



Artificial Intelligence & Assessments Policy

| Version 1.0 |

Policy Commencement Date	04/06/2025
Policy Version	1.0
Review by	03/06/2026
Document Controller	Robert Longstaff
Signature	<i>R. Longstaff</i>

Contents page

Content	Page
1. Introduction	2
2. Artificial Intelligence in Assessment	2
3. Risk Management	2
4. Responsibilities	3
5. Prevention, Identification & Management of Potential Malpractice	3
6. AI Plagiarism Software	6
7. AI Plagiarism Checklist	6
8. Policy Review	6
Appendix A - AI/Plagiarism checklist	7

1. Introduction

1.1 Staff Power Training (SPT) is committed to reducing the potential risks of learner malpractice in assessment through the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI). SPT have a responsibility to ensure any learner evidence for the purpose of achieving a qualification is authentic. This Policy will support SPT in undertaking appropriate actions to mitigate the risk of malpractice.

2. Artificial Intelligence in Assessment

2.1 AI has been available commercially for several years within various applications based on decision making software provided with rules to apply to the input, this can be seen in 'chatbot' applications on websites and similar. Recently AI has evolved with new algorithms to use the entire world wide web and applying certain conditions to generate responses to input. These responses are impressively unique and well referenced with very little limitations.

- *Pros: AI is a very useful tool for trainers to refer learners to who are struggling with specific topics and require additional support to help them understand the subject matter from a variety of differing perspectives.*
- *Cons: Temptation is the biggest factor here, with AI having the ability to produce written answers to questions to a high degree of accuracy. When assessments are non-invigilated i.e., away from the classroom and completed in the confinements of the learner's own privacy and time, it is very difficult to be sure if a learner has used AI to produce some/all of their written answers.*

3. Risk Management

3.1 The Conditions of Recognition from Ofqual, CCEA and Qualifications Wales states:

- *G8.1 An awarding organisation must take all reasonable steps to ensure that, in relation to qualifications which it makes available –
(a) evidence generated by a Learner in an assessment is generated by that Learner (or includes evidence generated by that Learner as a contribution to group work)*

3.2 It is immediately evident that AI produced evidence is capable of passing scrutiny of Assessor, IQA and EQA Moderator assessment decisions under the VARCS process, this presents a distinct risk that GCoR G8.1(a) is not met.

3.3 The risk to SPT as a flow through of G8.1(a) is that if it is evident that a submitted assignment/portfolio is clearly and evidently AI generated, it will show that effective controls are not in place at SPT to check for learner malpractice, which may result in sanctions being imposed on SPT presenting a risk of awarding organisations not fulfilling their requirements to G8.1 (a).

3.4 Where SPT makes a claim for certification, where a learner has used AI to generate their evidence, SPT will have failed in its responsibilities. An investigation into this failure may need to be undertaken at a cost to SPT.

3.5 The process for a malpractice investigation and the potential outcomes are outlined in both SPT and awarding organisations malpractice and maladministration policy. Outcomes may include:

- *Withdrawal of the learner*
- *Revoking of certificates for previous learners*
- *Sanctions applied to the centre which may include:*
 - o *Withdrawal of an assessor/IQA*
 - o *Withdrawal of approval for one or more qualifications*
 - o *Withdrawal of centre approval*

3.6 Awarding organisations are also required under Conditions of Recognition from Ofqual, CCEA and Qualifications Wales (A8.7) to inform other AOs of such sanctions. This may affect SPT's ability to offer qualifications through other AO.

4. Responsibilities

4.1 SPT are responsible for:

- *Ensure it has suitable resources to undertake the delivery and assessment of the qualifications*
- *Only submit claims for certification that are valid and based on authentic evidence.*

4.2 Assessors are responsible for:

- *Assessing learners in a consistent manner, regardless of the learner*
- *Basing assessment decisions on the evidence being valid, current, authentic (to the learner), reliable and sufficient.*
- *Preventing malpractice; e.g. by informing learners of what constitutes malpractice/mal administration including plagiarism and the use of AI.*
- *Identifying any potential cases of malpractice, including the unauthorised use of AI to generate assessment evidence.*

