The Priory School of Our Lady Of Walsingham

Artificial Intelligence Policy

Reviewed by: Executive Committee

On: ………………………………

Next review due: September 2024

Signature of Principal ………………………………..

Introduction

Although artificial intelligence (AI) has been in use for a while, the inappropriate use of AI by pupils continues to grow, and most of the strategies to prevent such misuse and manage the resulting risks are not mitigating these risks. However, there are existing measures in place to educate pupils on the significance of submitting their original work and to detect possible academic misconduct. This document provides guidance on how to apply best practices in the context of AI usage.

The guidance emphasises the following requirements:

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with Priory School malpractice policy, all work submitted by pupils must be the pupils' own work.
- Pupils who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice and may attract severe sanctions if there is sufficient evidence to prove that AI generation has been used.
- Pupils and 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 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 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 as per Priory School's Malpractice Policy.

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. 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://chatgbt.net/chatgpt-login/)
- 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 use of AI chatbots may pose significant risks if used by pupils completing qualification assessments.

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.

What is AI misuse?

As has always been the case, and in accordance with Priory School's Malpractice Policy, all work submitted by pupils must be the pupils' own work. The use of AI has the potential to improve learning outcomes, personalise education, and make education more accessible to pupils from diverse backgrounds. However, as with any technology, there is the potential for misuse and unintended consequences.

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 not rely on tools such as AI. Pupils should develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subjects they are studying.

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 must demonstrate that their assessments are their own. This means both ensuring that the final product is in their own words and if using sources they follow the Harvard Referencing System.

Any use of AI which means pupils have not independently demonstrated their own attainment is likely to be considered malpractice.

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.

Priory School's engagement with and discussion of AI

Within Priory School's exam procedures, it is made clear that pupils must authenticate their assessments and when taking exams. It is imperative that teachers and pupils address the risks associated with AI misuse.

At Priory School, teachers, assessors and other staff discuss the use if AI and have agreed in conjunction with other policies, the approach to managing pupils use of AI.

Priory School 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. Pupils are made aware of Priory School's approach to plagiarism and the consequences of malpractice.

Priory School's does the following:

- Explains the importance of pupils submitting their own independent work for assessments and stress the risks of malpractice
- Ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection
- Ask pupils to sign a declaration, where appropriate, that they have understood what AI misuse is, and that it is forbidden in certain areas of their courses
- 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
- Remind pupils that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice

Acknowledging AI Use

It is crucial for pupils to understand the significance of referencing the sources they have utilised while creating work for an assessment, and to possess the knowledge of how to do so correctly. Proper referencing serves as a means of exhibiting academic honesty and is fundamental in upholding the integrity of assessments. In the event that a pupil employs an AI tool that supplies information regarding the sources it has utilised in generating content, the pupil must authenticate and reference those sources in the same manner as usual.

In addition, it is imperative that pupils utilising AI technology disclose its use and provide a clear demonstration of how it has been employed. This allows teachers to review the appropriateness of AI usage in the context of a specific assessment. This is particularly crucial given that content generated by AI is not held to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.

In instances where AI tools have been utilised as a source of information, it is essential that the pupil acknowledges the AI source used and includes the date the content was generated, for instance, *"ChatGPT 3.5 (https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/), 25/01/2023"*. The pupil must retain a copy of the questions and computer-generated content for reference and verification purposes in a non-editable format, such as a screenshot.

Furthermore, the pupil must provide a concise explanation of how the content was utilised. All this information must be submitted with the work so that the teacher/assessor can review the work, AI- generated content, and how it has been employed.

If this information is not submitted and the teacher/assessor suspects that the pupil has used AI tools, they must refer to the centre's malpractice policy to determine appropriate steps and take action to verify that the work is the pupil's own.

When it comes to acknowledging AI use, other measures that should be taken into consideration include:

- Pupils should be reminded that poor referencing, paraphrasing, or copying sections of text from any source, including AI-generated content, may constitute malpractice and may result in severe sanctions, such as disqualification. Therefore, pupils must understand what is and what is not acceptable regarding acknowledging AI content and the use of AI sources. For instance, it is unacceptable to reference 'AI' or 'ChatGPT' without specifying the particular AI tool used, just as it is unacceptable to state 'Google' rather than identifying the specific website and web pages consulted.
- Pupils should also be reminded that if they use AI in a way that does not allow them to independently meet 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. To prevent misuse, education and awareness of staff and pupils is likely to be key.

Here are some actions which are being taken:

- Restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks where appropriate
- Ensuring that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams
- Setting reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders
- Where appropriate, allocating 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
- Examining 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
- Introducing classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident that the pupil understands the material
- Considering 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
- Not accepting, 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.

Detecting AI Misuse

Detecting the misuse of AI by pupils necessitates the same skills and observation techniques that teachers are already using to ensure that pupil work is genuine. Furthermore, some tools can aid in this process.

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)

There are many online plagiarism checkers that now include checks for AI. Where necessary, these will be used, and a report created with the findings. Staff must report any suspected AI generated content. The Head of Centre, in conjunction with the Exams Office, must then formatively investigate and provide details and actions taken via a written report.

For **all** identified or any suspicions that AI generation has been used by any pupil, Priory School should follow the Malpractice Policy. The Head of Centre will have a formative conversation with the pupil concerned to determine whether they have used AI not to impose any penalties on exams or assessments unless this is proven.

Other 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 appropriate to the qualification level

- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected – however some AI tools will produce quotations and references
- 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 themself, 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

Reporting

If suspicions are validated, and the pupil has <u>not</u> signed the declaration of authenticity, internal procedures will be followed.

Teachers must not accept work which is not the pupil's own. Ultimately the Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring that pupils do not submit inauthentic work.

References

JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications. Available at: https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/artificial-intelligece/

Authorised by the Principal, Mr David EJJ Lloyd   **September 2023**