

Plagiarism and AI Policy

Document Owner	Work Based Learning Manager
Date Approved	July 2026
Approved by	Interim Managing Director- Helen Lloyd-Hole
Last Review	June 2024
Next Review	July 2027

Version Control

Revision #	Date	Revision summary	Reviewed by
1	April 2024	Policy rewritten, inclusion of AI and new company template adopted.	EH
2	July 2026	Added in additional information to sections 1,2,5,6,8,13 mainly around AI	EH

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	2
2.	Definition of Plagiarism	2
3.	Unacceptable Behaviours	3
4.	What is AI Use and What are the Risks?	3
5.	Use of AI Tools	3
6.	Referencing AI- Generated Content.....	4
7.	Smart Guidance	6
8.	Consequences of Plagiarism	7
9.	Resources and Support	7
10.	Conclusion	7
11.	Review	8
12.	Quality Assurance	8
13.	Appendix.....	8

1. Introduction

This policy outlines WBTC's commitment to academic integrity and the importance of original work in all aspects of training and development. It defines plagiarism, outlines unacceptable behaviours, and describes the consequences for violating this policy. All learners are expected to uphold the highest standards of ethical conduct and to be responsible for ensuring the authenticity of their work.

This policy applies to all learner evidence, assessment submissions, portfolio work, workplace evidence, reflective accounts, presentations, written assignments, digital media, images, audio, video and any other material submitted to WBTC for assessment or quality assurance. It also applies to the use of generative artificial intelligence tools including but not limited to ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot, Google, Gemini, Quillbot, image generators, translation tools, summarisation tools and any other tool capable of producing, rewriting, paraphrasing, translating or substantially improving submitted work.

Work submitted to WBTC for assessment must be signed and dated, and where possible presented on company headed paper. By signing your evidence, you confirm that the evidence presented is your own work. It is a requirement of the awarding organisation for you to confirm that your work is authentic and a true representation of your own work.

2. Definition of Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the act of presenting another person's work or ideas as one's own without proper attribution. This includes, but is not limited to:

- Direct copying: Copying the exact words, images or ideas of another person without citation.
- Paraphrasing: Rephrasing someone else's work without acknowledging the source.

- Mosaic plagiarism: Combining snippets of text from various sources without proper citation.
- Collusion: Working with others to produce work that is submitted as individual work.
- Ghost-writing: Having someone else write work for you and submitting it as your own.
- Fabrication: Creating false data or results.
- AI plagiarism extends this definition to the use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools for generating content that is then submitted as one's own work. This includes using AI tools to write essays, generate research papers, or create presentations.
- AI-assisted plagiarism includes submitting work that has been generated, substantially rewritten, paraphrased, translated, summarised or improved by an AI tool in a way that means the final submission is no longer demonstrably the learner's own independent work. This includes AI to create false references, invented sources, fabricated quotations, inaccurate data, misleading evidence, images, screenshots or audio/video content.

3. Unacceptable Behaviours

The following behaviours are considered unacceptable and may be considered plagiarism:

- Failing to properly cite sources used in assignments, reports, presentations, or other work.
- Submitting work that has been produced by someone else as your own.
- Collaborating with others on work that is to be submitted as individual work, unless explicitly permitted by the Training Consultant.
- Obtaining or providing unauthorised information during assessments.
- Fabricating data or results.
- Misusing assessment materials.

4. What is AI Use and What are the Risks?

AI use refers to the employment of AI tools to obtain information and content that might be used in assessments leading towards qualifications. While the capabilities of AI tools are likely to expand, misuse in relation to qualification assessments at any time constitutes malpractice. AI tools have limitations, such as producing inaccurate or inappropriate content. They often produce answers that may seem convincing but contain incorrect or biased information. The use of AI tools in assessments poses a risk to the integrity of qualifications, and WBTC is committed to mitigating this risk.

5. Use of AI Tools

5.1 Acceptable Use of AI Tools

AI may be used as a support tool where this has been permitted by WBTC, the assessor, the employer, and the relevant boarding organisation. Acceptable use may include checking spelling and grammar, generating revision questions, explaining a concept, supporting accessibility needs, or helping a learner plan their own work. Any such use must not replace the learner's own knowledge, skill, judgement, or evidence of competence.

