

# SoundSkool Music

## Malpractice, Maladministration and Plagiarism Policy and Procedure

<b>Last Review Date</b>	26 <sup>th</sup> August 2025
<b>Review Date</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> August 2026
<b>Reviewed By</b>	Pamela Christie/Simon Gordon
<b>Amendments Made Since Last Review Date</b>	Formatting and reviewing dates



## Contents

1.0 Scope and Purpose .....	3
1.1 Intended Audience .....	3
1.2 Review Arrangements .....	3
2.0 Introduction .....	3
2.1 The objectives of the policy: .....	3
3.0 Definitions .....	4
3.1 Malpractice .....	4
3.1.1 Examples of Malpractice .....	4
3.2 Maladministration .....	5
3.2.1. Examples of Maladministration .....	5
3.3 Plagiarism .....	5
3.3.1. Examples of Plagiarism .....	5
3.3.2 AI use in assessments .....	6
3.3.2 Cases of Plagiarism .....	6
3.3.4 Procedure to deal with plagiarism .....	8
3.3.5 Appeal .....	9
4.0 Procedures .....	9
4.1 Detection of MMP .....	9
4.2 Management of MMP .....	10
4.3 Confidentiality and Whistleblowing .....	10
4.4 Investigating MMP .....	10
4.4.1. Responsibility for the Investigation .....	10
4.4.2. Notifying Relevant Parties .....	11
4.4.3. Investigation Timelines and Summary Process .....	12
4.4.4. Investigation Report .....	13
5.0 Associated Policies/Documents .....	13
6.0 Appendix- What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments .....	14

## **1.0 Scope and Purpose**

Incidents of malpractice/maladministration can potentially lead to students being disadvantaged, can require the conducting of costly and time-consuming investigations and may cause reputational damage to the company. It is, therefore, desirable to prevent malpractice or maladministration from occurring, whenever possible. Where it is not possible to prevent this, cases of suspected or actual malpractice/maladministration should be dealt with quickly, thoroughly and effectively.

This policy has been prepared with reference to the rubric and terminology contained in Ofqual's General Conditions of Recognition, and policy guidance from awarding bodies.

### **1.1 Intended Audience**

SoundSkool' staff and associates, delivery partners and other contractors and students.

### **1.2 Review Arrangements**

SoundSkool will review the policy annually as part of our annual self-evaluation procedures and revise it as and when necessary, in response to staff and student feedback, changes in our practices, actions from the regulatory authorities, including Awarding Organisations, Funding Agencies and or external agencies, changes in legislation, or trends identified from previous allegations. In addition, this policy may be updated considering operational feedback to ensure our arrangements for dealing with suspected cases of MMP remain effective.

## **2.0 Introduction**

This policy applies to internal and external summative assessments, assignments and examinations and their reporting.

It the responsibility of all staff to be vigilant with regard to any events which may lead to malpractice / maladministration occurring, and report promptly to the Head of College where they suspect malpractice / maladministration has and /or may occur so that appropriate action can be taken to address this with immediate effect.

A member of SMT is responsible for notifying relevant awarding bodies of cases of suspected / actual malpractice and maladministration to ensure the appropriate action may be taken.

### **2.1 The objectives of the policy:**

- To identify and minimise the risk of malpractice by staff or students.
- To identify and minimise the risk of maladministration by staff.
- To respond to any incident promptly and objectively.
- To standardise and record any investigation to ensure openness and fairness.
- To impose appropriate penalties and/or sanctions on students or staff where incidents (or attempted incidents) are proven.
- To protect the integrity of the company and awarding bodies.

In order to do this we will:

- Seek to avoid potential malpractice by using the induction period and the student handbook to inform students of the policy on malpractice and the penalties for attempted and actual incidents of malpractice;
- Show students the appropriate formats to record cited texts and other materials or information sources.

- Ask students to declare that their work is their own.
- Ask students to provide evidence that they have interpreted and synthesised appropriate information and acknowledged any sources used.
- Conduct any investigations in a form commensurate with the nature of any allegation.
- Ensure the handling of individual cases takes account of the needs of the student, including those arising from protected characteristics.

