



AI Policy

Introduction

While the potential for student artificial intelligence (AI) misuse is new, most ways to prevent misuse and mitigate the associated risks are not. Northleigh has established measures in place to ensure that students are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice.

In accordance with Section 5.3(k) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres staff must only accept work for qualification assessment which is the students' own work. 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 malpractice.

Scope

Students' complete examinations/ 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.

There are some assessments in which access to the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages. These will normally be Non-Examined Assessments (NEAs), coursework and internal assessments for General Qualifications (GQs) and Vocational & Technical Qualifications (VTQs). This policy is primarily intended to provide guidance in relation to these assessments.

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. While the range of AI tools, and their capabilities, is likely to expand, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice.

Staff and students should also be aware that AI tools are evolving quickly but there are still 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

AI chatbots currently 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/>)
- Bloomai (<https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom>)
- Google Bard (<https://bard.google.com/>)
- Claude (<https://claude.ai/>)

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

- Midjourney (<https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/>)
- Stable Diffusion (<https://stablediffusionweb.com/>)
- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (<https://openai.com/dall-e-2/>)

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate music.

These include:

- Soundraw (<https://soundraw.io/>)
- wavtool (<https://wavtool.com/>)
- Musicfy (<https://create.musicfy.lol/>)

The use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments. 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?

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 means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words and is not copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work.

Students are expected to 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.

While AI may become an established tool at the workplace in the future, for the purposes of demonstrating knowledge, understanding and skills for qualifications, it is important for students' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI. Students should develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying.

Students must be able to demonstrate that 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 that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Acknowledging AI use

It remains essential that students are clear about the importance of referencing the sources they have used when producing work for an assessment, and that they know how to do this.

Appropriate referencing is a means of demonstrating academic integrity and is 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 should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used. In addition to the above, where students use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it.

This allows staff to review how AI has been used and whether that use was appropriate in the context of a 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 student'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/>), 25/01/2024.

The student must, retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a noneditable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used. This must be submitted with the work the student submits for assessment, so staff are able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and 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 should take action to assure themselves that the work is the student's own. Further guidance on ways this could be done are set out in the JQC Plagiarism in Assessments guidance document (see link below).

The JQC guidance on referencing can be found in the following:

- Plagiarism in Assessments (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/>)
- Instructions for conducting coursework (https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Coursework_ICC_22-23_FINAL.pdf)

The Information for Candidates documents

(<https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/information-for-candidates-documents>)

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

a) Students 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, 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 should also be reminded that if they use AI so that they have not independently met the marking criteria, they will not be rewarded.

AI Use and Marking

When marking students work in which AI use has been acknowledged, and there are no concerns of AI misuse, staff must still ensure that if the student has used AI tools such that they have not independently met the marking criteria, they are not rewarded.

Depending upon the marking criteria or grade descriptors being applied, staff may need to consider the 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 staff, 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.

The school may determine, after careful consideration of any data privacy concerns, whether it is appropriate for their staff to use AI tools to help mark student work. Where we do permit AI tools to be used to mark student work, an AI tool cannot be the sole marker. A human member of staff must review all the work in its entirety and determine the mark they feel it warrants, regardless of the outcomes of an AI tool. Staff remain responsible for the mark/grade awarded.

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 guidance on what plagiarism is, how to prevent it, and how to detect it (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-inassessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/>).

Staff must be assured that the work they accept for assessment and mark is authentically the student's own work. They are required to confirm this during the assessment process.

To prevent misuse, education and awareness of staff and students 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):

- a) Consider restricting access to online AI tools on school devices and networks.
- b) Ensure that access to online AI tools is restricted on school 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 done in class under direct supervision to allow staff to authenticate each student's whole work with confidence.
- e) Examine intermediate stages in the production of work to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that 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 that the student understands the material.
- g) Consider whether it is 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.
- 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 school-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 students requires the same skills and observation techniques that staff are probably already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own.

There are a number of 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 student.

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)

Staff could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the student in the classroom, or under supervised conditions.

Private Candidates

Verifying the authenticity of work submitted by private candidates can be more challenging, given that they may not have a good understanding of the standard the student is currently working at.

Before accepting work for assessment, staff must take steps to ensure it is the student's own independent work. This may involve 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 that 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 might not appropriate to the qualification level*
- c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected~
- 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 might be notable for some subjects
- f) Instances of incorrect/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 this
- 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.

*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.

Automated Detection

AI chatbots, as large language models, produce content by 'guessing' the most likely next word in a sequence. This means that 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:

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

These can 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, 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 quality of these detection tools can vary and AI and detection tools will continue to evolve.

Spending time getting to know how the detection tools work will help staff understand what they are and are not capable of. AI detection tools, including those listed above, employ a range of detection models which can 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 can 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 should 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.

Reporting

If suspicions are confirmed and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, the school does not need to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation.

Staff 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 school 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/exams-office/malpractice/>).

Awarding Organisation Actions

The JCQ awarding organisations ensure that their 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 suspected by an awarding organisation's moderator or examiner, or if it has been reported by a student or member of the public, full details of the allegation will usually be relayed to the school. 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/>).

Updated 08 November 2024

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.

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

Review Date: November 2025