Learners may use AI tools for brainstorming ideas, generating draft text, translating text between languages, summarising research, and checking grammar and spelling. However, the use of AI tools should not compromise the integrity of qualifications.

Learners must declare any use of AI tools where the tool has contributed to the planning, drafting, editing, rewriting, translation, summarising, referencing, formatting, or presentation of submitted work. The declaration should state the name of the tool used, the date used, the purpose of use, the prompts or instructions entered where relevant, and the sections of work affected. Failure to declare AI use may be treated as suspected malpractice.

5.2 Unacceptable Use of AI Tools

Unacceptable use includes using AI to complete assessment tasks; generate answers for portfolio evidence; create reflective accounts that do not reflect the learner's own experience; produce witness statements; workplace records or evidence that is not genuine; fabricate sources, quotations, or data; translate or paraphrase copied material to avoid detection or use AI during controlled assessments, exams or professional discussions where this has not been expressly permitted.

Learners may not use AI tools to generate significant portions of submitted work that they pass off as their own creations. This includes using AI tools to rewrite or paraphrase text in an attempt to avoid plagiarism detection. Learners may not create 'Frankenstein' papers by combining AI-generated text with their own writing in an attempt to pass it all off as original work. Moreover, from an ethical and moral standpoint WBTC has a Zero Tolerance for Counterfeiting Human Likeness without express consent. This includes, but is not limited to, text, images, and videos. Any staff or student found in violation of this will face disciplinary action.

5.3 AI detection and professional judgement

WBTC may use plagiarism detection, text matching, authenticity checks, version history, professional discussion, questioning and any other quality assurance methods to review the authenticity of learner work. AI detection tools may be used as one source of information, but they must not be relied upon as the sole evidence of malpractice. Any concern must be considered alongside the learner's previous work, assessment records, drafts, assessor observations, questioning, workplace evidence and any other explanation provided by the learner.

5.4 Data protection and confidentiality

Learners and staff must not enter personal data, special category data, commercially sensitive information, assessment materials, employer records, client information or confidential WBTC information into public or unapproved AI tools. Where AI tools are used by WBTC they must be used in line with UK GDPR, WBTC data protection procedures, awarding organisation requirements, and any other relevant employer restrictions.

6. Referencing AI- Generated Content

6.1 In-Text Reference

When using AI-generated content within the body of work, it can be cited in-text like this:

"...as summarised by the AI tool (OpenAI ChatGPT-4, 2023)."

6.2 Bibliography

In the reference list or bibliography at the end of the document, the full reference would be included:

OpenAI ChatGPT-4 (2023) ChatGPT-4 response to Scott Hayden*, 31 August.

*insert own name

By doing this, academic integrity is maintained by clearly indicating the source of the AI-generated content, and anyone reading the work can easily find the original source for further information.

Citation order within the in-text citation:

- Name of AI and date of communication (all in round brackets): (OpenAI ChatGPT-4, 25/01/2023)
- Learners should retain a copy of the computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes.

Citation order within the reference list:

- Name of AI: OpenAI ChatGPT-4
- Year of communication (in round brackets): (2023)
- Medium of communication: (ChatGPT-4)
- Receiver of communication: (Scott Hayden)
- Day/month of communication: 31 August

6.3 Staff responsibilities

Assessors, Training Consultants, IQAs and managers must ensure learners understand what AI use is permitted before assessment work is completed. Staff must record any permitted AI use, retain evidence of authenticity checks where concerns arise, avoid entering learner personal data or assessment evidence into unapproved AI systems, and escalate suspected malpractice in line with WBTC's Malpractice and Conflict of Interest policy and awarding organisation requirements.

6.4 Authenticity Checks

Where appropriate, WBTC may ask the learner to explain, discuss, or demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and behaviour shown in their submitted work. This may include professional discussion, questioning, comparison with earlier drafts, review of document version history, review of workplace context, or requesting supporting evidence. If the learner cannot demonstrate understanding or ownership of the work, the work may not be accepted as authentic.

7. Smart Guidance

While there may be benefits to using AI in some situations, there is the potential for it to be misused by learners, either accidentally or intentionally. AI misuse, in that it involves a 'student submitting work for qualification assessments which is not their own, can be considered a form of plagiarism' (JCQ, 2023, p. 6).

Teachers and assessors must be assured that the work they accept for assessment and mark is authentically the student's own work. They are required to confirm this during the assessment process.

