Policy

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY, PLAGIARISM AND APPROPRIATE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) POLICY

SETTING	Pharmacy Workforce Development South (PWDS)
FOR STAFF	All learners/trainees, educational supervisors, designated supervisors, training programme directors, assessors and staff involved in the delivery of PWDS education and training programmes.
ISSUE	Academic Integrity, Plagiarism and Appropriate Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

1. Purpose

Pharmacy Workforce Development South (PWDS) is committed to promoting academic integrity, professionalism and ethical practice across all education and training programmes.
Learners/trainees are expected to submit work that is authentic, appropriately referenced and representative of their own knowledge, understanding, experiences and reflections.
This policy provides guidance on:

- Academic integrity
- Plagiarism
- Referencing requirements
- Appropriate use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)
- Investigation and management of suspected academic misconduct.

2. Scope:

This policy applies to all Learners/trainees, educational supervisors, designated supervisors, training programme directors, assessors and staff involved in the delivery of PWDS education and training programmes.

3. Academic Integrity:

Academic integrity refers to acting honestly, ethically and professionally in all learning, assessment and accreditation activities.

Learners/trainees must:

- Submit their own work.
- Acknowledge the ideas, words and work of others.
- Accurately reference all sources used.
- Be truthful in reflective accounts and assessment submissions.
- Behave in a manner consistent with the standards expected of pharmacy professionals.

Failure to uphold academic integrity may constitute academic misconduct and could result in disciplinary action or programme failure.

4. What is Plagiarism?

Plagiarism occurs when a learner/trainee presents another person's work, ideas or intellectual property as their own without appropriate acknowledgement.

Examples of plagiarism include:

- Copying text from books, journals, websites or reports without referencing.
- Copying work from another learner/trainee.
- Submitting work completed by another person.
- Purchasing or downloading assignments from external sources.
- Paraphrasing or rewording another author's work without referencing the original source.
- Copying reflective accounts, case studies or portfolio entries.
- Presenting AI-generated content as your own original work without declaration or appropriate attribution.

Plagiarism may be intentional or unintentional; however, both forms are considered unacceptable.

5. Why Plagiarism is Serious

Plagiarism undermines:

- The integrity of the educational process.
- Fairness for other learners/trainees.
- Public confidence in pharmacy professionals.

- The ability of assessors to make accurate judgements regarding competence.

In healthcare education, academic honesty is linked directly to professional behaviour, patient safety and fitness to practise.

6. Referencing Requirements

PWDS requires learners/trainees to use the Harvard Referencing System for all written assignments, projects, reports and academic submissions unless otherwise specified.

Why Reference?

Referencing:

- Acknowledges the work of other authors.
- Demonstrates academic rigour.
- Enables readers to locate original sources.
- Avoids plagiarism.
- Strengthens arguments and evidence within written work.

When Should Sources Be Referenced?

Sources must be referenced whenever learners/trainees:

- Quote directly from another source.
- Summarise information.
- Paraphrase ideas.
- Use statistics, data or research findings.
- Refer to published guidance, policies or professional standards.

Common knowledge does not normally require referencing.

Harvard Referencing Examples;

Journal Article:

In-text citation

(McCartney, 2024)

Reference list

McCartney, M. (2024) 'Improving pharmacy education through reflective practice', Pharmacy Education Journal, 18(2), pp. 45–51.

Website

In-text citation

(General Pharmaceutical Council, 2026)

Reference list

General Pharmaceutical Council (2026) Position statement: The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in pharmacy. Available at: www.pharmacyregulation.org (Accessed: 7 July 2026).

Direct Quote

"When directly quoting text, quotation marks should be used" (Smith, 2023, p.10).

7. Artificial Intelligence (AI)

PWDS Position on AI

PWDS recognises that generative AI tools such as Microsoft Copilot, ChatGPT and similar technologies are becoming increasingly available and may support learning, accessibility and productivity.

The General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) recognises that AI can support pharmacy education and training but highlights the risks of over-reliance, inaccurate outputs, bias, and loss of core skills. The GPhC expects education providers to support learners/trainees to use AI ethically, safely and effectively while maintaining the authenticity of assessments. (General Pharmaceutical Council, 2026)[1]

Permitted Uses of AI	Unacceptable Uses of AI
Learners/trainees may use AI responsibly to support: • Understanding concepts. • Planning or structuring written work. • Identifying areas for further reading. • Improving grammar and readability. • Generating ideas or discussion points. • Accessibility needs and communication support.	Learners/trainees must not: • Submit AI-generated content as their own work. • Use AI to create reflective accounts based on experiences the learner/trainee has not personally had. • Use AI to fabricate patient scenarios, evidence, learning activities or workplace experiences.

