

Plagiarism and Cheating Policy (Including Artificial Intelligence)

Employment, Skills, and Training (EST)

Version Control Sheet:

Document Title	Plagiarism and Cheating Policy (Including Artificial Intelligence)
Author	Mike Hampton
Owner	Mike Hampton
Approver	Rachel Fort
Doc version/status	V4.0
Date issued	07/09/2026
Review Date	31/07/2027
Division	Citizen Services
Intended Audience	Internal and External

Version History:

Version	Date	Summary of changes
V1.0	21/09/2023	First Issued
V1.1	17/10/2023	Rebranding only, no content changes
V2.0	15/03/2024	Addition of Artificial Intelligence (AI)
V3.0	01/08/2025	Annual update and format change
V4.0	07/09/2026	Full revamp of policy and process in dealing with suspected cases of AI misuse

Change Control

Any requested changes to this document should be emailed to: mike.hampton@serco.com

Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1	Purpose.....	3
2.	Definitions and Requirements.....	3
2.1	Plagiarism.....	3
2.2	Collusion.....	3
2.3	Cheating	3
3.	EST and Learner Commitments	4
4.	Process in the Event of an Incident (Plagiarism, Cheating or Collusion).....	4
5.	Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Assessments (learners work).....	4
5.1	Key principles:	5
5.2	Acceptable/Ethical Use of AI.....	6
5.3	Unethical Use of AI	6
5.4	Use of AI as a Reasonable Adjustment	6
5.5	How to Identify Potential Use of AI.....	6
5.6	Process for Managing Suspected AI Use in Assessments (learner work)	7
6.	Further Guidance.....	11
7.	Appendix A – JCQ - scenarios of AI Misuse.....	12
8.	Appendix B – Statement of Authenticity (SBPA example).....	13
9.	Appendix C – Using Grammarly as an ALN Support Tool.....	14
10.	Appendix D – Example Wording – Verbal Warning.....	15
11.	Appendix E – Example Written Warning Template	15

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The term “learner,” within this policy, is used to describe all learners and apprentices involved with Employment, Skills, and Training (EST) this also includes those learners enrolled with subcontractors. This policy outlines the definitions of plagiarism, collusion, cheating, fraud, and anti-bribery, as well as the process that must be followed in the case of an incident occurring.

2. Definitions and Requirements

2.1 Plagiarism

The University of Oxford (2023) defines Plagiarism as:

“Presenting work or ideas from another source as your own, with or without the consent of the original author, by incorporating it into your own work without full acknowledgment.”

Sources of information, including images/graphics:

- ✓ Published books.
- ✓ Published articles.
- ✓ Content sourced from the internet.
- ✓ Unpublished documents such as course notes and work from another Learner.

Examples of plagiarism could include the following without correct referencing being used (for example Harvard referencing):

- ✓ Copying extracts from another person’s work, published or unpublished.
- ✓ Use of diagrams, images, course notes
- ✓ Summarising/paraphrasing the work of another or using their ideas.
- ✓ Copying or using the work of another participant (past or present)
- ✓ Using Artificial Intelligence (AI) or any other automation tools without prior consent and/or acknowledgment. See further details in the AI section of this document.
- ✓ Plagiarism also includes the purchasing of essays or downloading them from the internet to submit them as your own work.

2.2 Collusion

According to the University of Oxford (2023), collusion involves “unauthorised collaboration between learners, failure to attribute assistance received, or failure to precisely follow regulations on group work projects”, and that “it is the responsibility of the learner to ensure that they are clear about the extent of the collaboration permitted”.

At times learners will be required to work together on projects, however the work submitted must that of their own (unless otherwise specified). It is acceptable to discuss ideas, talk about books, articles, online material, and strategies for example with other learners. It is not acceptable for learners to help each other to produce work that will be submitted as their own and an individual piece of work. Learners must never lend their work to another learner under any circumstances as it may be copied or reproduced. This example would leave both learners vulnerable to an accusation of collusion.

2.3 Cheating

Cambridge Dictionary (2023) defines cheating as behaving in a dishonest way to get what you want. Cheating is a form of plagiarism and collusion; examples of cheating may include:

- ✓ Gaining access to test papers/answers and using them to give the learner/s an advantage.
- ✓ Use of external sources of information, such as the internet, in assessments where this is not permitted.
- ✓ Receiving an excessive amount of support from the tutor giving the learner an unfair advantage.

