

# **GUIDANCE ON INTEGRITY AND THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS**

Guidance applies from EYFS to Sixth Form and to all staff

Date of review:	09.06.2023
Date of next review:	09.06.2024
Version:	06.23 v1
Author:	Mr Luke Goodman

**Clifton High School is committed to child protection and safeguarding children and young people and expects all staff, visitors, and volunteers to share this commitment.**

## **Related documents**

Exams

Exams - non-examination assessment

Pupil Acceptable use of ICT agreement

## **1. Introduction**

This guidance sets out the way in which Clifton High School will look to navigate the world of Artificial Intelligence within its delivery of an outstanding education; balancing its productive use with the maintenance of academic integrity, as well as offering guidance surrounding public examinations. This should be read in conjunction with JCQ guidance: [AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications](#).

## **2. Academic Integrity**

The goal of academic integrity is to make knowledge, understanding and thinking transparent. Pupils must also master the technical components of academic integrity, which includes learning how to correctly reference and ethically use information, sources, opinions and artificial intelligence (AI) tools. Such transparency needs to be taught and supported throughout the educational journey so that pupils understand how knowledge is constructed, and understand their own role in furthering knowledge construction and building understanding.

While technical proficiency is crucial, conceptual and ethical knowledge should come first. Recent technical advancements in AI tools have sparked some concerns in the educational community as pupils have the potential to use these tools to produce their assessments. It is important to remember that this is not new! Pupils have always been able to plagiarise and “cheat” by copying from sources without

reference. What we are seeing now, however, is how AI tools can effectively produce a unique essay (or other product) for the pupil from scratch—as an alternative or in addition to a pupil buying an essay from the internet or having a third party (such as a parent or tutor) write it for them. As is the case where another person writes an essay for a pupil, teachers are well placed to identify when it is not the pupil's own work.

### Teaching pupils about academic integrity

Opportunities created by AI tools reinforce that academic integrity is an ethical choice that pupils must make. Pupils cannot learn about acting with integrity by being given a list of rules for the examination room or learning a particular format for referencing. They learn by talking about what it means to act with academic integrity and seeing it role-modelled around them. To initiate a conversation about this topic, teachers could consider the links between our school values of empathy and love and the need for academic integrity, and in particular:

- how to reference and assign credit to the work of others
- in the arts, legitimately emulating a particular person's style and acting with academic integrity
- the scientific principle of testing another's hypothesis and acting with academic integrity.

The key message is that pupils need to be taught about academic integrity, and discussions about the ethical use of AI are a great classroom exercise.

### 3. AI tools and Assessments

Pupils complete the majority of their exams and a large number of other assessments under close staff supervision with limited access to authorised materials and no permitted access to the internet. The delivery of these assessments will be unaffected by developments in AI tools as pupils will not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments.

There are some assessments however in which access to the internet is permitted in the preparatory, research or production stages. The majority of these assessments will be Non-Examined Assessments (NEAs) for General Qualifications, coursework and internal assessments. This document is primarily intended to provide guidance in relation to these assessments.

**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.** The key term here is 'misuse'. In other words, AI is not banned by Clifton High School, but its proper use must be properly taught and this guidance sets out the expectations on pupils.

While the potential for pupil AI misuse is new, most of the ways to prevent its misuse and mitigate the associated risks are not.

As a School, we already have established measures in place to ensure that pupils are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential

malpractice. This guidance reminds teachers and assessors of best practice in this area, applying it in the context of AI use. The guidance emphasises the following requirements:

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/general-regulations/>), all work submitted for qualification assessments must be the pupils' own;
- Pupils 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 sanctions;
- Pupils and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice;
- Pupils 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 pupil 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 the use of AI' section below);
- Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the pupils' own (in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres); and
- Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of pupil 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.

#### 4. What constitutes AI misuse?

Pupils 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.

Pupils 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 pupils have been set. **Any use of AI which means pupils 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, it is important for pupils' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI. Pupils should develop 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 pupil is able to demonstrate that the final submission is the product of their own independent work and independent thinking.

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 pupil'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 pupil'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. Pupils' 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.

## 5. Acknowledging the use of AI

Clifton High School will not ban the use of AI software. The simplest reason is that it is the wrong way to deal with innovation. Over the next few years, the use of this kind of software will become as routine as calculators and translation programs. It is more sensible to adapt and teach pupils how to use these new tools **ethically**.

Pupils are expected to research a topic, and with today's technology that likely means starting with an internet search. AI may provide a starting text, but the pupil will need to understand how and why to refine the text to improve its impact. It therefore remains essential that pupils 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 pupil uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the pupil and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, pupils should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content - and then reference the sources they have used.

In addition to the above, where pupils 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 pupil'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 pupil 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.
- Submit this 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 pupil 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 pupil's own.

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

1. Pupils 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, pupils 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;
2. Pupils should also be reminded that if they use AI so that they have not independently met the marking criteria they will not be rewarded.

## 6. Identifying Misuse

Identifying the misuse of AI by pupils requires the same skills and observation techniques that teachers are probably already using to assure themselves pupil 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 pupil. 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)



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

## **Subjects with a significant coursework element**

For those subjects where coursework is still an important element, it may be advisable, (in addition to the education of pupils about plagiarism and the use of AI as outlined in this document), to:

1. **Allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each pupil's whole work with confidence;**
2. **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.** This is the fairest option for pupils, as identifying potential misuse of AI (or otherwise poorly referenced work) at an earlier stage allows the pupil the opportunity to put it right. As AI becomes ubiquitous pupils may not always be aware when they are relying on it;
3. **Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course, thereby making the teacher confident that the pupil understands the material;**
4. **Consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage pupils in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work;**
5. **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.**

## **Potential indicators of AI use**

If you see the following in pupil 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 be appropriate to 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 pupil in the classroom or in other previously submitted work;

- A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a pupil 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 pupil themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected;
- The inadvertent inclusion by pupils of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output;
- The submission of pupil 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.

*\*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, but be aware that AI tools have also been shown to invent non-existent academic papers/sources when asked to provide sources. These are known as 'hallucinations'. Teachers should be aware that these can appear very plausible.*