[1] *General Pharmaceutical Council (2026) Position statement: The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in pharmacy. Available at: www.pharmacyregulation.org (Accessed: 7 July 2026).*

Any use of AI must be critically reviewed by the learner/trainee.	• Use AI to complete assessments without significant original learner/trainee input. • Present AI-generated work as authentic evidence of competence. The GPhC states that pharmacy professionals remain personally accountable for decisions, actions and submissions that involve AI and must ensure outputs are accurate, truthful and transparent.

AI and Reflective Practice

Many PWDS programmes require reflective accounts.

Reflection should describe:

- The learner/trainees personal experiences.
- Individual learning.
- Personal insights.
- Future actions and development.

While AI tools may assist with structure, grammar or clarity, they cannot replace the learner/trainee's personal reflection, critical thinking or professional judgement. The final submission must remain an authentic account of the learner/trainee's own experience and learning.

Declaring the Use of AI

Where AI has been used to support a submission, learners/trainees should include a declaration such as:

"*Generative AI was used to support the planning, structuring and language review of this submission. All content, reflections, conclusions and professional judgements are my own*."

PWDS reserves the right to request further explanation regarding how AI was used during the preparation of submitted work.

AI in the Context of Reasonable Adjustments

Where AI is utilised as a reasonable adjustment to support learners/trainees with additional needs or protected characteristics, the requirements of this policy must be considered alongside

the PWDS Equality of Opportunity and Reasonable Adjustments Policy to ensure that appropriate support arrangements are implemented without compromising academic integrity.

Use of Programme Resources with AI Tools

Learners/trainees **MUST NOT** upload, input, share, or otherwise make available any PWDS programme templates, assessment materials, learning resources, workshop content, confidential, commercially sensitive documents or other programme-related materials into publicly available Artificial Intelligence (AI) platforms or tools.

This requirement is intended to protect intellectual property, confidential information, assessment integrity, and data security. Any unauthorised sharing of programme resources through AI systems may be considered a breach of academic integrity and could result in disciplinary action in accordance with relevant local information governance and/or PWDS policies.

Where AI is approved as a support mechanism for learners/trainees requiring additional support or reasonable adjustments, its use must comply with this policy and be considered alongside the Equality of Opportunity and Reasonable Adjustments Policy.

8. Identifying Potential Academic Misconduct

Educational supervisors and assessors should be vigilant for:

- Sudden changes in writing style.
- Language inconsistent with a learner/trainee's normal capability.
- Generic or impersonal reflective accounts.
- Work that lacks personal insight.
- Inaccurate or fictitious references.
- Content inconsistent with workplace experiences.
- AI-generated text patterns.
- Similarities between learner/trainee submissions.

Where concerns exist, PWDS may investigate further**.**

9. Identifying Potential Academic Misconduct

Where academic misconduct is suspected, PWDS may:

- Request clarification from the learner/trainee.
- Require resubmission of work.

- Reject the submitted evidence.
- Record the incident on programme records.
- Refer the matter through relevant employer or educational procedures.
- Remove accreditation or programme completion status where appropriate.

Serious or repeated incidents may result in withdrawal from a programme.

Appendix 1: Examples of Unacceptable and Acceptable in Assessments and Portfolio Evidence

While AI can be used as a learning support tool, it must not replace a learner/trainee's own thinking, reflection, professional judgement or demonstration of competence.
The following **unacceptable** examples would be considered inappropriate use of AI and may be treated as academic misconduct, plagiarism, falsification of evidence, or professional misconduct. The GPhC expects learners/trainees to ensure assessment submissions are authentic and to be transparent about any use of AI[1]. **Acceptable** use examples provide examples where use of AI would be considered reasonable and responsible use in the context of PWDS training programmes

Reflective Accounts

Unacceptable	Acceptable
• Asking an AI tool to write a complete reflection based on a workplace experience. • Submitting an AI-generated reflective account with minimal or no editing. • Providing a brief description of an event and asking AI to generate the learning, reflections and future actions.	• Writing your own reflective account and using AI to check grammar, clarity, or structure. • Asking AI questions that help you think more deeply about your experience, without asking it to generate the reflection. • Using AI to suggest relevant reading or professional guidance for further learning.
Why? Reflective writing is intended to demonstrate the learner/trainee's own experiences, thoughts, values and professional	**Why?** The reflection, learning, conclusions, and action plans remain the learner's own work. AI is used only to support editing, organisation,

development. AI cannot genuinely reflect on a learner/trainee's personal practice.	and critical thinking, not to generate the reflective content itself.