3. EST and Learner Commitments

All learners will be provided information upon induction onto the programme, which will include the various policies they need to be aware of – which includes the Plagiarism and Cheating policy. This also includes details on AI in relation to the learners' assessments/assignments and programme in general. All learners will be provided information on how to correctly reference other people's/source's work, within their own. All learners will ensure that all work submitted is their own and correctly referenced. All learners will be reminded of the content of this policy before undertaking any assessment or examination.

Upon submission of assignments EST staff will conduct various checks to ensure plagiarism is not present, this can include (not exhaustive):

- ✓ Identify any inconsistency in text formatting which may alert them to the potential of copy and paste taking place.
- ✓ Identify any inconsistency with the overall structure/layout, language used and sentence structures.
- ✓ Identify spelling inconsistencies such as the use of American and British spellings.
- ✓ Lack of referencing.
- ✓ Spot checking phrases/sentences using an online search engine, reviewing the results, and comparing similarity.

4. Process in the Event of an Incident (Plagiarism, Cheating or Collusion)

Any suspected incidents of plagiarism, cheating, or collusion will be managed in accordance with the procedures detailed in Section 5.6 of this policy. All learner assessments must be submitted via Turnitin through BUD, with an acceptable similarity report of no more than 20%

5. Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Assessments (learners work)

The use of artificial intelligence (AI) has the potential to impact on the way learning takes place; however, it is important to understand what is deemed learner malpractice when producing assessments (from this point forward referred to as work).

Learners must follow the principles as outlined in this policy to ensure the academic integrity of their work, ensuring the work submitted is that of their own understanding and demonstrates their own knowledge and skills. This policy is built off the work by the [Joint Council for Qualifications \(JCQ\)](#).

[JCQ \(2025\) state](#) that "work submitted for assessment must be in their own words and not copied or paraphrased from another source such as an AI tool and must reflect their own independent work."

JCQ (2025) have published a list of AI tools that are currently readily available:

[JCQ](#) have published a list of AI tools that are available (not exhaustive)

- ChatGPT (<https://chat.openai.com/auth/login>)
- Jenni AI (<https://jenni.ai>)

- Jasper AI (<https://www.jasper.ai/>)
- Writesonic (<https://writesonic.com/chat/>)
- Bloom AI (<https://huggingface.co/bigscience/bloom>)
- Gemini (<https://gemini.google.com/>)
- Claude (<https://claude.ai/>)
- Gauth (<https://gauthmath.com/>)
- Question AI (<https://questionai.com/>)
- Brainly (<https://brainly.com/>)

There are also AI tools which can be used to generate images, music or video, such as:

- Midjourney (<https://midjourney.com/showcase/top/>)
- Stable Diffusion (<https://stablediffusionweb.com/>)
- Dalle-E 2 (OpenAI) (<https://openai.com/dall-e-2/>)
- Soundraw (<https://soundraw.io/>)
- Musicfy (<https://create.musicfy.lol/>)
- Runway (<https://runwayml.com/>)
- LTX Studio (<https://ltx.studio/>)

5.1 Key principles:

- Learners must submit work that is their own and in their own words.
- Learners encouraged to complete all draft versions of assignments, as these can be useful in any cases of likelihood of AI misuse.
- Learners must sign the Statement of Authenticity declaring that their work is their own. This also includes a section for the learner to declare their use of AI and details of this (see Appendix B – SBPA example).
 - Any use of AI must be evidenced and evidence of this submitted with the assignment. This includes the name of the AI tool used, details of how the AI tool was used and any screenshots of any input prompts and generated outputs that resulted in material alterations to the learners work.
- Remember that AI tools can still produce inaccurate information.
- All assignments must be run through TurnItIn software – and the threshold of use of AI is 20%.
- Learners must be provided with a copy of the TurnItIn Report to identify the areas being flagged as likelihood of use of AI.
- Any AI reports from TurnItIn that exceed 20% require further investigation/assessments to take place. Tutors/IQA must not fully rely of AI detection software (TurnItIn)
- Tutor/marker will not award marks for sections of the learners work that they have doubts over the authenticity/unethical use of AI. If Turnitin flags a section of a learner's work as potentially AI-generated, and the tutor/marker determines, based on their professional judgement and expertise, that marks should still be awarded, the rationale for this decision must be clearly documented on the assessment marksheet against the relevant section.
- The IQA is responsible for ensuring that all claimed assignments are the learner's own work, and that sufficient evidence demonstrates competency before claiming achievement.

