



Quality, Training and Development Department

AI Use in Assessments

July 2023



AI Use in Assessments Guide



Introduction

Although artificial intelligence (AI) has been in use for a while, the inappropriate use of AI by students continues to grow, and most of the strategies to prevent such misuse and manage the resulting risks are not mitigating these risks. However, there are existing measures in place to educate students on the significance of submitting their original work and to detect possible academic misconduct. This document provides guidance to Centres, teachers and assessors on how to apply best practices in the context of AI usage.

The guidance emphasises the following requirements:

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with NCC Education's Academic Misconduct policy, all work submitted by students must be the students own work.
- Students who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice and may attract severe sanctions if there is sufficient evidence to prove that AI generation has been used.
- Students and centres 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.
- Teachers must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the students' own.
- 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 as per NCC Education's *Academic Misconduct Policy*.



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 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
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment, or formality

AI chatbots currently available include:

- ChatGPT (<https://chatgpt.net/chatgpt-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

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/>)

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

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 (JCQ, 2023).



What is AI misuse?

As has always been the case, and in accordance with NCC Education's *Academic Misconduct policy*, all work submitted by students must be the student's own work. The use of AI has the potential to improve learning outcomes, personalise education, and make education more accessible to students from diverse backgrounds. However, as with any technology, there is the potential for misuse and unintended consequences.

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's 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.

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.

Students must demonstrate that their assessments are their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words and if using sources they follow the Harvard Referencing System.

Any use of AI which means students have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice.

AI tools must only be used when the conditions of the assessment permit the use of the internet and where the student is able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.



Centre engagement with and discussion of AI

Within NCC Education Academic Regulations it is clear that students must authenticate their assessments and when taking exams. It is imperative that teachers and students address the risks associated with AI misuse.

Within your centre, teachers, assessors and other staff must discuss the use of AI and agree in conjunction with NCC Education policies and your approach to managing students use of AI.

Centres must make students 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 assessment. They should also make students aware of the centre's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.

Centres should do the following:

- Explain the importance of students submitting their own independent work for assessments and stress to them 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) – this can be referenced and adapted from this document and NCC Education Policies
- Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students should reference appropriately (including websites)
- Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how students should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse (see the below section on acknowledging AI use)
- Ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection
- Consider whether students 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
- Reinforce to students the significance of their (electronic) declaration where they confirm the work they're submitting is their own, 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

Acknowledging AI Use



It is crucial for students to understand the significance of referencing the sources they have utilised while creating work for an assessment, and to possess the knowledge of how to do so correctly. Proper referencing serves as a means of exhibiting academic honesty and is fundamental in upholding the integrity of assessments. In the event that a student employs an AI tool that supplies information regarding the sources it has utilised in generating content, the student must authenticate and reference those sources in the same manner as usual.

In addition, it is imperative that students utilising AI technology disclose its use and provide a clear demonstration of how it has been employed. This allows teachers to review the appropriateness of AI usage in the context of a specific assessment. This is particularly crucial given that content generated by AI is not held to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

In instances where AI tools have been utilised as a source of information, it is essential that the student acknowledges the AI source used and includes the date the content was generated, for instance, "ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>), 25/01/2023". The student must retain a copy of the questions and computer-generated content for reference and verification purposes in a non-editable format, such as a screenshot.

Furthermore, the student must provide a concise explanation of how the content was utilised. All of this information must be submitted with the work so that the teacher/assessor can review the work, AI-generated content, and how it has been employed.

If this information is not submitted and the teacher/assessor suspects that the student has used AI tools, they must refer to the centre's malpractice policy to determine appropriate steps and take action to verify that the work is the student's own.

When it comes to acknowledging AI use, other measures that should be taken into consideration include:

- Students should be reminded that poor referencing, paraphrasing, or copying sections of text from any source, including AI-generated content, may constitute malpractice and may result in severe sanctions, such as disqualification. Therefore, students must understand what is and what is not acceptable regarding acknowledging AI content and the use of AI sources. For instance, it is unacceptable to reference 'AI' or 'ChatGPT' without specifying the particular AI tool used, just as it is unacceptable to state 'Google' rather than identifying the specific website and web pages consulted.
- Students should also be reminded that if they use AI in a way that does not allow them to independently meet 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 students, either accidentally or intentionally. 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):

- 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 student'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 student understands the material
- 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
- 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.