Case Studies and Patient Examples

Unacceptable	Acceptable
• Using AI to generate patient cases that did not occur in practice. • Creating fictional consultations, interventions or clinical decisions and presenting them as real experiences. • Using AI to fabricate evidence for portfolio submissions.	• Using AI to improve the grammar, structure, or clarity of a case study based on a real patient or clinical experience. • Using AI to suggest prompts or questions that help identify areas for deeper clinical reflection or analysis. • Using AI to help organise information into a logical case-study format after the content has been written by the learner. • Using AI to identify relevant guidelines or evidence that can be reviewed and referenced appropriately.
Why? This constitutes falsification of evidence and may call into question a learner/trainee's professionalism, honesty and integrity.	**Why?** The case study, patient details, clinical decisions, and learning points must be based on genuine practice and written by the learner. AI may support presentation and critical thinking, but must not be used to create, alter, or fabricate evidence.

Knowledge-Based Assignments

Unacceptable	Acceptable
• Reliance on solely AI-generated answers directly for use in assignments without human review and critical thinking and active engagement with the content.	• Using AI to explain concepts or terminology to support understanding before completing assignment questions in your own words.

• Asking AI to complete an assignment question and submitting the response unchanged. • Using AI-generated references that have not been checked for accuracy.	• Using AI to help plan the structure of an assignment or organise key points. • Using AI to check grammar, spelling, and clarity of work you have written yourself. • Using AI to identify potential sources of information, provided all references are checked for accuracy and used appropriately.
Why? The submitted work does not demonstrate the learner/trainee's own understanding, critical thinking or application of knowledge.	**Why?** The learner/trainee remains responsible for researching, analysing, and writing the assignment. AI may support learning, understanding, and presentation, but must not be used to generate answers that are submitted as the learner's own work.

Workplace-Based Assessments

Unacceptable	Acceptable
• Using AI during assessments where independent knowledge and decision-making are being evaluated. • Using AI to generate responses to competency discussions without declaring its use. • Asking AI how to answer assessment questions and presenting the answers as personal knowledge.	• Using AI to revise relevant clinical, professional, or theoretical knowledge before an assessment. • Using AI to help understand assessment criteria or competency frameworks. • Using AI to reflect on feedback received after an assessment and identify areas for development. • Using AI to improve the grammar or clarity of a written account that documents real workplace practice and has been written by the learner.
Why? Assessment decisions must be based on the learner/trainee's own competence and professional judgement.	**Why?** The learner/trainee's competence, professional judgement, and assessment responses must remain their own. AI may be

	used to support preparation, understanding, and presentation, but must not be used to provide answers or demonstrate competence on the learner's behalf during assessment.

Referencing

Unacceptable	Acceptable
• Using references suggested by AI without verifying they exist. • Including fabricated journal articles, books or websites generated by AI. • Citing sources that have not been reviewed by the learner/trainee.	• Using AI to suggest potential sources or search terms as a starting point for research. • Using AI to check the formatting of references against a required referencing style. • Using AI to help summarise a source that has already been located and reviewed by the learner. • Using AI to identify possible gaps in the range of sources used, while independently locating and verifying any additional references.
Why? Generative AI can create inaccurate or entirely fictitious references, and learners/trainees remain responsible for checking the accuracy of all sources used. The GPhC emphasises that individuals remain accountable for the outputs of AI tools and must review information for accuracy and reliability	**Why?** The learner/trainee remains responsible for locating, reading, evaluating, and accurately citing all sources. AI may support the research and referencing process, but all references must be verified for accuracy, relevance, and authenticity before inclusion in submitted work.

General Examples of Acceptable AI Use

The following uses would generally be acceptable, provided the learner/trainee reviews all outputs and remains the author of the work:

- Asking AI to explain a concept or topic.
- Using AI to improve grammar, spelling or sentence structure.
- Using AI to suggest a structure for a report or reflection.
- Using AI to generate revision questions.
- Using AI to identify relevant topics for further reading.
- Using AI accessibility features to support learners/trainees with disabilities or specific learning needs.
- Using AI to summarise a paper that the learner/trainee has personally read and critically reviewed.

PWDS AI Accountability Statement

Learners/trainees should be aware that:
The use of AI does not remove individual accountability. Learners/trainees remain responsible for the accuracy, authenticity and integrity of all submitted evidence. Any work submitted for assessment must represent the learner/trainee's own knowledge, understanding, professional judgement, experiences and reflections. Any use of AI must be transparent, proportionate and consistent with PWDS requirements and GPhC expectations[1]

Document Change Control

Document Change Control				
Date of Version	**Version Number**	**Lead for Revisions**	**Type of Revision**	**Description of Revision**
July 26	1.0	Mary Carter	Major	New document