5.2 Acceptable/Ethical Use of AI

- ✓ Produce a plan to allocate time and focus to an assessment (time management tool).
- ✓ Scope out initial starting points for research/brainstorming (as you would do on Google/other search engines) -**Important:** must check the research is valid, accurate.
- ✓ Appropriate referencing must be in place.
- ✓ Find specific topics for research – again as a starting point as above.
- ✓ Check and correct spelling, grammar and punctuation. **Important:** must not be used to alter text or content, just the SPAG corrections required.
- ✓ Reorganise work – however cannot be used to alter text/content including paraphrasing.
- ✓ Check work is coherent/logical – however cannot be used to alter text/content including paraphrasing.

If the learner has used AI for any of the above, they must declare it within the Authenticity Statement, ensure correct referencing within assessment & reference section and submit a record of:

- The AI tool used
- screenshots of any input prompts
- screenshots of any generated outputs.

5.3 Unethical Use of AI

- ✗ Direct copying of sections of AI-generated content – including paraphrasing (this is no longer the learners own work).
- ✗ Direct copying of whole responses of AI-generated content – including paraphrasing (this is no longer the learners own work).
- ✗ Using AI to complete parts of the learners work so that it now does not reflect their own work, analysis, evaluations or calculations. This includes:
 - Using AI to reword own sentences to improve them (this is no longer the learners own work).
 - Using AI to improve own arguments/analysis (this is no longer the learners own work).
 - Using AI generated work without checking further sources of information to ensure the information is accurate.
- ✗ Not acknowledging (in full/incomplete) the use of AI tools within the Authenticity Statement and references section of the learner's work.

See appendix A – for scenarios from JCQ (2025) of AI Misuse

5.4 Use of AI as a Reasonable Adjustment

Where a learner is receiving support through the Additional Learner Support (ALS) Team, any agreed support arrangements and/or reasonable adjustments must be documented within the learner's Additional Learner Support Plan in BUD. Where approval from the Awarding Organisation is required, this must be obtained before implementation. All agreed reasonable adjustments must also be clearly recorded on the Authenticity Statement submitted with the relevant assessment or assignment.

Grammarly is a commonly used support tool for learners. To promote academic integrity and the ethical use of AI, guidance has been produced (see appendix C) to help learners understand how Grammarly can be used appropriately within assessment requirements.

5.5 How to Identify Potential Use of AI

All learner work and assessments must be submitted via Turnitin through BUD. A threshold of 20% has been established for the likelihood of AI-generated content. Turnitin is the plagiarism and AI detection tool approved by Serco. However, tutors/markers must not use Turnitin results as the sole basis for

assessment decisions. They must apply their professional judgement and expertise to ensure that all assessment decisions are accurate, fair, and evidence based.

JCO (2025) state the following are possible indicators of AI misuse. These indicators will support tutors/markers/IQAs in making assessment decisions:

- A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations.
- A default use of language or vocabulary which may not accord with the qualification level (though be aware AI tools may be instructed to employ different languages, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content).
- A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected (though 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 may be notable for some subjects.
- Instances of incorrect and/or 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.
- 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 it.
- 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 learner themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected.
- 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.
- The submission of learner 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 learner's usual style.

5.6 Process for Managing Suspected AI Use in Assessments (learner work)

Where the TurnItIn has identified that there is 20% (and above) likelihood the use of AI then the following processes must be followed:

Stage One - Initial Submission

This stage is when the learner initially submits their assignments for marking. This could be as a formative/draft or as the summative submission. The tutor/marker will run the assignment through TurnItIn via BUD. If the AI report is showing a likelihood use of AI over 20%:

Step 1) Tutor/marker checks authenticity statement. This will also include a declaration of whether learner has used AI and what for.

