



Mullion School

Artificial Intelligence Policy

(Exams)

2024-2025

This policy is reviewed annually to ensure compliance with current regulations

Approved/reviewed by	
Spring 2025	
Date of next review	Spring 2026

Key staff involved in the policy

Role	Name(s)
Head of centre	Michelle Dunleavy
Exams Manager	S Reed
Senior leader(s)	<u>Michelle Dunleavy</u>
IT manager	D Harris

Introduction

With the increase in use of AI within the wider world this policy is in line with Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) guidelines and aims to provide some information and guidelines for use of staff.

Students complete the majority of their exam 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 students will not be able to use such tools when completing these assessments.

There are some assessments 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.

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 pupil's 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 AI Use section below);
- Teachers and assessors must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the pupil's 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.

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 that could 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 in development and there are often limitations to their use, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content.

AI chatbots are AI tools that 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 that they have been trained to use.

The chatbots generate responses that are statistically likely to be relevant and appropriate. AI chatbots can complete tasks such as the following:

Answering questions

- Analysing, improving and summerising text
- Authoring essays, articles, fiction and non-fiction
- Translating text from one language to another
- Writing computer code
- Generating new ideas, prompts or suggestions of a given theme or topic
- Generating text with specific attributes, such as tone, sentiment or formality.

Examples of Chatbots currently available include:

- 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>)

Gemini (<https://gemini.google.com/>)

Microsoft Bing AI (<https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/bing?ep=357&form=MA13MQ&es=31>)

Writesonic (<https://writesonic.com/chat/>)

Claude(<https://claude.ai/>)

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/>)

AI tools can also be used in the generation of music. Those available include:

Soundraw(<https://soundraw.io/>)

Wavtool(<https://wavtool.com/>)

Musicfy(<https://create.musicfy.lol/>)

The use of AI chatbots could pose significant risks if used by students completing qualification assessments. 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. They often produce answers that on the surface may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. There is also evidence to suggest that some AI chatbots are providing harmful and dangerous answers to questions asked. Some chatbots have also been identified as producing fake references to books and articles.

AI Misuse

AI misuse is where a student has used an AI tool but has not acknowledged the use of it and then submitted work for an assessment that was not their own. Students must be able to demonstrate that the final submission is a product of their own independent thinking and independent work.

Examples of AI Misuse include

- 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.

Communication

Mullion School will clearly communicate the policy to pupils through course materials, exam instructions and regular class \ assembly briefings

- We will explain the importance of students submitting their own independent work for assessment and stress to them and to their parents/carers the risk of malpractice.
- We will also ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools and their risks and AI detection tools.
- Ensure that, when students are using word processors or computers to complete assessments, teachers and centre staff are aware of how to disable improper internet/AI access when this is prohibited.
- Remind students that Awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice.
- Ensure that teachers are aware that they must not use AI tools as the sole marker of student work.

Detection Measures

Potential indicators of AI use

If you see the following in pupils' work, it may be an indication that they have 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 appropriate to the qualification level*
- c) 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)
- 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 pupil 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 pupil 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 pupil themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
- l) The inadvertent inclusion by pupils of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability.
- m) The submission of pupil 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, 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 pupil'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.

Prevention Strategies

Outline strategies for preventing unauthorised AI use, including:

- Invigilation during exams.
- Randomised question pools to discourage sharing.
- Automated detection from online programs such as OpenAI Classifier, GPTZero
- Use of secure exam platforms with AI detection capabilities.
- Designing coursework assignments that require critical thinking and personalized responses.
- Where internet access is permitted screen monitoring will be in place on devices to monitor the internet usage.
- restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;
- Ensuring 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, 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
- eExamine 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.

Reporting and Investigation

If your suspicions are confirmed and the pupil has not signed the declaration of authentication, the centre does not need to report the malpractice to the appropriate awarding organisation. We can resolve the matter prior to the signing of the declarations.

Teachers must not accept work that is not the pupil's own. 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/>).

Consequences

If a teacher suspects AI misuse, or if a pupil or member of the public has reported it, it must be reported immediately. The relevant awarding body will liaise with the Head of Centre regarding the next steps of the investigation and how appropriate evidence will be obtained.

The awarding body will then consider the case and, if necessary, impose a sanction in line with JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>).

The sanctions applied to a pupil committing plagiarism and making a false declaration of authenticity range from a warning regarding future conduct to disqualification and the pupil being barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time.

Awarding organisations will also take action, which can include the imposition of sanctions, where centre staff are knowingly accepting, or failing to check, inauthentic work for qualification assessments.

Compliance with JCQ Regulations

Mullion School are fully committed to complying with JCQ regulations and guidelines regarding the prevention of unauthorised AI use.

Review and Continuous Improvement

Mullion School are fully committed to regular reviews of the policy to adapt to evolving technologies and emerging best practices.