To prevent misuse, education and awareness of staff and learners is likely to be key. Here are some actions which should be taken:

- a) Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;
- b) Ensure that access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams;
- c) Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders;
- d) Where appropriate, allocating 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;
- e) Examine 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 sequenced continuation of earlier stages;
- f) 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;
- g) Consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage learners in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work;
- h) 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.
- i) 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.

Procedure All cases of suspected misuse of AI should be referred to the Director of Teaching, Learning and Quality Improvement immediately, who will take on the responsibility for agreeing the appropriate action. If work is submitted and it is discovered that the regulations have been broken, one of the following penalties will be applied;

- The piece of work will be awarded zero marks;
- The student will be disqualified from that unit for that examination series;

- The student will be disqualified from the whole subject for that examination series;
- The student will be disqualified from all subjects and barred from entering again for a period of time. This will be in accordance with the awarding organisation guidance.

Supporting Documentation: Malpractice and Conflict of Interest Policy

8. Consequences of Plagiarism

If the Training Consultant deems that the work is not the learner's own, either in part or whole, then the following process will apply:

- Involvement of the Internal Quality Assurances and the Work based Learning Manager: The Training Consultant will contact you to discuss the concerns about the authenticity of your work and consult with the relevant staff at WBTC.
- Resubmission of work: You may be required to resubmit your work with appropriate citations or to complete the work again.
- Reporting to line manager/organisation: The Training Consultant will inform your line manager of any suspected evidence not deemed as your own.
- Notify the Award Body: The IQA will notify the relevant Awarding Body and follow their specific Plagiarism Policy.
- Disciplinary action: WBTC may take disciplinary action, up to and including termination of your training programme.

Where AI misuse or plagiarism is suspected, WBTC will record the concern, preserve relevant evidence, inform the learner of the concern, give the learner an opportunity to respond, consult the relevant assessor, IQA and manager, and follow awarding organisation malpractice procedures. Evidence may include drafts, version history, AI declarations, assessment records, similarity reports, professional discussion notes, learner explanations and any other relevant employer or witness evidence.

9. Resources and Support

WBTC provides resources and support to help participants understand and comply with this policy. These resources include:

- Training materials
- Clear guidance on expectations and requirements
- Access to 121 support

10. Conclusion

This Plagiarism and AI Policy is in place to ensure fair and ethical learning within the organisation. By understanding and adhering to this policy, participants can demonstrate their commitment to academic integrity and contribute to a positive learning environment for all.

11. Review

Notwithstanding our current policies and procedures, the Senior Leadership Team reserve the right to amend, curtail or terminate this policy at any time and without notice

12. Quality Assurance

The Policy will be reviewed every year, sooner if legislation, best practice or other circumstances indicate this is necessary. It shall remain in force until any alterations are formally agreed.

13. Appendix

- Centre for Humane Technology. (2023). The A.I. Dilemma. [Video]. Available at: [[The A.I. Dilemma - Mar 9, 2023](#)]
- Joint council for qualifications (JCQ) AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications, effective from 30 April 2025;
- University of Portsmouth. (2022). Academic Integrity Policy. [Online]. Available at: [<https://policies.docstore.port.ac.uk/policy-053.pdf>]
- QAA. (2023). Guidance on the Use of AI in Higher Education. [Online]. Available at: [<https://www.qaa.ac.uk/news-events/news/qaa-publishes-additional-advice-on-generative-artificial-intelligence-tools#:~:text=This%20new%20guidance%20specifically%20aims,while%20also%20maintaining%20academic%20standards.>]
- University of Reading. Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy. [Online]. Available at: [<https://www.reading.ac.uk/cqsd/-/media/project/functions/cqsd/documents/qap/9-academic-integrity-and-academic-misconduct-final.pdf>]
- University of Waterloo. AI and Referencing Systems. [Online]. Available at: [https://subjectguides.uwaterloo.ca/chatgpt_generative_ai/ai-generated-content/citation]
- Ofqual, Ofqual's approach to regulating the use of artificial intelligence in the qualification sector, 2024
- Ofqual, Senior leadership team briefing pack: AI and coursework integrity, 2026
- Department for Education, Generative artificial intelligence in education, updated 2025
- Generative artificial intelligence and data protection in schools, updated 2026