### **3.0 Definitions**

#### **3.1 Malpractice**

Malpractice is essentially any activity or practice which deliberately contravenes regulations and compromises the integrity of the internal or external assessment process and/or the validity of certificates. It covers any deliberate actions, neglect, default or other practice that compromises, or could compromise:

- The assessment process
- The integrity of a regulated qualification
- The validity of a result or certificate
- The reputation and credibility of SoundSkool
- The reputation and credibility of any awarding and/or assessment organisations with which the bodies work
- The qualification or the wider qualifications

Malpractice may include a range of issues from the failure to maintain appropriate records or systems to the deliberate falsification of records in order to claim certificates. For the purpose of this policy the term also covers misconduct and forms of unnecessary discrimination or bias towards certain or groups of students.

##### **3.1.1 Examples of Malpractice**

The examples of malpractice given below are illustrative and do not provide exhaustive descriptions of the form's malpractice can take.

Persistent instances of maladministration within SoundSkool following.

- Notification, warning, or reasonable assumption to have known about it and continued with it.
- Denial of access to premises, records, information, students and staff to any awarding and/or assessment organisations and/or the regulatory authorities.
- Failure to carry out invigilation, internal assessment, internal moderation or internal verification in accordance with SoundSkool requirements- inclusive failure to complete proper and robust checks for plagiarism in student work including AI, or failure to act on found instances.
- Deliberate failure to adhere to SoundSkool student registration and certification procedures.
- Deliberate failure to maintain appropriate auditable records, e.g. examination registration/certification claims and/or forgery of evidence.
- Fraudulent claim for certificates.
- The unauthorised use of inappropriate materials/equipment in assessment settings (e.g. mobile phones).
- Collusion or permitting collusion in examinations and/or assessments.
- Students still working towards qualifications after certification claims have been made.

- Deliberate contravention by an Assessor/ Tutor/ IQA and/or its students of the assessment arrangements specified for qualifications.
- A loss, theft of, or a breach of confidentiality in, any assessment materials.
- Unauthorised amendment, copying or distributing of examination/assessment papers/materials.
- Inappropriate assistance to students (e.g. unfairly helping them to achieve a unit or qualification).
- Deliberate submission of false information to gain a qualification or unit.

### 3.2 Maladministration

Maladministration is any activity or practice which results in non-compliance with administrative regulations and requirements and includes the application of persistent mistakes or poor administration (e.g. inappropriate student records).

#### 3.2.1. Examples of Maladministration

The examples of maladministration given below are illustrative and do not provide exhaustive descriptions of the form's maladministration can take.

- Persistent failure to adhere to SoundSkool student registration and certification procedures.
- Persistent failure to adhere to SoundSkool qualification requirements and/or apprenticeship requirements and/or associated actions.
- Late student registrations (both infrequent and persistent).
- Unreasonable delays in responding to requests and/or communications from external providers.
- Inaccurate claim for certificates.
- Failure to maintain appropriate auditable records, e.g. certification claims and/or forgery of evidence.
- Withholding of information, by deliberate act or omission, which is required to assure Awarding Organisations, external providers of SoundSkool's and associated third parties' ability to deliver qualifications, assessments and apprenticeships appropriately.
- Misuse of the SoundSkool logo and trademarks or misrepresentation of a delivery partner's relationship with the SoundSkool.
- Failure to adhere to, or to circumnavigate, the requirements of SoundSkool Assessment Policy.

### 3.3 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined in the Oxford Dictionary as *"the practice of taking someone else's work or ideas and passing them off as one's own"*.

#### 3.3.1. Examples of Plagiarism

The examples of plagiarism given below are illustrative and do not provide exhaustive descriptions of the form's plagiarism can take.

- Plagiarism of any nature.
- Collusion by working collaboratively with other students to produce work that is submitted as individual student work.
- Copying (including the use of ICT to aid copying and AI)
- Deliberate destruction of another's work.

