



USE OF AI POLICY

Policy Custodian: *Senior Master*

Approving Body: *MTS Senior Leadership Team*

Approved: *June 2024*

Next Review: *June 2025*

New AI technologies are emerging at an unparalleled rate. This in turn will require the School to review this policy on at least an annual basis or more often as new AI tools become available.

The focus of this policy is to ensure that pupils have created assessments in a manner that is fair and where needed transparent.

MTS will follow the guidance issued by JCQ when dealing with assessments submitted by all pupils when suspicions that unfair use of AI has occurred.

Summary:

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

This policy emphasises the following requirements:

Pupils who misuse AI such that the work they submit is not their own will have committed malpractice. In accordance with School rules, this may lead to severe sanctions. Where concerns have arisen, it may not be possible for the School to submit certain pieces of pupil work to the exam boards;

Pupils and their teachers 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 both internal and external 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;

Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the pupils' own;

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;

Pupils complete in class under close staff supervision with monitored access to the internet. However, it is also common practice for pupils to continue to produce their assessments outside of lesson time and it is at these times where the risk of the unfair use of AI tools is at its highest.

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.

In this context, the term assessment is used to mean pieces of work that include stand alone pieces of homework set by teachers for their pupils, pieces of work or projects undertaken by pupils which are intended for submission by one of the JCQ exam boards, pieces of work intended for submission for internal and external competitions and articles for publication that are both produced in-house and externally.

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 pupils 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://chat.openai.com>)
- 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 terms and conditions of all these AI chat bots require the users to be at least 13 years old. This means that pupils in the Third or Upper Third Form should not be set any assessments where use of the tools is required or even recommended. Several of these tools require the user to be capable of entering into a legal contract which raises the age of engagement to 18. At present the School does not allow pupil access to any AI tools and teachers need to keep in mind even older boys may not have access to the tools at home

The use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by pupils to complete qualification assessments. These 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.

The School requires that 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's important for pupils' progression that they do not rely on tools such as AI. Pupils 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 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.

Pupils need to be aware that their final mark may be affected if they have relied on AI to complete an assessment and the attainment that they have demonstrated in relation to the requirements of the qualification does not accurately reflect their own work.

Where concerns arise about the authenticity a piece of work submitted by a pupil, their teacher may wish to ask them questions pertaining to the detail within the assessment.

Teachers within departments must discuss the use of AI and agree their approach to managing pupils' use of AI in their school, college or exam centre. The School will make pupils 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.

Particular emphasis is placed on the following:

- Explaining the importance of pupils 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;
- The Schools follows JCQ guidance on malpractice and plagiarism to acknowledge the use of AI (e.g. what it is, the risks of using it, what AI misuse is, how this could be treated as malpractice, when it may be used and how it should be acknowledged);

- The School will offer pupils guidance on how to reference source materials appropriately (including websites);
- The School will follow JCQ guidance on malpractice and plagiarism includes clear guidance on how pupils should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse;
- The School will ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools;
- The School will ask pupil to re-sign upto the ICT Acceptable use policy to show they have understood what AI misuse is, and that it is forbidden at MTS;
- The School will ensure that each pupil is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents);
- The School will reinforce to pupils 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;
- The School will remind pupils that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice.

Acknowledging AI Use

It 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.

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 pupil has used AI tools, the teacher will need to consult or appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the pupil's own.

Further guidance on ways this could be done are set out in the JCQ *Plagiarism in Assessments* guidance document (see link below).

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

- Plagiarism in Assessments (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/);

- Instructions for conducting coursework (www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Coursework_ICC_22-23_FINAL.pdf);
- The Information for Candidates documents (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents).

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

- a) 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;
- b) 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.

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 pupils, either accidentally or intentionally. AI misuse, in that it involves a pupil 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 (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/).

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

To prevent misuse, additional education of staff and pupils will be undertaken.

- MTS will restrict on-site pupil access to online AI tools;
- MTS will ensure that access to online AI tools will be restricted on centre devices used for exams;
- MTS will set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and provide reminders;
- Where appropriate, MTS will 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;
- MTS will 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;
- MTS may 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;
- Teachers may engage pupils in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work;
- MTS will 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;
- MTS will aim to set 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 pupils requires the same skills and observation techniques that teachers are probably already using to assure themselves pupil work is authentically their own. Tools and methods that can be used are described below

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.

Potential indicators of AI use

If aspects from the non-exhaustive list are seen 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.

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 use a variety of words in their normal writing. One program uses this difference to statistically analyse written content and determine the likelihood that it was produced by AI:

- GPTZero (<https://gptzero.me/>)

In addition, the JCQ awarding organisations imply that AI detection will shortly be added to the existing tool Turnitin Originality (www.turnitin.com/products/originality).

This tool features an AI review of a pupil's work, reviewing a portfolio of evidence and, we understand, will indicate the likelihood of AI use. These tools could be used as a check on pupil work and/or to verify concerns about the authenticity of pupil 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 pupils. The quality of these detection tools can vary and AI and detection tools will continue to evolve. The use of detection tools should form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of pupils' work; all available information should be considered when reviewing any malpractice concerns.

Reporting

Teachers will not accept work which is not the pupil's own. In the case of public exams, ultimately the Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring that pupils do not submit inauthentic work. 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. The procedure is detailed in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>).