Details of possible sanctions are listed below in the 'Penalties' section.

Centre Responsibilities

The Centre will:

- make accessible to staff and students the policy and procedures of the centre concerning plagiarism and malpractice
- ensure that policy and procedures of the centre are known and implemented throughout the centre
- ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools. Information on this can be found in the JCQ document "AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications" (see the sections 'What

is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments?' and 'What is AI misuse?')
- ensure that each student is emailed a link to, and understands, the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates documents, as well as the school's Plagiarism and Malpractice Policy, which can all be found on the school's Exam Documentation website page
- disable AI/chatbot software on school systems
- ensure that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams
- 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
- 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 within the centre directly
- consider how the school can improve the education about AI and how teachers communicate this to all students completing NEA
- report to the awarding bodies all instances of plagiarism or malpractice in line with the JCQ publication dealing with this subject
- maintain confidential records of any cases of plagiarism or malpractice
- establish a process for students to appeal decisions resulting from plagiarism

Staff Responsibilities

How to prevent plagiarism

Teaching staff must:

- know the policy and procedures of the centre concerning plagiarism
- understand and comply with the general guidelines detailed within the JCQ publications Instructions for Conducting Coursework and Instructions for Conducting Non-Examined Assessment, as well as the JCQ Malpractice Policies, including the Plagiarism in Assessments and AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualification documents
- understand and comply with the guidance detailed in the JCQ
- understand and comply with the awarding body's specification for conducting NEA, including any subject-specific instructions, teachers' notes or additional information on the awarding body's website
- ensure that students are aware of the importance of them producing their own independent work for all NEA work and that plagiarism will be considered malpractice, stressing to them the sanctions that can be imposed if plagiarism is discovered (see the 'Penalties' section below)
- ensure that, in the rare event that AI use is appropriate and is deemed as such by the awarding body's specification and/or associated documentation published by the awarding bodies and the regulator, students have referenced this appropriately - staff can refer to the following JCQ documents for guidance:
    - Plagiarism in Assessments (see the 'Guidance on referencing' section)
    - AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications (see the 'Acknowledging AI use' section)
    - Instructions for conducting coursework
    - Instructions for Conducting Non-Examined Assessment

    - Information for candidates documents
- allow time, where appropriate, for sufficient portions of work to be completed in class under direct supervision to allow authentication of student's work with confidence
- examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages
- introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident that the student understands the material
- issue 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
- consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work
- set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and provide reminders
- ensure that work undertaken in previous years' examinations is not copied by the current season's students – issuing this work to students for reference purposes must be carefully monitored
- reinforce to students the significance of their (electronic) declaration, where they confirm the work they are submitting is their own – ensure they are aware of the consequences of a false declaration and that 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 - information on this can be found in the JCQ document "AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications" (see the 'Awarding Organisation actions' section)
- not accept, without further investigation, work which you 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 (see the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures for more information)

How to identify plagiarism

Teaching staff must:

- accept the obligation to authenticate the work which is submitted for assessment;
- check the content of work and compare it with previous work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions. Look out for any varying quality of the work submitted.
- make note of the following characteristics, where the work is made up of writing, to assess if the work is at the level expected of the student:
    - 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)

Potential indicators of AI misuse

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

- a default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations*
- a default use of language or vocabulary which might not accord with 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 themself, 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, or the hypothetical nature of its output
- 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 and 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, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content.
  ~However, some AI tools will produce quotations and references.

Further guidance on identifying plagiarism can be found in the JCQ document "AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications" (see the ''Identifying misuse' section).

Automated detection

Where appropriate, staff should check work submitted by students as part of their Non-Examined Assessment on one of the following programmes, which will statistically analyse written content and determine the likelihood that it was produced by AI:

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

However, it should be noted that the above tools, as they base their scores on the predictability of words, will give lower scores for AI-generated content which has been subsequently amended by students.

The use of detection tools, where used, should form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of students' work. Staff will know their students best and so are best placed to assess the authenticity of work submitted to them for assessment.

What to do if you suspect plagiarism

Teaching staff must:

- keep all records of any actual or suspected malpractice
- report any case where plagiarism is suspected to your Line Manager for this to be investigated in line with the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures

What to do if plagiarism has been detected

Where plagiarism is detected, the Line Manager must seek advice from Mr Bhullar. The following process will be followed depending on whether the student has signed the declaration of authenticity:

- If the student has not yet signed the declaration of authenticity form, the matter will be dealt with internally as appropriate to the case

- If the student has already signed the declaration of authenticity form, this will be treated as malpractice and Mr Bhullar will report the plagiarism to the Exams Officer, who will then report this to the relevant awarding body at the earliest opportunity, in line with the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures

What to do in cases of malpractice

In all cases where staff are alerted to malpractice, including malpractice in exam conditions, the centre will follow the procedure as set out by the JCQ Instructions for Conducting Examinations (ICE) document and the JCQ Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures document.

Penalties

The following penalties could be applied:

Centre Applied Penalties

Student

- A warning may be given regarding future conduct
- Loss of marks
- If the declaration form has not been signed, and where it is allowed, the student may be required to complete an alternative piece of work under supervision
- Awarding body is notified of plagiarism/malpractice - see penalties below which could be applied by them

Awarding Body Penalties

Student

- A warning about further sanctions if the offence is repeated within a set period of time
- Loss of marks for a section/component or unit
- Disqualification from a unit or all units preventing the student aggregating or requesting certification in that series, if the student has applied for it

- Disqualification from a whole qualification or all qualifications preventing the student aggregating if the student has applied for it
- Student debarral preventing a student from entering one or more examinations for a set period of time

Staff

- Written warning
- Training
- Special conditions, for example supervision
- Suspension/debarment (not being allowed to be involved in the delivery or administration of an awarding body's assessments or examinations for a set period of time)

Centre

- Written warning
- Review and Report (Action plans)
- Approval of specific assessment tasks
- Additional monitoring or inspection
- Removal of direct claim status
- Restrictions on examination and assessment materials
- Independent invigilators
- Suspension of student registrations and entries
- Suspension of certification
- Withdrawal of specific qualifications and centre recognition

Further information on sanctions can be found in the JCQ document Suspected Malpractice Policies and Procedures

Appeals

Appeals, should a sanction be applied, can only be made through the Head of Centre/Exams Officer and must be put in writing by the parent/carer. Where a penalty has been applied by an awarding body the request for an appeal must be made within 5 calendar days. In line with JCQ regulations, students are not entitled to appeal to the awarding body directly. The Head of Centre's decision on whether to proceed with an appeal is final. Further information about the awarding bodies' appeals process can be found in the JCQ document A Guide to the Awarding Bodies' Appeals Processes.

Policy Reviewers: Mr T. Bhullar (Associate Headteacher) and Mrs J. Smith (Data and Examinations Assistant)

Approval: Approved by C&S Committee on 05 November 2026

Date of Next Approval: Autumn 2027