Use of Artificial Intelligence Policy

Contents

Version Log	
Date of amends:	**Details of change/s made:**
19/7/24	Removed links to specific 'ChatBots'
	Pg 9 – 'Reporting' added section on investigation responsibility regarding Apprentices post-Gateway.
	Removed Section 8 – 'Automated detection' as this was duplicated elsewhere in the policy.
	Updated links within Section 10 'Useful references'

Introduction

This policy is an addendum to the ISP Malpractice Policy as, although the potential for learner misuse of artificial intelligence (AI) is new, most of the ways to prevent its misuse and mitigate the associated risks are not. Centres will already have established measures in place to ensure that learners are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice. This policy reminds tutors and assessors of best practice in this area, applying it in the context of AI use. The policy emphasises the requirement for all work submitted for qualification/end point assessment must be the learners' own. Misuse of AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, and may attract severe sanctions.

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

AI use refers to the use of AI tools to obtain information and content which might be used in work produced for assessments which lead towards qualifications/end point assessment. While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification/end point assessment at any time constitutes malpractice.

Tutors and learners should also be aware that AI tools are still being developed and there are often limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content. 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

The use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by learners completing qualification/end point assessment. As noted above, they 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 chatbots often produce answers which may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. Some AI chatbots have been identified as providing dangerous and harmful answers to questions and some can also produce fake references to books/ articles by real or fake people.

What is AI misuse?

Learners must submit work for assessments which is their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words, and isn't copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work. Learners are expected to demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and understanding as required for the qualification/end point assessment in question and set out in the qualification/end point assessment specification. This includes demonstrating their performance in relation to the assessment objectives for the subject relevant to the question/s or other tasks learners have been set. Any use of AI which means learners have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice.

While AI may become an established tool at the workplace in the future, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications/end point assessments, it's important for learners' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI. Learners should develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying. AI tools must only be used when the conditions of the assessment permit the use of the internet and where the learner is able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

Examples of AI misuse
Includes, but not limited to, the following:
- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the learner'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 learner'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/end point assessment and debarment from taking qualification/end point assessments for a number of years. Learners' marks may also be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and, as noted above, the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification/end point assessment does not accurately reflect their own work.

ISP AO/EPAO Requirements for Centres

Centres will already have agreed policies and procedures relating to assessment in place to ensure the authenticity of assessments. Centres must:

- Ensure that these can also address the risks associated with AI misuse;
- Discuss the use of AI with all staff and agree their approach to managing learners' use of AI in their centre
- Make learners 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/end point assessment.
- Make learners aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice
- Explain the importance of learners submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice
- Update 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 and how it should be acknowledged) – most simply by referencing this document
- Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how learners should reference appropriately (including websites) and include clear guidance on how learners should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse (see the below section on acknowledging AI use)
- Ensure that Tutors 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 What is AI misuse? sections)
- Consider whether learners should be required to sign a declaration that they have understood what AI misuse is, and that it is forbidden in the learning agreement that is signed at enrolment in some centres
- Remind learners that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice (ISP Policy and Procedures section).

Putting Policy into Practice:

ISP Practice:

- All learner work will be checked using software provided by Turnitin. This is an advanced writing detection technology that is highly reliable and proficient in distinguishing between AI and human written text. Should the incorrect use of AI be detected prior to assessment, then the ISP Malpractice Policy process will be implemented.
- ISP Assessors are trained and regularly updated to monitor for suspected misuse of AI and will report this back to ISP before continuing with any assessments.

Centre staff Practice:

- Learners and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice
- Learners 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 learner 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)
- Tutors and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the - learners' own; and
- Where Tutors have doubts about the authenticity of learner 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.
- Learners should be reminded that in the case of work-based projects they sign a declaration in which they state they have not plagiarised from other sources or misused AI in any way.

Acknowledging AI use

It remains essential that learners are clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and that they know how to do this. Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is key to maintaining the integrity of assessments. If a learner uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the learner and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, learners should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.

In addition to the above, where learners use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. This allows Tutors and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether that 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, a learner's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and should show the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/ blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2023. The learner must, retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used. This must be submitted with the work so the tutor/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used.

Where this is not submitted, and the tutor/assessor suspects that the learner has used AI tools, the tutor/assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the learner's own.

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

a) Learners being reminded that, as with any source, poor referencing, paraphrasing and copying sections of text may constitute malpractice, which can attract severe sanctions including disqualification – in the context of AI use, learners 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) Learners should also be reminded that if they use AI so that they have not independently met the marking criteria they will not be rewarded.

Other ways to prevent misuse

While there may be benefits to using AI in some situations, there is the potential for it to be misused by learners, either accidentally or intentionally. AI misuse, in that it involves a learner submitting work for qualification/end point assessment assessments which is not their own, can be considered a form of plagiarism (ISP provides further information on plagiarism in its Malpractice Policy).

Tutors and assessors must be assured that the work they accept for assessment and mark is authentically the learner's own work. They are required to confirm this during the assessment process. To prevent misuse, education and awareness of staff and learners is likely to be key. Here are some actions which should be taken (many of these will already be in place in centres as these are not new requirements):

- Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;
- Ensure that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams;
- Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders;
- Where appropriate, allocating time for sufficient portions of work to be done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each learner's whole 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 learner understands the material;
- Consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage learners in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work;
- 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.
- 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.

Identifying misuse

Identifying the misuse of AI by learners requires the same skills and observation techniques that Tutors are probably already using to assure themselves learner work is authentically their own. There are also some tools that can be used.

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 learner. Where the work is made up of writing, one can 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)

Tutors could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the learner in the classroom, or under supervised conditions. Potential indicators of AI use If you see the following in learner 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/end point assessment 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 learner in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a learner 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 learner themself, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
- The inadvertent inclusion by learners of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output
- The submission of learner 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 candidate's usual style

AI ChatBot themselves can be used to detect the use of AI although this is not necessarily accurate and should not be relied on.

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.

Reporting

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 ISP.

In the case of EPAO, the responsibility to report and investigate lies with ISP EPAO as the Training Provider cannot provide any training post Gateway.

ISP Policy and Procedures

If AI misuse is suspected by ISP or if it has been reported by a learner or member of the public, full details of the allegation will usually be relayed to the centre. ISP will liaise with the Head of Centre regarding the next steps of the investigation and how appropriate evidence will be obtained. ISP will then consider the case and, if necessary, impose a sanction in line with the ISP Sanctions Policy. ISP 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/end point assessment.

ISP have established procedures for identifying, reporting and investigating learner malpractice, including the misuse of AI. If the mis-use of AI is suspected then the procedures and policies as per the ISP Malpractice Policy will apply.

Useful references

https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/

DfE Generative artificial intelligence in education Departmental statement