- Fabrication of results or evidence.
- False declaration of authenticity in relation to the contents of a portfolio or coursework.
- Impersonation by pretending to be someone else in order to produce the work for another or arranging for another to take one's place in an assessment/examination/test.
- Inappropriate behaviour during an internal assessment that causes disruption to others. This includes shouting and/or aggressive behaviour or language and having an unauthorised electronic device that causes a disturbance in the examination room.
- Inclusion of inappropriate, offensive, discriminatory or obscene material in assessment evidence. This includes vulgarity and swearing that is outside of the context of the assessment, or any material of a discriminatory nature.
- Frivolous content - producing content that is unrelated to the examination paper/question in scripts or coursework.
- Unauthorised aids - physical possession of unauthorised materials (including mobile phones, MP3 players, notes, etc) in the examination room.

### 3.3.2 AI use in assessments.

While the potential for Student artificial intelligence (AI) misuse is new, most of the ways to prevent its misuse and mitigate the associated risks are not, there are measures in place to ensure that students are aware of the importance of submitting their own independent work for assessment and for identifying potential malpractice.

- Students 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.
- Students must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice.
- Students 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 student, 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.
  - Where tutors/trainers have doubts about the authenticity of student 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.

### 3.3.2 Cases of Plagiarism

Procedure to deal with plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct will vary according to the type of case.

#### 3.3.2.1 *minor cases,*

The person carrying out the procedure will usually be the tutor/trainer

If moderate or severe cases are suspected, then the procedure should be carried out by a member of the Head of College.

Examples of minor cases could include a student:

- Receiving undue help in good faith because instructions have been misunderstood.

- Copying a couple of sentences or using part of someone else's diagrams.
- Copying small amounts of text from books without direct acknowledgement, but which does not make a significant contribution to the overall work.
- Downloading small amounts from the internet without acknowledgement
- Using ideas or part of another's artwork without acknowledgement.
- Not referencing work properly
- Failing to acknowledge the source of a small section of an assignment.
- Infringing the policy when the assessed work does not contribute to final grade.

#### 3.3.2.2 moderate cases

- Copying from books without acknowledgement which has the effect of making a significant contribution to the overall work.
- Limited plagiarism from professional work (not course books).
- Limited copying of other candidates' works or excessive help within one piece of work.
- Limited downloading of information from the internet
- The use of model answers downloaded from the internet.
- Infringing the policy when the assessed work contributes to final grade.
- Repeated minor cases.

#### 3.3.2.3 serious cases:

- Extensive copying of textbooks in one piece of work or limited copying in two or more pieces of work which makes a significant contribution to the work/s.
- Extensive plagiarism of professional works (more than 100 words)
- Buying, selling or stealing of work.
- Repeated evidence of extensive use of information from the internet without acknowledgement
- Using model internet answers
- Using past candidates' work from previous years.
- Undue help from outside of SoundSkool.
- Repeated moderate cases.

Students must ensure all coursework is in their own words, unless they are quoting a referenced source. If an assessor doubts the work is the students own, he/she will ask a student to explain their work, and the student should be able to do so to the satisfaction of the assessor.

- Credit work that is not their own regardless of where the ideas came from.
- Not share their coursework/assignments with other students where it could lead to a student being accused of collusion.
- Never use services that are available from the internet and offer to provide students with coursework materials for a fee.
- Understand the meaning of plagiarism and the potential consequences of submitting work that is not their own.

The awarding bodies issue strict guidelines that both assessors and students must adhere to.

Tutors/trainers must authenticate the students work by:

- Paying attention to any changes in writing style that may indicate that a student is using text from several authors.
- Paying attention to changes in font styles and sizes, and random hyperlinks.
- Asking the student to explain what they have written.
- Checking phrases using a search engine when in doubt
- Checking coursework using plagiarism detection software where available.

#### 3.3.4 Procedure to deal with plagiarism.

Where SoundSkool discovers or suspects an individual, or individuals, of plagiarism or collusion it will conduct an investigation in a form commensurate with the nature of the malpractice allegation.

Such an investigation will be initially undertaken by the IQA who will interview all personnel linked to the allegation and report to the Head of College.

