

# Ginger Nut Training.



## Document Title

Plagiarism Policy

## Originator

Directors

## Responsible Person

Quality and Compliance Lead

## Date of Approval

April 2026

## Policy Due for Renewal

March 2027

Version

10.0.3

## Contents

Inclusive and Supportive Approach .....	2
What Constitutes Plagiarism or Cheating? .....	3
The use of AI in Assignments .....	3
Appendix A.....	4
Detection and Monitoring .....	6
Consequences of Plagiarism and Cheating .....	7
Supporting Learner Development .....	7
Malpractice and Maladministration .....	8
Version Control .....	8

## Plagiarism Policy

### Inclusive and Supportive Approach

Ginger Nut Training is committed to promoting an inclusive and supportive environment in which all learners understand academic integrity expectations and feel confident in demonstrating their own learning.

This policy aligns with Ofsted expectations for academic integrity within apprenticeship training. Tutors must ensure learners understand the importance of producing independent work, how to use AI tools ethically, and how to meet assessment criteria without gaining an unfair advantage. All submitted evidence must be authentic and attributable to the learner.

In line with the Education Inspection Framework, we recognise that some learners—particularly those with SEND, additional learning needs, or language barriers—may require further guidance to fully understand plagiarism, referencing, and independent work requirements. Tutors will provide accessible explanations, differentiated examples, and targeted support to ensure all learners can meet academic standards fairly and confidently.

Learners will receive guidance on plagiarism, referencing, and ethical use of AI tools during induction and throughout their programme.



## What Constitutes Plagiarism or Cheating?

To ensure equity, all information relating to plagiarism, referencing, and academic honesty will be made available in accessible formats. This may include simplified explanations, visual guides, audio resources, and one-to-one support where needed.

Learners who require reasonable adjustments will receive tailored guidance to help them understand expectations and apply academic integrity principles effectively. Ginger Nut Training aims to ensure that no learner is disadvantaged in demonstrating their knowledge due to literacy barriers, disability, or lack of prior experience with academic writing.

If you submit an assignment that contains work that is not your own, without clearly acknowledging the source, you are committing plagiarism, and this is an offence. This might occur when:

- Using a phrase or sentence from another source without acknowledgement
- Copying word-for-word directly from a text
- Closely paraphrasing without proper referencing
- Using text downloaded from the internet without citation
- Borrowing statistics or facts without acknowledging the source
- Copying images, diagrams, or figures without referencing
- Copying from another learner's work
- Reusing your own previously submitted work without acknowledgement

Although you are encouraged to refer to sources to support your learning, copying without acknowledgement is considered plagiarism and will not be accepted. You must make clear which ideas are your own and which are from other sources through appropriate referencing.

Learners are encouraged to collaborate for study purposes; however, submitted work must always be their own unless collaboration is explicitly required.

## The use of AI in Assignments

### Acceptable vs. Unacceptable Use of AI Tools

Ginger Nut Training recognises that AI tools can support learning when used appropriately and ethically.

#### Acceptable use includes:

- Grammar, spelling, and formatting support



- Structuring ideas or planning responses
- Supporting research, where information is checked and verified

**Unacceptable use includes:**

- Generating full assignment answers, reflections, or competency evidence
- Producing portfolio or workplace evidence
- Replicating or predicting End Point Assessment (EPA) responses
- Submitting AI-generated content as your own work

Any AI-generated content must be critically evaluated, fully rewritten in the learner's own words, and appropriately referenced. Learners remain responsible for the authenticity, accuracy, and integrity of all submitted work.

Learners will receive clear and accessible guidance on how to reference AI tools using Harvard referencing (see Appendix A). Additional support will be provided for learners with SEND, ESOL needs, or limited digital literacy.

## Appendix A

**Using Microsoft Co-pilot (11/2/2026) I asked for 'Create a Harvard referencing guide specifically for AI tools' and below is a direct copy and paste of how to reference using AI.**

### Harvard Referencing Guide for AI Tools (Including ChatGPT & Similar Systems)

Harvard referencing is based on **author + date** in citations and a **full reference list** at the end of the work.