Detecting AI Misuse

Detecting the misuse of AI by students necessitates the same skills and observation techniques that teachers are already using to ensure that student work is genuine. Furthermore, some tools can aid in this process. In the following section, we will delve into these various methods.

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)

As set out in NCC Education Academic Misconduct Policy all assignments marked by centre markers must be uploaded to Turnitin to obtain an originality report. Turnitin has added an AI writing indicator that has been added to the Similarity Report will show an overall percentage of the document that may have been AI-generated.

The AI writing report contains the overall percentage of prose sentences contained in a long-form writing format within the submitted document that Turnitin's model determines was generated by AI. These sentences are highlighted in blue on the submission text in the AI writing report (Turnitin, 2023)

For AI misuse and Turn it In Detection please refer to the Turn It In FAQs in using the detection feature : <https://www.turnitin.com/products/features/ai-writing-detection> as well NCC Education's *Academic Misconduct Policy*.

Centres must report any AI generated content percentage over 50% through the plagiarism survey on the VLE. The centre must then formatively investigate this and provide details and actions taken via the VLE. Example below:

Plagiarism Survey for Centres

Mode: User's name will be logged and shown with answers

AI Generated content (i.e. the AI Generated content percentage on the Turnitin Report is 50% or over) Yes
was detected?  No

There are required fields in this form marked 

Previous page

Next page

Cancel



Plagiarism Survey for Centres

Mode: User's name will be logged and shown with answers

For each instance of AI Generated content detected, please provide details in the following format: Candidate Name and number – brief description of the AI Generated content percentage (any AI Generated content percentages over 50% MUST be reported) - Action taken. Please use a separate line for each instance/description.

For example:

John Smith P00122234 – high percentage showing on Turnitin Report for AI Generated content, with overall AI percentage at 79% for assignment - lecturer had a meeting with the candidate who admitted to using AI tool without referencing they had done so in assignment, mark for assignment set to zero.

Kate Jones P00273641 - Student had high AI Generated content percentage of 51% showing on Turnitin Report throughout their assignment - lecturer met and spoke with candidate. Candidate claimed they did not use AI tools - Mark for assignment remains as it was marked but this is being reported here as the AI Generated content percentage was over the threshold of 50% and so that NCC Education can carry out any further investigations if required.

Details of AI Generated content detected. 

There are required fields in this form 

[Previous page](#)

[Submit your answers](#)

[Cancel](#)

NCC Education will also investigate this and as per our Malpractice and Maladministration policy ask for further evidence of actions taken if required.

For **all** identified or any suspicions that AI generation has been used by any student, centres should follow NCC Education's Malpractice and Maladministration Policy. If support is required please refer to your Academic Standards Manager.

Centres should be utilising the AI detection from Turnitin to have a formative conversation with each student to determine whether they have used AI not to impose any penalties on exams or assessments unless this is proven.



Other potential indicators of AI use

If you see the following in student 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 – however some AI tools will produce quotations and references
- 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, 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, 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

(JCQ, 2023)



Quality, Training and Development Department

AI Use in Assessments

July 2023



Reporting

If your suspicions are validated, and the student has not signed the declaration of authentication, all centres must follow the guidance in section 4 of NCC Education Academic Misconduct Policy.

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.



References:

JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications. (n.d.). AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications. [online] Available at: <https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligence/>. (Accessed: 01 April 2023).

help.turnitin.com. (n.d.). AI Writing Detection. [online] Available at: <https://help.turnitin.com/ai-writing-detection.htm>. (Accessed 01 April 2023)

Regulatory references

This guide addresses the following regulatory conditions and criteria:

Qualification regulator or relevant governing body	Regulatory rule or guidance document	Regulatory condition, criteria, or principle
Ofqual	General conditions of Recognition	A8
Qualifications Wales	Standard Conditions of Recognition	A8