Step 2) In all cases the learner is to be provided with the TurnItIn report so they can see the text that is being flagged by the software as likelihood of AI use.

Step 3) Learner to re-do the assessment using the feedback and TurnItIn report and resubmit by an agreed deadline.

Step 4) Tutor/marker to inform the learners coach so they are aware of the feedback.

Stage Two - Identified at Marking Stage (First Resubmission)

Where at the marking stage the tutor/marker/TurnItIn has identified the likelihood of use of AI (above 20%) then it is the responsibility of the tutor/marker to carry out a further assessment.

Step 1) Tutor/marker marks the assignment as usual providing feedback via the marksheet.

Step 2) Tutor/marker will not award marks for sections of the learners work that they have doubts over the authenticity/unethical use of AI.

- If the final mark achieves a pass (minimum) for the assessment then next steps in this process are not required.
 - If Turnitin flags a section of a learner's work as potentially AI-generated, and the tutor/marker determines, based on their professional judgement and expertise, that marks should still be awarded, the rationale for this decision must be clearly documented on the assessment marksheet against the relevant section.
- If the final mark does not achieve a pass then tutor/marker proceeds with the next steps in this process.

Step 3) The tutor/marker will carry out a Professional Discussion with the learner, this must be video (or verbal recording, i.e. via Dictaphone, if video is not possible) recorded and assessed following the awarding organisations requirements for such evidence:

- The learner to provide a verbal declaration of whether they have used AI to produce their assignment.
- For the sections of the assignment that have been identified as likelihood of use of AI, the tutor will ask the learner a series of questions/discussion points – where the learner has the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and competency.
- Where the learner has demonstrated competency against all or any part of the assessment criteria this must be submitted with the assignment and claimed as evidence against this – reducing the need for the learner to redo that part of the written assignment.
- Where the learner has not demonstrated competency (all or parts of) then those parts of the written assessment must be completed again by the learner or the tutor/marker can complete alternative assessment methods to gather this evidence (it is the responsibility of the tutor/marker to check with the IQA first before proceeding with any alternative assessment evidence to ensure it meets the requirements of the qualification/awarding organisation)
- All evidence of the professional discussion and alternative assessment methods must be stored with the written assessment and are subject to IQA sign off before completion claims can be made.

Step 4) Tutor (or other allocated person- of appropriate position) provides a verbal warning over the use of AI (See Appendix D).

Stage Three - Identified at Marking Stage (Second Resubmission)

Where the learner has resubmitted, the work following a referral, due to likelihood use of AI and the professional discussion took place but the learners wasn't deemed as competent in those areas to claim as a pass - the following process must be followed:

Step 1) Tutor/marker will not award marks for sections of the learners work that they have doubts over the authenticity/unethical use of AI.

- If the final mark achieves a pass (minimum) for the assessment then next steps in this process are not required.

- If Turnitin flags a section of a learner's work as potentially AI-generated, and the tutor/marker determines, based on their professional judgement and expertise, that marks should still be awarded, the rationale for this decision must be clearly documented on the assessment marksheet against the relevant section.
- If the final mark does not achieve a pass then tutor/marker proceeds with the next steps in this process.

Step 2) Tutor/marker must inform the IQA and Apprenticeship/Training Manager within 2 working days of identifying the concern. The IQA has a responsibility of supporting the tutor/marker and providing a second opinion.

Step 3) The Apprenticeship/Training Manager must investigate to establish the allegation of use of AI – within 3 working days of being notified:

- Reviewing the assessments submitted and comparing this to the TurnItIn report, professional discussion evidence and previous drafts/final submissions.
- Once further investigation has been completed the Apprenticeship/Training Manager will provide the outcome to the tutor/marker and IQA.
- Where the Apprenticeship/Training Manager deem there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate competency of the learner to claim achievement of the assessment/sections in question, then this is to be re-marked by the tutor/marker and resubmitted to IQA.
- Where the Apprenticeship Manager/Training Manager conclude there is a significant likelihood AI has been misused – they will:
- Provide the learner with a written warning (see Appendix E), outlining the allegation and potential consequences if the learner resubmits any assignment again that contravenes the Plagiarism and Cheating Policy.
- Provide the tutor/marker with support in managing the situation moving forward with the learner. They may also request that the IQA provides this support on the behalf of the Apprenticeship Manager/Training Manager.
- Evidence of this investigation must be stored with the submitted assignment, marking and IQA records.
- Learner informed they will be required to start the assessment again and resubmit by an agreed deadline.

