



Cookstown High School

Artificial Intelligence (AI)
Use in Assessments
Policy

Reviewed: February 2024

Next Review: February 2025

Contents

POLICY OVERVIEW..... 3

RECORD OF POLICY AMENDMENTS 3

Introduction..... 4

What is AI Misuse 4

Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments 4

Identifying Misuse 5

 Comparison with Previous work 5

 Private Candidates..... 5

Potential Indicators of AI Misuse 6

 Automated detection 6

 Reporting..... 7

Acknowledging AI Use 7

POLICY OVERVIEW

DETAILS

TITLE	AI Use in Assessment Policy
TARGET AUDIENCE	Governors', Staff, Parents/Guardians
REVIEW DATE	February 2024
REVIEW LEAD	Principal
POLICY DEVELOPED BY	Senior Leadership Team
POLICY RATIFIED BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS ON:	February 2024
EFFECTIVE FROM:	February 2024
REVIEW FREQUENCY:	Every three years (minimum)
REVIEW DATE:	February 2025
PRINCIPAL	Miss G J Evans
CHAIR OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS	Mrs L Dripps

This procedure has been reviewed to include reference to the remit of the Northern Ireland Public Services Ombudsman (NIPSO) in investigating complaints from members of the public in relation to maladministration in publicly funded schools.

RECORD OF POLICY AMENDMENTS

The following table outlines any significant changes/amendments made to this procedure since it was ratified by the Board of Governors on:

DATE OF REVIEW OR AMENDMENT	SUMMARY OF CHANGED / AMENDMENTS TO PROCEDURE	AMENDED BY

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence 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 greatly in the near future, misuse of AI tools in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice.

Teachers and students 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

What is AI Misuse

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.

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 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.

Preventing AI Misuse in Assessments

AI misuse involves a student submitting work for qualification assessments which is not their own, can be considered a form of plagiarism.

Teachers and assessors 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. Some actions which should be taken:

- a) Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks
- b) Ensure that 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 done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each student's whole work with confidence
- e) 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
- 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'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
- 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

Identifying Misuse

Identifying the misuse of AI by students requires the same skills and observation techniques that teachers are probably already using to assure themselves student work is authentically their own.

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)

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. Before accepting work for assessment, teachers 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.

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 be 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://GptzeLQJJeL>)
- Sapling (<https://sapling.ai/ai-content-detector>)

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

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. 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.

A holistic approach to considering the authenticity of students' work should be employed; 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 a teacher's suspicions are confirmed and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, the centre does not need to report the incident to the appropriate awarding organisation.

Teachers must not accept work which is not the student's own.

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.

Acknowledging AI Use

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 teachers 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 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/>), 25/01/2023.

The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication Malpractice Policy 5 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 teacher/assessor is 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