

**Artificial Intelligence
Suffolk County Council
End Point Assessment: Career Development Professional Apprenticeship.
Position Statement October 2025.
Review Date April 2026.**

This document provides training providers with information about the use of Artificial Intelligence in relation to End Point Assessment for the Careers Development Professional.

What is Artificial Intelligence and what are the risks to using it in assessments?

Artificial intelligence is the intelligence of machines or software, as opposed to the intelligence of humans or animals. Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) is when content can be generated – text, video and/or images or sound - for example by someone prompting a programme to ‘write an essay’, ‘produce a speech’, ‘create a marking scheme’, and the technology generates the content.

The use of AI in learning has both benefits and risks. It can be used in a number of ways to enhance teaching and learning. However, there is concern over the risk of plagiarism and the impact on developing a learner’s deep knowledge and analysis.

Regulatory bodies have been developing guidelines on the use of Gen AI in education and assessment.

AI in assessment:

It is impossible to ignore AI, as the technology is already here and developing all the time. Your students - and your assessors - will have different levels of expertise and interest in the technology and may already be using or experimenting with it.

However, in terms of ensuring the validity and authenticity of assessment and feedback, the current rules are clear. (*Joint Council for Qualifications AI Use in Assessments 2023*).

Using AI to produce work to submit for assessment and to pass off as their own work is not permitted and will constitute malpractice.

It is important that learners can **demonstrate that work is their own** and is in their own words, and that they develop the knowledge, skills and understanding of the subject they are studying so that they can apply these in future learning and employment. Learners need to demonstrate higher order skills such as critical analysis, synthesis and evaluation, rather than regurgitating content that can be produced by AI.

If learners do submit work reproduced directly from AI generated responses, they must identify this. These sections of work will not be classed as their own work and so not form part of the marking criteria.

In addition, for assessment, using AI as the sole form of marking learners work is also not permitted. Work has to be initially assessed by a human assessor, not a machine.

AI in the CDP End Point Assessment

Apprentices on the career development professional course, will need to understand the impact and ethics of AI in not only their sector (careers and employment) but also in a range of other sectors, so that they can discuss with confidence the impact on AI for their clients.

They will also need to understand the benefits and risks of AI in terms of their learning programme and assessment so that if they do choose to use AI, they are aware of the ethics and risks.

Due to the nature of the End Point Assessments in the CPD, Suffolk County Council End Point Assessment team have assessed the use of AI as low risk. This is because much of the assessment is specific to time and place of the apprentice's workplace and also their practice.

The questions for the **Professional Discussion** are unknown to the apprentice in advance and answers require apprentices to link to their own practice. Apprentices must also confirm that they do not have outside help – that would include using AI tools to generate answers.

The report is based on a **project** specific to their practice. However, it is possible that some parts of the **report** could be generated by AI and EPA assessors will be scrutinising work in these sections.

The **portfolio** consists of evidence generated from their practice and their main qualification. If AI is suspected in any of these pieces of evidence, we may contact the relevant Awarding Organisation. Even where they have been awarded the qualification, if a case of plagiarism is found and/or that AI has been used to generate the work and it is therefore not their own, this will be investigated and could result in the award being withdrawn from them at a later date. This will also impact on the Apprenticeship certificate.

Authenticating Work

Portfolios and reports must be authenticated by the apprentice and their employer to confirm that it is their own. They are also signing to confirm that they are aware of the plagiarism policy and misuse of AI. Suffolk County Council will not accept work that is not authenticated by wet or electronic signatures or email trail. Typed names will not be accepted.

Assessing Work

Independent end point assessors will not be using AI to mark work as this is not permitted as the sole form of assessment.

Policies and Procedures

Suffolk County Council have updated Malpractice and Plagiarism policies, reviewed the risk to the assessments, given training to IEPAs and will review procedures on a regular basis.

Plagiarism and Malpractice

Training providers will already have policies in place to prevent plagiarism and malpractice, so these need to be reviewed to make sure they provide information relating to AI. Awarding organisations also have policies that will have been updated to take AI into account.