Action to be taken by staff if plagiarism is believed to be proven beyond reasonable doubt with direct reference to the parent text or other evidence, and/or is admitted by Student. If the Student admits misconduct:

- Arrange a meeting with the student to hear his/her comments. T
- The investigating member of staff determines the level of seriousness of the incident and considers the appropriate action.

If a minor case is identified, the member of staff may choose one or more of the following at their discretion:

- Discuss the incident with the student.
- Warn the student about future conduct.
- Allow the student to re-sit an exam/test or resubmit an assessed piece of work if this is allowed by the awarding body's procedures.
- If this is not the first instance, refer directly to a second stage interview.

If a moderate case is identified, staff may elect to:

- Withdraw the right of the student to re-sit an exam/test or resubmit an assessed piece of work.
- Refer the case immediately to a second stage interview (at the discretion of the investigating member of staff)
- This will be with a member of the Head of College who will recommend an appropriate sanction.

If a serious case is identified, staff are entitled to:

- Withdraw the right of the student to re-sit the exam or test or withdraw the right to resubmit work for assessment.
- Disqualify the student from the course with SMT approval.

In all cases of misconduct, the Head of College should:

- Notify the awarding organisation, in line with their procedures.
- Inform external examiners/verifiers in line with awarding organisation's procedures.

JCQ (Joint Council for Qualifications) guidelines state that: “Centres should not normally give credit for any work submitted which is not the candidate’s own work.” Therefore, a mark should not be given to the student

SoundSkool will make the individual(s) aware (preferably in writing) at the earliest opportunity of the nature of the alleged malpractice and of possible consequences should malpractice be proven.

The investigation will follow the Disciplinary Policy process and the Chair will issue one of the following findings:

- No case to answer – in this incidence the submitted work will be assessed and verified following the company and awarding body procedures.
- Allegation upheld – in this incidence the student may be: Given the opportunity to submit a completely new piece of work and will receive a not competent or fail for the plagiarised work. However, the student will not be permitted any more attempts than provided to an honest student.

If the student fails to submit a new piece of work in the agreed timescale or produces work that is judged unsatisfactory; the student will not be permitted to continue with the course.

The student will be accredited with any completed units if appropriate to do so and in accordance with the awarding body guidelines.

The student will receive notice of the decision **within seven working days**.

### 3.3.5 Appeal

The student will have a right to appeal the decision. Notice of appeal must be made in writing and addressed to SLT. The appeal will be heard within fifteen working days, with the student receiving at seven working days’ notice of the time and place of the appeal interview. The student will be entitled to be accompanied by a friend or relative. The decision of the appeal will be confirmed in writing to the student within seven working days.

## **4.0 Procedures**

### 4.1 Detection of MMP

There may be a number of reasons why MMP occurs, and they can be detected in a number of different ways during the normal course of training, assessment and examinations including:

- 4.1.1. Observation – where they have been witnessed by someone (or a number of people) doing something they feel is inappropriate and they report it.
- 4.1.2. Word of Mouth – someone is told that something has happened, or is happening that is inappropriate, and it is reported.
- 4.1.3. Thorough Professional Identification – where, for example, a Tutor, Assessor, Internal Verifier, External Verifier, or Examiner identifies that students’ answers or assessments are exactly the same or they believe the work has been plagiarised. Alternately an Invigilator in an exam may witness people talking, copying or passing notes or using mobile phones.

## 4.2 Management of MMP

Anyone associated with SoundSkool, especially centre employees and associates, delivery partners and other contractors, and students who identify or who are made aware of suspected or actual cases of MMP at any time must notify a member of SLT not more than 5 working days after the event and where possible include the following information at a minimum:

- Full details of anyone suspected of being involved: names, job roles (including if they are students), their registration numbers, and employer's name.
- Details of the qualification(s) affected, or the apprenticeship involved.
- A full description of the suspected or actual malpractice, maladministration, or plagiarism, associated dates and times together with the location and/or sites where the events are alleged to have taken place.
- Names and contact details of any witnesses.
- Any supporting evidence.

When SoundSkool identifies that suspected or actual MMP has occurred it must always follow the procedures published by the Awarding Organisations and Regulators with which it works and notify these bodies of the alleged MMP in writing within 2 working days. All suspected cases of MMP will be reported to the SLT and entered the SoundSkool' MMP Log.

