

# AI text for PAs marking coursework

Generative artificial intelligence is a label used to describe any type of artificial intelligence (AI) that is used to create text, prose, formulae, code, images, video or audio. ChatGPT and Google Gemini are two examples of generative AI tools. AI outputs can be very human-like, potentially increasing the risk of plagiarism.

Many of our assessments are conducted under conditions that prevent the use of such online tools to generate assessment content. There are also checkpoints built into assessment approaches that enable teachers and lecturers to identify work that may not be authentic. While plagiarism is a long-standing issue, it is rare for learners to submit work to us that is not their own or hasn't been produced in accordance with the relevant assessment conditions. Our robust malpractice procedures outline that learner's risk serious penalty if they submit work that is not their own. This includes the potential cancellation of their award.

Our current position on the use of generative AI in session 2024-25 has been developed to ensure equity and fairness for all learners studying our qualifications. The position covers two areas:

Policy position	Guidance
<p><b>Learners cannot submit AI outputs as their own work.</b></p> <p>Learners are <b>not</b> permitted to use generative AI tools to create outputs – for example text, prose, formulae, code, images, video, audio – that they then submit as their own work for assessment tasks that contribute towards an SQA qualification. These tasks include exams, unit assessments, coursework, and portfolios. Doing so would constitute plagiarism and could result in awards being cancelled.</p>	<p>Normal marking processes should be followed with the escalation malpractice processes being used where required.</p>
<p><b>AI cannot be referenced as a source.</b></p> <p>Learners must <b>not</b> include outputs from generative AI tools that are referenced as a source for assessment tasks that contribute towards an SQA qualification. There are currently some significant issues regarding the reliability and validity of these outputs that mean referencing the tools could be inappropriate or disadvantageous to learners.</p> <p>Using outputs from generative AI tools as sources may not meet the referencing requirements of specific courses and could impact the number of marks a learner can achieve.</p>	<p>Where AI-based sources are acknowledged by the learner, it is not a malpractice issue and it should not be escalated via the malpractice escalation process.</p> <p>Normal marking processes should be followed. For subjects where marks are allocated to referencing requirements, marks should not be awarded for AI-sources.</p>

Further information can be found on the SQA webpage: [Generative artificial intelligence \(AI\) in assessments - SQA](#)

## Potential AI-based plagiarism - recognising features

Whether plagiarism, including from AI sources, is likely to occur in the coursework your team assesses depends on the nature and the conditions of assessment, ie coursework produced over time and/or in open book conditions, has a higher risk of plagiarism.

Marking Teams will already be aware of the typical characteristics of plagiarised work but may be less certain about how AI-produced text can be spotted. We have listed below a number of indicators that may be present in AI-produced text. Please be aware that these are just indicators; each indicator may not, on its own, be indicative that work is AI produced. Indeed, some learner work may share some of these characteristics.

- ◆ Repeated use of language or vocabulary which might not be appropriate to the qualification level or context.
- ◆ A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/expected.
- ◆ A variation in the style of language evidenced within a piece of work, including inconsistency in the tone and style of writing.
- ◆ Use of US English spelling, or American terminology.
- ◆ Content being generic in nature rather than relating to the learner, or where they live or the specific topic, where this is required or expected.
- ◆ Inadvertent inclusion of warnings or provisos produced by the AI tool that have not been removed from generated text.
- ◆ An unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitive conclusions in an overarching essay structure.
- ◆ The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs within otherwise cohesive content.
- ◆ Instances of incorrect or inconsistent use of first-person and third-person pronouns where generated text is left unaltered.
- ◆ Reference to outdated or obscure sources of information.