If the learner submits another assignment that contravenes the Plagiarism and Cheating Policy, following the written warning – then this must be escalated to the Head of Continuous Improvement and Head of Operations Skills and Training who will make a final decision on the penalty to be imposed on the learner. The Head of Continuous Improvement / Head of Operations Skills and Training (with the support of the Quality Manager) will follow the Awarding Organisations processes, which will include reporting the incident to them.

Stage Four – Identified at IQA

Where a learner has submitted an assignment and this has been marked – however the tutor/marker has:

- Not provided evidence the assignment has been run through TurnItIn – but marked as pass.
- Submitted the TurnItIn report, however, is showing a likelihood of 20%+, it has been passed without following the above process.

The IQA will refer the assessment back to the tutor/marker and Apprenticeship or Training Manager who will be required to take the appropriate action with the learner (see Identified at Marking Stages above).

The IQA must:

- Inform the Apprenticeship Manager/Training Manager and Head of Continuous Improvement/Head of Operations Skills and Training within 24 hours of identification.

- Increase the tutor/markers RAG rating for IQA activity (i.e. increasing % sampling strategy) – as identified risk to future claims (i.e. from Green to Amber or Red).
- Provide training to the tutor/marker.
- Recap the contents of this policy at the next Standardisation meeting . If the next standardisation meeting is more than 30 days away, then the IQA must send out a communication via email to all tutors reminding them of the process. This communication must also be sent to the Quality Manager and Training/Apprenticeship Manager – so a central record can be kept. Evidence of this must be stored centrally on the Serco share drive and sent to the Quality Manager.

Stage Five - Identified after Claimed with Awarding Organisation

This is the most serious scenario, that will likely result in an investigation by the Awarding Organisation.

- Whoever has identified this incident must report this within 24 hours to the Head of Continuous Improvement / Head of Operations Skills and Training.
- The Head of Continuous Improvement/Head of Operations Skills and Training (with the support of the Quality Manager) must inform the Awarding Organisation within 24 hours of becoming aware of the incident.
- Awarding Organisation processes will then be followed.

Appeals

The learner must be made aware of their right to appeal any assessment decision. Please refer to the Complaints, Disciplinary and Appeals Policy ([link to website](#)).

6. Further Guidance

Serco My Code. (2026) Bribery and Corruption.

<https://www.serco.com/mycode/doing-it-right/bribery>

Serco Speak Up. (2026) Speak Up – help make it right.

<https://secure.ethicspoint.eu/domain/media/en/gui/104065/index.html>

JCQ (2025) AI Use in Assessments: Your Role in Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications

<https://www.jcq.org.uk/knowledge-hub/ai-use-in-assessments-your-role-in-protecting-the-integrity-of-qualifications/>

University of Oxford (2026) Plagiarism.

<https://www.ox.ac.uk/students/academic/guidance/skills/plagiarism>

Awarding Body

ILM - <https://www.i-l-m.com/trainers-and-centres/customer-handbook/policies>

NCFE - https://www.ncfe.org.uk/qualifications/mandatory-policies-fees/?gclid=EAlalQobChMlrpaCsOnlgAMVwtTtCh3LwwdoEAAYASAAEgL7d_D_BwE

C&G - <https://www.cityandguilds.com/delivering-our-qualifications/centre-development/centre-document-library>

Gateway - <https://www.gatewayqualifications.org.uk/centre-support/quality-assurance/>

7. Appendix A – JCQ - scenarios of AI Misuse

JCQ (see appendix A within the link provided) has provided examples of AI misuse (see link for more examples):

Awarding body: OCR

Qualification: Cambridge Nationals Enterprise and Marketing

The moderator raised concerns of suspected plagiarism in a unit of the above qualification, due to a lack of referencing seen within candidates' work. Through using Turnitin, two candidates were identified who may have potentially used AI tools, or Large Language Models (LLMs), to generate content for at least one Learning Objective. These included explanations of different business terms and financial analyses.