4.3 Internal Quality Assurers are responsible for:

- *Ensuring the assessor and SPT compliance with their responsibilities*
- *Through effective quality management, ensuring SPT, its staff and its learners do not put SPT at risk of malpractice.*

5. Prevention, Identification & Management of Potential Malpractice

5.1 Prevention: SPT is responsible for preventing malpractice in the first instance.

The following can be considered as preventative actions:

- *Undertake a risk assessment of the likelihood that learners will use AI and how this can be controlled.*
- *Consider the use of invigilated or supervised assessments or samples*
- *Adding 'warnings' to joining instructions*
- *Issuing a SPT policy on the inappropriate use of AI to all learners*

- *Ensuring the inappropriate use of AI forms part of the ‘housekeeping’ arrangements provided at the start of the course*
- *Training and supervising staff in their responsibilities related to the prevention, identification and management of (potential) cases of malpractice.*
- *Ensure teaching is effective and supported by formative assessment to ensure learners are progressing with their learning.*
- *Allow time for sufficient portions of work to be completed in classroom time under the direct supervision of the assessor, who can then authenticate the learner’s evidence.*
- *Set realistic deadlines for submission of assessment evidence.*

5.2 Identifying malpractice: There are a series of checks that can allow an Assessor/IQA to critically analyse the assessment evidence and reach a decision based on a balance of probabilities. It has to be as such as it remains impossible to an outright confirmation currently until such point as AI builds in hidden metadata into its scripts.

- *Check 1 – Baseline text. Comparison of learner’s writing style between an authentically verified passage of writing vs non invigilated submission allows the reviewer the ability to identify if there is an evident change of writing style. An authentically verified passage of writing shall be known as the ‘baseline text’.*
- *Check 2 – Sufficiency Although this is a requirement under standard assessment criteria, learner’s have their own unique levels in relation to the depth of answer they will produce. This also is referred to as the ‘pen fatigue point’ in other academic circles i.e. The learner becomes bored or wishes to wrap up their answer after a period of time unique to themselves based on their enthusiasm for the subject, focus and sometimes their lifestyle. Changes to look for are situations when a learner typically lacks succinctness to suddenly producing answers directly to the point, or conversely, a learner who typically produces a sentence or two now producing 1000 words per answer.*
- *Check 3 – Reliability This word is used with a variety of meanings within assessment, typically it relates to the assessment decision being standardised, however relating to AI it refers to the reliability of the reference sources. Where a passage of text includes a reference or list of references at the end, the first question raised is ‘does this learner usually use references?’ as an immediate indicator of a change of writing style. Moving on from this it is important to check any reference sources provided as AI tends to find web pages which are often inaccurate or inaccessible. The reason for this is provided under ‘Currency’.*
- *Check 4 – Currency, public source AI is limited upto 2021, therefore unable to provide current information in relation to recent events, topics, or legislation. Some AI source data is ‘offline’ meaning it is a snapshot of the available documents on the worldwide web at the time it was captured to load into*

offline servers, this is why some of the links within references fail especially if the source has been updated since 2021.

- *Check 5 – Probing Questions Professional discussions have played a part in assessment for a long time to support written evidence or in some cases to replace as an assessment method. They are a valid tool to use and have several merits as well as drawbacks; the opportunity they provide in building a picture of likelihood is that they allow the assessor/IQA to find out if the learner really understands the question by exploring opinions, viewpoints, applications, and learner feelings about an issue. Questions such as ‘why did you say this’, ‘tell me more about why you think this is the case’ or ‘where else is this used’ are all examples of probing a learner response further via a professional discussion to identify if the depth of knowledge is there, or if it appears the learner does not have the knowledge to have provided the answer submitted.*

5.3 Building the picture: Now the checks have been completed, analysis of the outcomes needs to be completed to reach a determination based on the balance of probabilities with weight being added if a check results in a positive indicator.

No of indicators	Outcome
5	Almost 100% certainty
4	90% certainty
3	80% certainty
2	70% certainty
1	60% certainty

In some ways the % is irrelevant as the Assessor though to the moderator at the AO need to be 100% confident in all cases the learner evidence is authentically theirs, however the above does provide a guide to how strong the grounds are to refer the work back to the learner, or indeed raise a learner malpractice case to be handled internally at the centre. Each incident of a learner raising an indicator/s needs to be investigated on a case-by-case basis as some of the indicators may have a perfectly justifiable reason behind them, however the more indicators present, the less likely that will be.