## 4.3 Confidentiality and Whistleblowing

Sometimes the individual making an allegation of MMP may wish to remain anonymous. Whilst it is preferable for the whistle-blower to reveal their identity and contact details to SoundSkool, if the informant has concerns over this, a request to the Company can be made not to divulge their identity. Such requests will be respected by if to do so would be a breach of confidentiality and/or other legal duties – see SoundSkool' Whistleblowing Policy. Whilst SoundSkool is prepared to investigate cases which are reported to us anonymously and/or by whistle-blowers, we will always attempt to confirm, through investigation, the validity of the allegations made.

## 4.4 Investigating MMP

### 4.4.1. Responsibility for the Investigation

**Investigations will adhere to the following principles:**

- **Confidentiality** – by their very nature investigations usually necessitate access to information that is confidential to a centre or individuals. All material collected as part of an investigation must be kept secure and not normally disclosed to any third parties (other than the regulators or the police, where appropriate).
- **Impartiality** - investigations will be undertaken by a senior manager and assessed against the specific facts/evidence of the case in arriving at a decision about intention and culpability.
- **Rights of individuals** – where an individual is suspected of malpractice they should be informed of the allegation made against them (preferably in writing) and the evidence that supports the allegation. They should be provided with the opportunity to consider their response to the allegation and submit a written statement or seek advice, if they wish to. They should also be informed of what the possible

consequences could be if the malpractice is proven and of the possibility that other parties may be informed.

- **Staff Interviews** - these interviews should be carried out in line with policy and procedures. Staff may request that they are accompanied by a friend or colleague and these requests should be processed in line with the company and/or awarding body policy.
- **Student Interview** - where a student is to be interviewed and they are a minor or vulnerable adult, SoundSkool should consider the need to have a parent or representative present or to have the permission of a parent prior to the interview taking place.
- **Retention and storage of evidence and records** – all relevant documents and evidence should be retained in line with the awarding body and the companies stated policy and procedures.
- **Decisions and action plans** – all conclusions and decisions should be based on evidence. A course of proposed action should be identified, agreed between SoundSkool and the awarding body, implemented and monitored to the point of completion. The actions should address the improvements that are required to SoundSkool's policies and procedures as well as any action that is related to staff or other resources.
- **Proportionality** - any decision on the outcome must reflect the weight of evidence and the minor or major nature of the case – the student does not have to admit malpractice.

In accordance with regulatory requirements all suspected cases of MMP will be considered promptly by SoundSkool to establish if MMP has occurred. SoundSkool will take all reasonable steps to prevent any adverse effect from occurring as defined by the regulators. All reports received of suspected cases of MMP will be acknowledged, as appropriate, to external parties **within two working days**.

A nominated member of SMT will be responsible for ensuring that the investigation is carried out in a prompt and effective manner and in accordance with the procedures in this policy and an Investigation Plan will be developed and circulated. SoundSkool will allocate a relevant member of staff to lead the investigation and establish whether or not the MMP has occurred and review any supporting evidence.

At all times SoundSkool will ensure that personnel assigned to the investigation have the appropriate level of training and competence and that they have had no previous involvement or personal interest in the matter under investigation.

#### 4.4.2. Notifying Relevant Parties

In all cases of suspected or actual MMP, the Head of College will inform the CEO that SoundSkool will be investigating a case of MMP. If the activities of the CEO are under investigation any communication will be with the chair of Governors of SoundSkool.

In the case of student MMP, SoundSkool may investigate the issue in conjunction with awarding organisation/assessment organisation personnel and representatives of employers.



SoundSkool will communicate directly with employees, students and employers (if required) who have been accused of MMP. SoundSkool may also communicate directly with a student or their representative if there is a contradiction in the evidence provided during an investigation or where SoundSkool is suspected of being involved in MMP.

If fraud is suspected and/or identified SoundSkool will consult with the Skills and HR Directors and may also notify the police in extreme circumstances.

