



**City &
Guilds**

PLAGIARISM AND CHEATING POLICY



Dentrain Professionals Ltd

info@dentrain.net



INTRODUCTION



Plagiarism and Cheating Policy

Definition Plagiarism (the presentation of another's words, ideas, or creations as one's own) is regarded as a serious offence at Dentrain Professionals Ltd. Associated dishonest practices include cheating, the faking or falsification of data, and the uttering of false statements to obtain unjustified concessions.

Plagiarism and cheating include but are not limited to the following:

Exams, Written work, Tests, and Quizzes

1. Copying from another student or making information available to another student knowing that it will be submitted as the borrower's own work.
2. Use of unauthorized material or resources (e.g., cell phone, electronic dictionary, unauthorised calculator).
3. Impersonation.
4. Submission of a take-home exam written by someone else.
5. Copying and pasting from the internet or other materials.



Dentrain Professionals Ltd have an expectation to:

- 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 and to their parents/carers the risks of malpractice;
- Update the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy to acknowledge the use of AI (e.g. what it is, the risks of using it, what AI misuse is, how this will be treated as malpractice, when it may be used and how it should be acknowledged) – most simply by referencing this document;
- Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how learners should reference appropriately (including websites);
- Ensure the centre's malpractice/plagiarism policy includes clear guidance on how learners should acknowledge any use of AI to avoid misuse (see the below section on acknowledging AI use);
- Ensure that Trainers / Assessors are familiar with AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools (see the What is AI use and what are the risks of using it in assessments? and What is AI misuse? sections);
- Consider whether learners should be required to sign a declaration that they have understood what AI misuse is, and that it is forbidden in the learning agreement that is signed at enrolment in some centres;
- Ensure that each learner is issued with a copy of, and understands, the appropriate JCQ Information for Candidates (www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/information-for-candidates-documents);
- 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
- Remind learners that awarding organisation staff, examiners and moderators have established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice (see the Awarding Organisation actions section below).

Acknowledging AI use



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 Trainers / 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 Trainer/Assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Where this is not submitted, and the Trainer / Assessor suspects that the learner has used AI tools, the Trainer / Assessor will need to consult the centre's malpractice policy for appropriate next steps and should take action to assure themselves that the work is the learner's own. Further guidance on ways this could be done are set out in the JCQ Plagiarism in Assessments guidance document (see link below).

The JCQ guidance on referencing can be found in the following:

- Plagiarism in Assessments (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/plagiarism-in-assessments---guidance-for-teachersassessors/>)
- Instructions for conducting coursework (https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/08/Coursework_ICC_22-23_FINAL.pdf)
- The Information for Candidates documents (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/examsoffice/information-for-candidates-documents>) Other actions which should be considered in relation to acknowledging AI use are:



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

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

Guidelines for Proceeding with a Charge of Plagiarism/Cheating

1. The Trainer / Assessor or IQA suspects that a learner has plagiarised or cheated and gathers whatever supporting evidence is available the learner will receive a warning from the Trainer / Assessor.
2. The Trainer / Assessor or IQA has evidence of plagiarised work for a second time a Director from Dentrain Professionals Ltd will contact both the learner and workplace manager/practice manager/dentist.
3. The Trainer / Assessor or IQA has evidence of plagiarised work for a third time then the learner will be removed from the apprenticeship programme. This in turn will mean the loss of employment due to not being registered on a training course.

Guidelines for Proceeding with a Charge of Plagiarism/Cheating

Identifying the misuse of AI by learners requires the same skills and observation techniques that Trainers are probably already using to assure themselves learner work is authentically their own. There are also some tools that can be used. We explore these different methods below. Comparison with previous work When reviewing a given piece of work to ensure its authenticity, it is useful to compare it against other work created by the learner.

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) Trainers could consider comparing newly submitted work with work completed by the learner in the classroom, or under supervised conditions.



Potential indicators of AI use If you see the following in learner 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
- d) 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 learner 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 learner 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 learner themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
- l) The inadvertent inclusion by learners of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output
- m) The submission of learner 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 candidate'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. Automated detection AI chatbots, as large language models, produce content by 'guessing' the most likely next word in a sequence. This means that AI-generated content uses the most common combinations of words, unlike humans who use a variety of words in their normal writing.

Several programs and services use this difference to statistically analyse written content and determine the likelihood that it was produced by AI:

- OpenAI Classifier (<https://openai.com/blog/new-ai-classifier-for-indicating-ai-written-text/>)
- GPTZero (Potential being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth, variety or to overcome its output limit)
- The Giant Language Model Test Room (GLTR) (<http://gltr.io/dist/>) In addition, the JCQ awarding organisations are aware that AI detection will shortly be added to the existing tool Turnitin Originality (<https://www.turnitin.com/products/originality>). This tool features an AI review of a learner's work, reviewing a portfolio of evidence and, we understand, will indicate the likelihood of AI use.

These tools could be used as a check on learner work and/or to verify concerns about the authenticity of learner work.

However, it should be noted that the above tools, as they base their scores on the predictability of words, will give lower scores for AI-generated content which has been subsequently amended by learners. The quality of these detection tools can vary and AI and detection tools will continue to evolve.

The use of detection tools should form part of a holistic approach to considering the authenticity of learner work; all available information should be considered when reviewing any malpractice concerns.



Reporting

If your suspicions are confirmed and the learner has not signed the declaration of authentication, your centre doesn't need to report the malpractice to the appropriate awarding organisation. You can resolve the matter prior to the signing of the declarations.

Trainers must not accept work which is not the learner's own.

Ultimately the Head of Centre has the responsibility for ensuring that learner 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/>).

Awarding Organisation actions

The JCQ awarding organisations ensure that their staff, moderators and examiners are appropriately trained in the identification of malpractice and have established procedures for reporting and investigating suspected malpractice.

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 in line with the sanctions given in the JCQ Suspected Malpractice: Policies and Procedures (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/malpractice/>). 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 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.