



Use of Artificial Intelligence (A.I.) policy

Introduction

The purpose of this Policy is to provide information to our clients, candidates, Assessors and IQA's on what Lucelly Consultancy Ltd policy is with regarding the use of Artificial Intelligence (A.I.), based upon guidance from Awarding Bodies (AB) and centre processes.

The scope of the policy is to provide:

- Definition of A.I and examples of when it can be utilised, to ensure ethical, responsible, and transparent use of AI tools
- Support learning and teaching, not replace them
- Protect the integrity of the Awarding Body qualifications and ensure fairness for all, in line with our access to fair assessment and maladministration and malpractice policies
- Guidance on what is acceptable vs. unacceptable use, the misuse of A.I., associated risks and how it can't be used
- Process of candidates declaring own work
- Process for reviewing A.I. as part of the Internal Quality Assurance Procedures
- Appeals procedure

Definition of Artificial Intelligence

Artificial Intelligence (AI) enables computers and robots to perform tasks typically associated with intelligent beings. In education, A.I. can help gather information for assessments and can be misused to create assessments itself.

However, A.I. has limitations, such as producing inaccurate content.

Ofqual defines AI systems by two main characteristics:

- **Adaptivity:** Systems learn and adapt beyond their initial programming, making their logic difficult to explain
- **Autonomy:** Systems make decisions independently of human control, complicating accountability for outcomes.

Examples of when it can be utilised

They can be used to:

- Support candidates with language barriers, such as google translate, however these can have limitations and can provide inaccurate translation.
- Support candidates to correct grammar only.
- Support candidates to research topics that may have been cited as a development requirement by their assessor.
- Used as a transcription tool for meetings. E.g. Microsoft Teams and Zoom provide this facility. In all instances the transcription tool, captures speakers, times etc as an audit trail.
- Assessor could use A.I. to check if candidates have used A.I. or copied from the internet to produce evidence.

AI should enhance learning, not replace effort or to produce written or verbal assessments. All qualification evidence submitted by a candidate, must for the NVQ must represent solely the candidates own work and that it has not been copied from another individual's work, used A.I. or copied information from the internet to produce evidence.

Please note: Candidates must not submit A.I. generated work as their own.

Candidates **must** also acknowledge any use of AI and should disclose the name of the source, when and how AI tools were used, to their assessor to avoid allegations of misuse.

Example of misuse of A.I.

The misuse of AI tools in relation to assessments is considered malpractice. The penalties for offences such as 'making a false declaration of authenticity' and 'plagiarism' can include disqualification and being barred from taking qualifications in the future. This would be determined by the Awarding Body and Centre.

Additionally, a candidate using A.I. to create their evidence would resulting in their work not accurately reflecting their own abilities and may even be a danger to working on a construction site as an example.

- Using A.I. to create written or verbal evidence, this not being the candidates own work
- Using AI to cheat in assessments or exams such as the Level 1 Health and Safety Award
- Fabricating information or prior learning certificates
- Assessors using A.I. to mark assessments and not reviewing it themselves. Ofqual's Conditions of Recognition definition is clear that an assessor must be a person who is able to make judgements. AI as a sole marker would not fall within this definition.
- Over relying on A.I. therefore critical thinking or learning is undermined

Associated Risks of using A.I. for qualifications

- It can be classed as cheating and plagiarism.
- Creating misinformation.
- Data privacy concerns.
- Inaccurate assessment of a candidate's evidence.

Process for reviewing A.I. as part of the Internal Quality Assurance Procedures

There are now tools out there to identify content produced by A.I. which assessors can now use as an aid to detection; however, they should not substitute the assessor reviewing work submitted by the candidate as the A.I. detection tools are not designed to bypass this process. Ofqual's Conditions of Recognition definition is clear that an assessor must be a person who is able to make judgements. AI as a sole marker would not fall within this definition.

How to Detect AI-Written Documents

- Their grammar may come across as perfect with no mistakes
- The content may be a bit impersonal with no specific real-life examples which we would expect as evidence for any of our qualifications, to ensure authenticity
- Grammar may be written in a certain way. E.g. the American way of spelling things rather than the English way
- Answers may lack depth or critical thinking
- May be generic or vague
- Structure may not feel natural or lacks any coherence
- Maybe factually incorrect

How to ensure authentic evidence is provided and prevent misuse of A.I.

1. **Professional Discussions:** Here at Lucelly Consultancy, we encourage our Assessors to undertake professional discussions with all their candidates, as this is our preferred method of capturing knowledge evidence, either via recorded phone calls or video recordings. This ensures that evidence is authentic as it is in most cases, simpler and quicker for the candidate as it is easier to chat about company processes or what they do in their role, rather than write about it.
2. **Induction meeting:** We expect all our assessors to undertake a recorded induction meeting with the candidate when they are first registered. During this induction meeting, the assessor should discuss A.I. and where it can and can't be used and the consequences of a false declaration and A.I. generated evidence. They must also ask if they understand what the assessor has discussed with them.
Assessor will discuss with candidates that the centre itself and the awarding body has established procedures for reporting and investigating malpractice and the potential consequences for proven malpractice.

Our induction form also requires the candidate to declare that they will submit their own work. The completed form and induction recording are added to the Quals Direct system under the candidates account in the “additional information” section as part of their SLA.

3. **Completion of an NVQ:** As part of Lucelly Consultancy processes, candidates will be expected to declare electronically that it is their own work upon completion of an NVQ, by completing and signing the “declaration of authenticity form” provided by their assessor.

What to do if you suspect a candidate has used A.I. to produce their evidence

1. Firstly, call the candidate to chat to them about this and to ascertain if they have simply forgot to acknowledge the use of A.I.
2. If the assessor is still unclear, they should conduct a recorded professional discussion (PD) to explain certain concepts in their work and to check authenticity of the written evidence provided. This should then be added to the candidate’s portfolio of evidence and a note to the IQA added as to why the PD took place.
3. If deemed appropriate, the assessor must report this as part of the centres Malpractice and Maladministration Policy.

Appeals procedure

As with any assessment decision on procedural grounds, if a candidate wishes to appeal against a decision made about their assessment, they need to follow the Lucelly Consultancy “Appeals and Grievance/Complaints Policy” to take this forward.

Review and Amendment

This policy will be reviewed regularly to ensure its ongoing compliance with Awarding Bodies, legislation and industry best practices. Changes will be made as necessary.

Document Owner:	Louise Dodds
Date of issue:	May 2026
Review Date:	May 2027