#### 4.4.3. Investigation Timelines and Summary Process

SoundSkool aims to action and resolve all stages of the investigation **within twenty working days** of receipt of the allegation. However, in situations where complex cases are involved, the investigation may take longer. In such instances, SoundSkool will advise all parties concerned of any revised timescales.

The fundamental principle of all investigations is to conduct them in a fair, reasonable and legal manner, ensuring that all relevant evidence is considered without bias. In doing so, investigations will be supported by terms of reference and based around the following comprehensive objectives:

- Establish the facts relating to allegations in order to determine whether any MMP has taken place.
- Identify the cause of any MMP and those involved.
- Establish the scale of any MMP including which qualifications, assessments and accreditations are affected.
- Determine if corrective action is required to reduce the risk to current registered students and to preserve the integrity of and qualifications, assessments, and accreditations.
- Determine if any certificates need to be withheld or if any action is required in respect of any certificates already issued.
- Identify clear evidence to determine any sanctions to be applied within SoundSkool or delivery partner and/or any actions/support relating to employees, associates and students.
- Identify and report on any Adverse Effects.
- Draw up an Improvement Plan identifying what action needs to be taken going forward to prevent a repetition of the same or similar events.

The investigation may involve a request for further information from relevant parties and/or interviews with personnel involved in the investigation. SoundSkool will expect all parties, who are either directly or indirectly involved in the investigation, to cooperate fully.

SoundSkool will ensure that all material collected as part of an investigation is kept secure. All records and original documentation concerning a completed investigation that ultimately leads to any action against any individual will be retained for a period of not less than 12 months.

If an investigation leads to invalidation of certificates, or criminal or civil prosecution, all records and original documentation relating to the case will be retained until the case and any appeals have been heard and for 12 months thereafter.

Either at notification of a suspected or actual case of MMP and/or at any time during the investigation, SoundSkool will follow SoundSkool's investigation procedure in order to protect the interests of staff, associates and students together with the integrity of the qualifications, assessment and accreditations affected.



SoundSkool also reserves the right to withhold any certificates claimed or candidates' results for qualification, assessments or accreditations they are registered for at the time of the notification/investigation.

Should SoundSkool find that the complexity of a case or a lack of cooperation from those being investigated means that it is unable to complete an investigation, SoundSkool will consult the relevant regulatory authority to determine how best to progress the matter. Throughout the investigation the Head of Quality and Curriculum will be responsible for overseeing the work of the investigation team to ensure that due process is being followed, appropriate evidence has been gathered and reviewed and for liaising with and keeping informed relevant external parties.

#### 4.4.4. Investigation Report

On the completion of an investigation, SoundSkool will produce a draft report for all of the parties concerned to check the factual accuracy. Any subsequent amendments will be agreed between the parties concerned and SoundSkool.

The report will contain the following information that aims to:

1. Confirm the facts of the case together with any mitigating factors if relevant.
2. Parties involved dates and times.
3. Identify where the MMP, if any, has occurred.
4. Identify who was responsible for the MMP, if any, has occurred.
5. Contain supporting evidence where appropriate (e.g. written statements, taped interviews, transcript of conversations, witness testimony).
6. Confirm an appropriate level of remedial action and/or sanctions being applied.

SoundSkool will make the final report available to the awarding and regulatory authorities as required.

If it was an independent/third party that notified SoundSkool of the suspected or actual case of MMP, SoundSkool may also inform them of the outcome, normally **within ten working days** of making the decision, in doing so SoundSkool may withhold some details if to disclose such information would breach a duty of confidentiality or any other legal duty.

## **5.0 Associated Policies/Documents**

This document is issued in conjunction with related SoundSkool policies, including:

- Whistleblowing Policy
- (Staff) Disciplinary Policy and Procedures
- Exam appeals policy

## **6.0 Appendix- What is A1 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 Students should also be aware that AI tools are evolving quickly but there are still 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/auth/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 (<https://bard.google.com/>)
- Claude (<https://claude.ai/>)

Potential indicators of A1 misuse

If the following are seen in Student work, it may be an indication that the Student has 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.
- 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 Student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work.
- Variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a Student 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 Student themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected.
- The inadvertent inclusion by Students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output.
- The submission of Student 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 and 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.