AI tools are **not traditional authors**, so they must be referenced using the organisation behind the tool (e.g., OpenAI, Microsoft).

This guide gives **simple, ready-to-use examples**.

#### 1. In-Text Citations for AI Tools

Use the organisation name and year of access:

**Examples:**

- Paraphrasing AI output:  
*The AI suggested several ways to structure the report (OpenAI, 2026).*

- Quoting directly:  
“AI tools can support idea generation but must not replace original work” (OpenAI, 2026).

If using Microsoft Copilot, replace with:  
(Microsoft, 2026)

## 2. Reference List Entries

Harvard format for AI tools:

**Organisation. (Year). Title or description of output. AI tool name. Available at: URL (Accessed: date).**

**Examples:**

### ChatGPT example

OpenAI. (2026). *Response generated by ChatGPT on benefits of inclusive assessment practice*. ChatGPT. Available at: <https://chat.openai.com> (Accessed: 11 February 2026).

### Microsoft Copilot example

Microsoft. (2026). *Summary generated by Microsoft Copilot on reducing barriers to learning*. Microsoft Copilot. Available at: <https://copilot.microsoft.com> (Accessed: 11 February 2026).

### If using a prompt in the reference

You can include the prompt used, in square brackets:

OpenAI. (2026). *Response to prompt: “Explain plagiarism for apprentices in simple terms”*. ChatGPT. Available at: <https://chat.openai.com> (Accessed: 11 February 2026).

## 3. Referencing Your Own Prompt (Optional but Good Practice)

When the assignment requires transparency, add your prompt:

**In text:**

*I asked ChatGPT to define critical thinking (OpenAI, 2026).*

**Reference list:**

OpenAI. (2026). *Response to prompt: “Define critical thinking”*. ChatGPT. Available at: <https://chat.openai.com> (Accessed: 11 February 2026).

## 4. Referencing AI Images or AI-Generated Tables



If the AI produced an **image, diagram or table**, reference it like this:

OpenAI. (2026). *AI-generated diagram explaining apprenticeship progression routes*.

ChatGPT. Available at: <https://chat.openai.com> (Accessed: 11 February 2026).

In text:

(Figure created using ChatGPT, OpenAI, 2026)

## 5. Good Practice Rules for AI Referencing

- ✓ **Always declare** when you use AI to generate ideas, explanations, structure, or wording.
- ✓ **Rewrite AI content in your own words** unless directly quoting.
- ✓ **Never submit AI-generated content as your own** — this counts as plagiarism.
- ✓ **Check facts** – AI output may be incorrect or outdated.
- ✓ **Be specific** about the prompt if transparency is required.

## 6. Quick Copy-Paste Templates

**In-text citation:**

(Organisation, Year)

**Reference list (generic):**

Organisation. (Year). *Description of AI-generated output*. AI tool name. Available at: URL (Accessed: Day Month Year).

**Example to adapt:**

OpenAI. (2026). *Response to prompt: "Explain the key features of GDPR"*. ChatGPT. Available at: <https://chat.openai.com> (Accessed: 11 February 2026).

## Detection and Monitoring

Ginger Nut Training uses text comparison and plagiarism detection software to support the identification of potential academic misconduct. This may include analysis of electronically submitted, scanned, or retyped assignments.



Plagiarism detection software is used as a support tool and does not make final decisions. Tutors are responsible for reviewing flagged content and making informed academic judgements. Tutors and assessors are responsible for monitoring learner work for authenticity, providing guidance, and taking appropriate action where malpractice is suspected.

End Point Assessment organisations also carry out their own checks and may reject work that does not meet authenticity requirements.

Any confirmed plagiarism that impacts synoptic assessments, portfolios, or gateway evidence will be reported to the relevant awarding organisation in line with their malpractice procedures. This may result in delays to gateway progression or End Point Assessment (EPA) booking.