5.4 Actions to take if AI misuse has been identified: Where an assessor has identified potential malpractice they should:

- *Ensure the learner is not submitted the AO for certification/moderation.*
- *Report the event to their IQA who will undertake further checks to support or reject the assessor’s decision. Checks may include use of plagiarism checkers, review of the evidence or a professional discussion with the learner.*
- *Report the event to the AO and outline actions being taken to mitigate the effect.*

Where evidence has been reviewed and the learner, on the balance of probabilities has been deemed to have submitted work generated by AI, the Assessor/IQA should consider the following:

- *Remind the learner of the SPT policy in regard to the event and that the learner may be withdrawn from programme and issued with a copy of the appeals policy.*
- *If a second submission is allowed, SPT may wish to undertake stricter controls, for example hold an invigilated assessment where learners complete their assignments in the classroom.*
- *Assess learners for a sample of learning outcomes using video and audio recorded professional discussions.*

6. AI Plagiarism Software

6.1 There are some options available on the market to assist with this process which have varying degrees of capability for detecting passages of work produced by AI. AO's do not endorse any particular brand, however they do support its use to substitute any of the 5 checks or used as an addition depending on the scope of the software.

6.2 In all cases the software cannot be relied upon independently to provide a decision and should be used as an indicator towards likelihood to build a picture as part of the balance of probability, on which the assessor/IQA is required to base their (now informed) decisions.

7. AI/Plagiarism Checklist

7.1 Appendix A of this guide is 'SPT AI/Plagiarism Checklist', this can be used as evidence that the appropriate checks and balances are taking place when delivering qualifications which contain short answer questions, essays or assignments. The checklist is designed to produce as minimal burden as possible yet provide evidence that SPT is robustly monitoring for this type of risk to the integrity of qualifications.

7.2 While assessors should be checking for use of AI or plagiarism, SPT do not expect each and every learner in a cohort to have a recorded check for AI misuse or plagiarism, however as a minimum, 30% or two learners, whichever is greater can have their checks recorded.

7.3 SPT strongly recommend that, where an assessor has a suspicion of misuse of AI or plagiarism, the checklist is completed in order to provide evidence to the IQA or EQA.

7.4 The checklist is to be added to the course documentation when submitting it the IQA/EQA, a copy should be retained by SPT within their records for that particular qualification.

8. Policy Review

12.1 This policy will be reviewed annually, or more frequently if there are significant changes in legislation, working practices, or following any related incidents.

Appendix A

AI/Plagiarism Checklist

Centre Name	
Assessor Name	
Qualification	
Learner Name	
Assessment Date	
Checks Completed by	

Check	Description	Level of Confidence <i>(circle)</i>				
		1	2	3	4	5
Check 1 – Baseline Text	Comparison between baseline and submitted work.	1	2	3	4	5
Check 2 – Sufficiency	Variation in quantity of input by learner for similar question types	1	2	3	4	5
Check 3 – Reliability	Are any references used valid/traceable?	1	2	3	4	5
Check 4 – Currency	Is the work current? i.e., using post 2021 best practice/legislation where appropriate	1	2	3	4	5
Check 5 – Probing Questions	Is the learner able to explore a topic at a greater depth than just the text within their submission?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Level of Confidence: 1 = No indicators of AI misuse/plagiarism, 5= Strong indicators of AI misuse/plagiarism</i>						

Balance of probability		Tick
No Risk Identified	There are no positive indicators in relation to AI misuse and I am confident the submitted evidence is entirely that of the learner	
Medium Risk	There are some possible indicators, and I will discuss these with the learner to establish if there is a plausible reason for these indicators	
High Risk	It is highly likely that some/all of the learner evidence has been AI generated, and I will refer the work back to the learner/invoke our learner malpractice policy	

Final Outcome - Following any interventions <i>(if any)</i>	Tick
No identified risk, proceed to submit to AO for moderation	
Indicators have been resolved as plausible reasons, submit to AO for moderation	
Learner has resubmitted their evidence under supervision, submit to AO for moderation	
Learner has been withdrawn from the cohort for malpractice	