One candidate admitted to using ChatGPT in the later parts of their coursework as they had not understood some of the questions and felt assistance from their teacher was "too infrequent". They stated their logic was it was no different to asking a teacher for advice as the AI tool would take information from across the internet and since they were asking specific questions, the 'reply' from the AI tool would be the same as getting teacher advice and feedback. The other candidate admitted they had used an AI tool to generate content for their work but couldn't remember which sections of work had been their own. Although the cohort had been told about plagiarism and how to avoid it, there had been no specific mention of AI tools – despite AI misuse being a form of plagiarism.

Based on the evidence provided by the centre, it was determined that the two candidates would receive zero marks for the affected Learning Objectives.

Awarding body: WJEC

Qualification: Level 3 Diploma in Criminology, Unit 3 controlled assessment

During a centre's internal moderation process and prior to work being submitted to WJEC moderation, an assessor/teacher at the centre suspected that part of the work presented was not entirely the candidate's own. It was suspected by the assessor that certain assessment criteria within the work did not match the work produced within other assessment criteria produced by the candidate. With this particular qualification, candidates are permitted to take a folder of general notes into the assessment based on prior research for an unseen assignment brief. When comparing the assessment criteria of concern to the notes the candidate took into the assessment, it was found that the candidate had copied their notes word for word, and they were identified as being generated by AI. The candidate had not referenced the source as AI-generated and had not declared it. On receipt of the candidate's work WJEC conducted further checks of the work via an AI detection tool, which provided evidence to confirm the centre's suspicion. The checks of the candidate's full body of work did not detect any further AI-generated content elsewhere.

As part of the investigation, the candidate confirmed that they had used an AI tool for one section of their notes only, due to rushing to prepare their notes prior to the assessment taking place. Following a careful review of the available evidence, WJEC determined that the candidate was in breach of the assessment requirements and JCQ *AI Use in Assessments* document which defines as malpractice "*copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own*" and "*failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information*". WJEC decided that as a result of the AI misuse being confined to one assessment criteria, the candidate received a penalty of loss of marks for a section. The impact of which resulted in the candidate not obtaining the overall qualification, as all assessment criteria for the unit must be met and a minimum number of marks must be achieved in each assessment criteria to gain the qualification.

8. Appendix B – Statement of Authenticity (SBPA example)

School Business Professional Apprenticeship (SBPA)

Statement of Authenticity

It is a regulatory requirement that every assessment submission is authenticated as your own work when submitted to Serco. This cover sheet/statement of authenticity should therefore be completed, signed and submitted with all assessment tasks and activities you are expected to submit for this course. Any submission that does not carry a statement of authenticity will not be verified and could result in the centre undergoing a malpractice investigation.

Centre Name	Serco
Centre Number	004985
Module Title	
Learner Name	
Learner Signature <i>*typed signature will be rejected</i>	
Learner Signature Date	

Statement of confirmation of Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Note: All assessments are submitted into TurnItIn software

Participants are advised to keep all versions of their work so these can be reviewed upon request.

Please answer the following questions on the use of AI for this assessment.

I have read the Serco Plagiarism & Cheating Policy	Yes		No	
I have used AI to aid me with completing this assessment	Yes		No	

If you have used AI – please answer the following:

State which AI software/programme/s were used:
State how you have used the AI software/programme:

Statement of confirmation of authenticity

By the act of making this submission, I am declaring that this is all my own work and that:

- The work has not, in whole or in part, been knowingly submitted elsewhere for assessment
- Where the submission includes work from a previous assessment, this has been identified
- Where materials have been used from other sources, it has been properly acknowledged
- If this statement is untrue, I acknowledge that an assessment offence has been committed

Attention is drawn to the plagiarism, collusion and cheating policies found in the SBPA Programme Handbook, and ILM's Plagiarism, Collusion & Cheating Policy.

Proven incidents of plagiarism, collusion or cheating can result in a participant being withdrawn from a qualification.