Where AI has been used to produce any part or all of the work, this means the learner may not have produced the work themselves and this could be classed as plagiarism and malpractice.

All cases of malpractice must be investigated.

Referencing AI: If a learner has used AI for any part of their assessment, they must declare this by showing the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated. For example: ChatGPT 3.5 (<https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt/>) 25/01/2023. The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes in a noneditable 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 assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used. Depending on its use/misuse, this element of the work submitted may not count or only count in part towards the marks awarded.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to:

- copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work is no longer the learner's own,
- copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content,
- using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the learner's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations,
- failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information,
- incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools,
- submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

What providers need to do.

1. Keep up to date with emerging technologies such as AI, including being fully aware of the latest guidance produced by your own Awarding Body and qualification regulators such as Ofqual. For a list of some suggested reading, see Appendix 1.
2. Be fully conversant with all relevant conditions and policies of your Awarding Organisation e.g. Malpractice, including AI.
3. Regularly review and update your own policies related to the use of AI, plagiarism and malpractice.
4. Ensure that all those involved in the delivery of assessments have regular training on AI, including how it relates to malpractice.
5. Teach learners about AI – Apprentices must be clear about the risks and implications of misuse and abuse of these technologies in terms of assessment and that they are fully aware of the implications of misusing AI.
6. Advise learners to keep original copies of work before they have put through AI or grammar checker.
7. Actively seek to identify risks of AI and seek to mitigate them.
8. Encourage assessors and learners to report suspected cases of misuse of AI.

9. Put robust processes in place to verify and check the authenticity of learners' work being submitted for assessment e.g. quality assurers, audits, random checks.
10. Act in all suspected cases of malpractice (including misuse of AI) by investigating swiftly and robustly, and where cases are proven, the appropriate remedial action is taken.
10. Keep a log of both suspected and proven cases of malpractice related to AI, and review these as part of your continuous improvement reviews to learn lessons and strengthen your processes for the future.

How to detect AI use

It is currently very difficult to confirm AI content through normal plagiarism software. Therefore, assessors can use the following methods to detect AI use.

- compare work submitted for assessment with other work the same learner(s) produced previously,
- use of professional discussion or Q&A to check learning,
- look out for unusual language that is uncharacteristic or of a higher level to that usually provided by that learner,
- information that is factually incorrect,
- lack of specific local or topical information,
- use of American spellings can be an indicator of using AI,
- the format or formatting is different to the way the learner usually submits work.

Reporting and whistleblowing

Ensure that your complaints and whistleblowing processes and procedures are up to date and well communicated. Make sure that all cases of reporting/escalating and whistleblowing are investigated swiftly and that where evidence is found, these are followed up with the appropriate malpractice investigation and processes.

Appendix 1: Other guidance and suggested reading

- [The Department for Education \(DfE\) statement on Generative artificial intelligence in education](#)
- [JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications. Guidance for teachers and assessors – AI Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications](#)
- [JISC National Centre for AI.](#)
- [Office for Artificial Intelligence - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)
- [OCR AI Support](#)

Appendix 2 Excerpt from Ofqual Regulations

G8.1 must take all reasonable steps to ensure that ... evidence generated by a learner in an assessment is generated by that learner (or includes evidence generated by that Learner as a contribution to group work).

A8.1 must take all reasonable steps to prevent the occurrence of any malpractice or maladministration.

A8.6 Where any malpractice has occurred, must promptly take all reasonable steps to: (a) prevent that malpractice from recurring; and (b) take action against those responsible which is proportionate to the gravity and scope of the occurrence, or seek the cooperation of third parties in taking such action.

A8.7 Where an awarding organisation has any cause to believe that an occurrence of malpractice or maladministration, or any connected occurrence –

(a) may affect a Centre undertaking any part of the delivery of a qualification which an awarding organisation makes available, it must inform that Centre, and

(b) may affect another awarding organisation, it must inform that awarding organisation.