## Consequences of Plagiarism and Cheating

Plagiarism, collusion, and cheating are breaches of the Ginger Nut Training Learner Code of Conduct and apprenticeship behavioural expectations.

Proven cases may result in:

- Disciplinary action in line with company procedures
- Assessment decisions being withdrawn or invalidated
- Delays in programme progression or gateway approval
- Impact on End Point Assessment eligibility
- Potential impact on employment status where employer agreements apply

Passing work to others with the knowledge it may be copied, copying from social media or online sources, or purchasing work to submit as your own are all considered serious offences.

All learners are required to confirm that submitted work is their own.

## Supporting Learner Development

Assignments are designed to support learning, develop understanding, and build independent thinking skills. Producing your own work helps you gain the knowledge and confidence required for successful completion of your programme and End Point Assessment.



Learners are encouraged to seek

support from tutors if they are unsure about referencing, academic writing, or expectations. Ginger Nut Training promotes a positive learning culture where integrity, honesty, and effort are valued.

**Malpractice and Maladministration**

Where plagiarism, collusion, cheating, or misuse of AI is suspected or confirmed, this will be managed in line with the Ginger Nut Training Malpractice and Maladministration Policy.

Malpractice includes any deliberate action that compromises the integrity of assessment, including submitting work that is not your own, falsifying evidence, or gaining an unfair advantage. Maladministration refers to unintentional actions or omissions that may impact assessment processes or outcomes.

All suspected or confirmed cases will be formally reviewed, investigated, and documented. Learners will be informed of the process and given the opportunity to respond to any concerns raised.

Where required, cases will be reported to the relevant awarding organisation in line with their malpractice procedures. This may result in sanctions, including invalidation of assessment results, delays to progression, or restriction from End Point Assessment (EPA).

Further details can be found in the Ginger Nut Training Malpractice and Maladministration Policy.

**Version Control**

Version	Date	Author	Summary of changes
10.0.3	April 2026	Q&C Lead	Updated to align with Ofsted expectations; added AI guidance, clarified plagiarism definitions, strengthened detection processes, introduced awarding organisation reporting, enhanced tutor responsibilities, and improved inclusivity and accessibility

*J Celino*  
J Celino (Apr 1, 2026 11:51:32 GMT+1)

*Dan Williams*  
Dan Williams (Apr 1, 2026 11:54:34 GMT+1)



# Plagiarism Policy - March 24 - Draft (002)

Final Audit Report

2026-04-01

Created:	2026-04-01
By:	Ginger Nut Training (delivery@gingernuttraining.co.uk)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAeA6uP0hM9pEWpEGYNnNPfsVLPQvowrSb


## "Plagiarism Policy - March 24 - Draft (002)" History

 Document created by Ginger Nut Training (delivery@gingernuttraining.co.uk)

2026-04-01 - 10:33:15 AM GMT

 Document emailed to jacqui.celino@gingernuttraining.co.uk for signature


2026-04-01 - 10:33:20 AM GMT

 Email viewed by jacqui.celino@gingernuttraining.co.uk

2026-04-01 - 10:51:07 AM GMT

 Signer jacqui.celino@gingernuttraining.co.uk entered name at signing as J Celino

2026-04-01 - 10:51:30 AM GMT

 Document e-signed by J Celino (jacqui.celino@gingernuttraining.co.uk)


Signature Date: 2026-04-01 - 10:51:32 AM GMT - Time Source: server

 Document emailed to dan.williams@gingernut.co.uk for signature


2026-04-01 - 10:51:34 AM GMT

 Email viewed by dan.williams@gingernut.co.uk

2026-04-01 - 10:54:14 AM GMT

 Signer dan.williams@gingernut.co.uk entered name at signing as Dan Williams

2026-04-01 - 10:54:32 AM GMT

 Document e-signed by Dan Williams (dan.williams@gingernut.co.uk)

Signature Date: 2026-04-01 - 10:54:34 AM GMT - Time Source: server

 Agreement completed.

2026-04-01 - 10:54:34 AM GMT