Permission for ILM to use this script

ILM use participants' submission – on an anonymous basis – for assessment standardisation. By submitting, both Serco Education and the participant agree that ILM may use the script on condition that identifying information is removed. However, if you are unwilling to allow ILM to use this script, please refuse by clicking this box: ☐

9. Appendix C – Using Grammarly as an ALN Support Tool

You have permission to use the **free version of Grammarly** as a support tool — similar to a spell-checker.

It helps you spot errors, **but the writing must remain your own.**

You must declare the use of Grammarly within the Statement of Authenticity with each assessment submitted.

You CAN	You CANNOT
Use Grammarly to correct spelling, punctuation, and grammar errors	Use AI Assistant, "Rewrite with AI" or any generative AI feature
Note clarity suggestions and rewrite those sections in your own words	Click 'Accept all' and allow Grammarly to make changes
Learn from suggestions to develop and improve your own writing	Submit work that has been rewritten or generated by any AI tool

How to Use Grammarly — Step by Step

- 1 Write your work yourself first — in full, in your own words.
- 2 Save a copy for reference before any amendments are made, in case this is requested after your Turnitin submission.
- 3 Paste it into Grammarly (or use the browser extension if permitted).
- 4 Only review spelling, punctuation, and grammar suggestions
- 5 Review each spelling, punctuation, and grammar suggestion one at a time. Do not click 'Accept all'.
- 6 Ask yourself: is this correcting a mistake, or is it changing what I said?
- 7 If it corrects a spelling, punctuation error, or suggests a more accurate single word — accept it. If it changes your sentence or how you have expressed your idea — leave it and review the section yourself.
- 8 Ignore or close any AI features — if you see "Rewrite with AI", "AI Assistant", or "Improve with AI", do not use these. AI-rewritten text can be detected by Turnitin and may put your work at risk.
- 9 Copy the corrected text back – that you have written in your own words - into your document and proofread as normal. Make any additional changes and save.
- 10 On your submission front sheet/statement of authenticity, please include the following (or something similar): I have used Grammarly as an approved spelling, punctuation, and grammar support tool in the preparation of this assignment. I confirm that all ideas, arguments, and written expression remain entirely my own. I have not used any AI rewriting or generative AI features.

Remember: Your ideas, your voice, your work. Grammarly helps you polish it — not rewrite it

10. Appendix D – Example Wording – Verbal Warning

I would like to remind you of Plagiarism and Cheating Policy ([link to website](#)). specifically, around the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in assignments. Following a review of your recent submission we have identified evidence indicating the likelihood of unauthorised artificial intelligence (AI) tools in the completion of your assignment. The assignment has been run through TurnItIn software which has identified the likelihood is more than 20% - which is our threshold.

Ref to Stage One: Initial Stage and outline the next steps for the learner.

11. Appendix E – Example Written Warning Template

Private and Confidential

Formal Written Warning – Unauthorised Use of Artificial Intelligence in Assessment

Dear [Learner Name],

Following a review of your recent submission for [qualification/unit/assessment title], we have identified evidence indicating the use of unauthorised artificial intelligence (AI) tools in the completion of your assignment.

As outlined in the signed Authenticity Statement all submitted work must be the learner's own and must not be generated, in whole or in part, by AI tools unless explicitly permitted and properly referenced. The use of unauthorised AI constitutes a breach of these requirements and undermines the integrity of the assessment process.

After careful consideration, this matter has been classified as a formal breach of the Plagiarism and Cheating Policy (link can be found at the bottom of this letter). As a result:

- This letter serves as a formal written warning.
- The affected assignment will be marked as a referral and will need to be completed again in your own words and resubmitted. Your tutor will provide guidance on whether this applies to the full assignment or sections of.
- You may be required to complete additional assessment activities to demonstrate your own knowledge and competency.

Please be aware that any further breaches of the Plagiarism and Cheating Policy, including continued inappropriate use of AI, may result in more serious disciplinary actions. These may include removal from the course or notification to the awarding body.

If you are unsure about what constitutes acceptable use of AI tools, you should seek guidance from your tutor before submitting future work.

You have the right to appeal any assessment decisions. If you wish to appeal then you can find the Appeals Policy on our website:

<https://est-serco.com/support-for-individuals/skills-training/policies/>

We trust that you will take this matter seriously and take the necessary steps to prevent any recurrence.

Yours sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Job Title]

Serco Skills and Training