

The Business School (UK) Ltd has established procedures for identifying, reporting and investigating learner malpractice, including the misuse of Al.

The majority of The Business School complete their assessments on their own with no supervision. Hence it is vital that they understand their responsibilities regarding the use of Al and other methods of plagiarism.

The main points of our approach are:

- All work submitted for qualification assessments must be the Learners' own
- Learners who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, and may attract sanctions
- Assessors and tutors are aware of the risks of using AI and are clear on what constitutes malpractice
- Learners 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 learner 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
- Tutors and assessors will only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the Learners' own
- Where Assessors have doubts about the authenticity of learner work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI but this has not been acknowledged), they will investigate and take appropriate action.

WHAT IS AI USE AND WHAT ARE THE RISKS OF USING IT IN ASSESSMENTS?

Al use refers to the use of Al 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. Learners 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.

The use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by Learners 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.

Learner Responsibilities

Learners 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 Al tool, and that the content reflects their own independent work. Learners 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 Learners have been set. Any use of Al which means Learners have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice. While Al 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 Learners' progression that they do not rely on tools such as Al. Learners should develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying.

Al tools must only be used when the conditions of the assessment permit the use of the internet and where the learner 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:

- 1. Copying or paraphrasing sections of Al-generated content so that the work is no longer the learner's own
- 2. Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of Al-generated content
- 3. Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the learner's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations
- 4. Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information
- 5. Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools
- 6. Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

Al misuse constitutes malpractice – please refer to our Malpractice and Maladministration Policy. 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. Learners' 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.

Learning Centre Responsibilities

It is our responsibility to make Learners aware of the inappropriate use of AI, the risks of using AI, and the possible consequences of using AI inappropriately in a qualification assessment, and our approach to Plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.

We:

- 1. Explain the importance of Learners submitting their own independent work (a result of their own efforts, independent research, etc) for assessments and stress to them the risks of malpractice. This is done through our Preparation for Submission document (available on every module), Plagiarism Policy, Malpractice and Maladministration Policy all of which are provided clearly on the VLE.
- 2. Require all learners to complete a Cover Sheet for all assignments, confirming that the submitted is their own.
- 3. Continually review our policies and other available information to ensure we are current in our approach.
- 4. Provide information on how to reference work, and on the use of bibliographies this is contained within the Preparation for Submission document, included in every module delivered.
- 5. Ensure Tutors and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools.
- 6. Reinforce to Learners 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; and
- 7. Remind Learners that awarding organisation staff, moderators and internal quality assurers have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice.

The Use of AI by Learners

It remains essential that Learners 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 learner uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these



sources must be verified by the learner and referenced in their work in the normal way. Where an AI tool does not provide such details, Learners should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content – and then reference the sources they have used.

In addition to the above, where Learners use AI, they must acknowledge its use and show clearly how they have used it. This allows Tutors 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 learner'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 learner 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 tutor/assessor is able to review the work, the Al-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the teacher/assessor suspects that the learner has used Al tools, the teacher/assessor will need to consult the malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the learner's own. This may involve discussion with the Operations Director and/or the Awarding Organisation.

Learners are 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 Al use, Learners must be clear what is and what is not acceptable in respect of acknowledging Al content and the use of Al sources. For example, it would be unacceptable to simply reference 'Al' or 'ChatGPT', just as it would be unacceptable to state 'Google' rather than the specific website and webpages which have been consulted;

Learners are also reminded that if they use AI so that they have not independently met the marking criteria they will not be rewarded.

Areas of Concern, Misuse and Actions

While there may be benefits to using AI in some situations, there is the potential for it to be misused by Learners, either accidentally or intentionally. AI misuse, in that it involves a learner submitting work for qualification assessments which is not their own, is considered by the Business School to be a form of plagiarism.

Our approach is, and always has been, that we require our learners to demonstrate their ability to apply their learning into a real working environment, whether that is past or



present, or through the use of case studies. Assessors will always be looking for evidence of this, and it is highly unlikely that this could be presented through the use of Al content.

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

We will not accept, without further investigation, work which tutors or assessors 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 malpractice which can attract sanctions.

Our Approach to Assessment and the use of Al

At The Business School we have highly experienced and qualified tutors and assessors and they may utilise the following methods during assessment to ensure that no malpractice has occurred:.

• Comparison with previous work - Standardisation

When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, we often compare it against other work created by the learner or other learners. Where the work is made up of writing, one can make note of the following characteristics:

- a) Spelling and punctuation
- b) Grammatical usage
- c) Writing style and tone
- d) Vocabulary
- e) Complexity and coherency
- f) General understanding and working level
- g) The mode of production (i.e. software used)

A review of language

- 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 Al 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 Al



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 learner in other previously submitted work
- h) A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a learner has taken significant portions of text from Al 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 learner themself, or a workplace or scenario
- I) The inadvertent inclusion by Learners of warnings or provisos produced by Al to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output.
- m) The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching assignment structure within a single lengthy assignment, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an assignment several times to add depth, variety or to overcome its output limit
- n) The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
- o) Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style
- p) A lack of application into a working environment
- q) Assignment questions not being answered, or parts not answered. As an example, the question 'Describe the management structure in your own working environment, and explain the impact of this structure. ' is in two parts, and requires clear description and an explanation of your own thoughts on that structure. This cannot be answered by Al.

We may use automated detection tools as a check on learner work and/or to verify concerns about the authenticity of learner work.

If AI misuse is detected or suspected by the centre and the declaration of authentication has been signed, the case will be reported by The Business School to the relevant awarding organisation.

If AI misuse is suspected by an awarding organisation's moderator or examiner, or if it has been reported by a learner or member of the public, full details of the allegation will usually be relayed to the centre. 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. The sanctions applied to a learner committing plagiarism and making a false declaration of authenticity range from a warning regarding future conduct to disqualification and the learner being barred from entering for one or more assignments for a set period of time.