Quality Management System

Policy Number

POL-C-10

Policy Title

Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Assessment Policy

Author	Vicky Nelson Quality Assurance Manager
Approved By	Lee Phillips Director of Quality and HE
Version	Issue 1 Rev 0
Effective from	September 2026
Last reviewed	September 2026
Next review due	September 2027
Equality Impact Assessed	September 2026

Alternative Format Statement

We are committed to ensuring all our materials are accessible to everyone. If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:

Quality Improvement Team
Email: Quality@bacoll.ac.uk
Phone: 01388 443069

Please note: On our website, we have the Recite Accessibility toolbar. If you select Accessibility on the top toolbar, any text on the website, including linked policies and procedures can:

- be converted from text to speech
- be translated into over 100 languages including 65 text to speak voices
- have its colour, scheme, text, font style, size and spacing changed

Contents

Section and Title		Page Number
Alternative Format Statement		2
1.0	Introduction to AI in Education	4
2.0	Purpose and Scope	4
3.0	Definitions	5
4.0	Risks, limitations and considerations of using AI	6
5.0	Permitted and Prohibited use of AI in formative and summative assessment	7
6.0	Principles for Ethical AI Use	10
7.0	Assessment Design and AI Assignment Categorisation	10
8.0	Referencing AI and acknowledging its use	13
9.0	BACG's Generative AI detection process and Academic Misconduct	14
10.0	Support for Students	15
11.0	Review and update	16
12.0	Related Documentation	16
Contact Information		17
Appendix 1 - Guidance for teaching staff		18

Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Assessment Policy

1.0 Introduction to AI in Education

At Bishop Auckland College Group (BACG), we recognise that Artificial Intelligence (AI) is evolving rapidly and transforming the educational landscape.

The responsible use of Artificial Intelligence in assessment is essential to maintaining fairness, academic integrity, and meaningful learning across Further and Higher Education. While AI technologies can provide valuable support for developing ideas, enhancing study skills, and improving access to learning, they must be used transparently, ethically and in line with the requirements outlined in this policy.

2.0 Purpose and Scope

2.1 The purpose of this Policy is to:

- Provide guidance to students and teaching staff, on when and how Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools may be used to produce assessment tasks, including formative and summative assessments, with the aim of ensuring academic integrity, safeguarding the validity and reliability of assessment outcomes, and preventing AI-related academic misconduct in an ever-evolving AI landscape.
- Provide clear guidance on how to use AI responsibly, safely and ethically.

2.2 Scope - this Policy applies to:

- All L3 students and above (FE and HE) enrolled on courses at BACG.
- All staff involved in facilitating and supporting learning, assessment design, delivery and validation L3 and above (FE and HE).
- All forms of assessed academic work, including but not limited to essays, assignments, examinations, coursework, research projects, presentations, group work, reflective tasks, and in-class activities.
- All AI systems, including—but not limited to—ChatGPT, Copilot, Gemini, Grammarly, translation tools, image generators, code assistants, and automated writing or problem-solving tools.

3.0 Definitions

3.1 AI: Artificial Intelligence: Any digital system or tool capable of generating text, data, images, audio, code, or providing explanations, solutions, analysis, or other outputs based on automated processes.

3.2 Generative AI: Generative Artificial Intelligence is a type of artificial intelligence which generates content in response to prompts from the user, including text, images and code.

3.3 AI-Generated Content: Any material created or changed by an AI system, including text, images, citations, translations, code, data analysis, or audio.

3.4 Assisted content: Student work that uses AI as a support tool but remains predominantly authored by the student.

3.5 Permitted AI Use: Where AI is allowed by identification on assessment documentation, module requirements, Awarding Organisation guidance and policies or instructor guidance, provided it is fully declared and used ethically.

3.6 Prohibited AI Use: Any use of AI that replaces a student's own critical thinking, misrepresents the work as the student's original contribution, violates assessment regulations or Awarding Organisations' guidance or policies.

3.7 BACG: Bishop Auckland College Group

3.8 Viva: Viva questions (often used in *viva voce* examinations) are oral questions asked directly to a student to verify their understanding, authorship, and knowledge of submitted work.

3.9 DSA: Disabled Students' Allowance (DSA) is funding that helps students with disabilities, long-term health conditions, mental health conditions, or specific learning difficulties access the support and equipment they need for their studies.

3.10 EHCP: Education, Health and Care Plan is a legal document which describes a child or young person's, aged up to 25 with special educational needs and disabilities (SEND), support needs required to access education, and achieve their outcomes.

4.0 Risks, limitations and considerations of using AI

While the benefits of AI are significant, there are many risks and limitations associated with its use.

4.1 Data Privacy and Safeguarding Your Data: The use of AI introduces significant data privacy concerns. You must ensure that AI tools are not used to process personal or confidential information, as these tools may not guarantee data security or anonymisation. You should avoid entering any personal details about yourself, other individuals or BACG, private files, or original coursework into them. Anything that identifies you or someone else, such as your full name, address, phone number, email, date of birth, photos, student ID, or details about BACG, counts as personal data.

Note: once information is uploaded to a public AI tool, you lose control over how it is stored or reused.

4.2 Copyright- You should not provide AI tools with any copyright material unless;

- The third-party individual or organisation has given you permission to do so,
- You are using Microsoft Copilot in protected mode (check that there is a shield). Microsoft Copilot (when accessed through your BACG Microsoft 365 account) is the only AI tool approved by BACG for use with copyright-protected college materials. Copilot operates within BACG's Microsoft 365 environment and is covered by Microsoft's enterprise data protection commitments. Prompts, responses and organisational data are not used to train public AI models. Always use your college account when accessing Copilot and never use personal email accounts for college work involving AI. However, users remain responsible for checking the accuracy, appropriateness and legality of any AI-generated content before using it.

4.3 Accuracy, Bias and Fairness: AI tools can be very helpful for learning, but they do make mistakes. They can give information that sounds convincing but is factually wrong, out of date, or based on biased sources. Always double-check what AI produces against trusted materials such as your textbooks, college resources, or reliable websites.

Read carefully, think critically, and make your own decisions as to any AI outputs. If you're unsure whether information is correct, compare it with an official source.

4.4 Academic Integrity: The ease of generating high-quality content with AI poses significant challenges to traditional assessment methods and requires a new approach to evaluating authentic learning and understanding. This policy addresses these challenges by providing clear guidelines on what constitutes academic misconduct (ref 5.2) and how to properly attribute and cite the use of AI tools, reinforcing the value of original thought (ref 8.2.4).

4.5 Over-reliance: Excessive dependence on AI tools may diminish critical thinking skills, creativity, and independent problem-solving abilities. Students must be mindful that AI is a tool to supplement, not replace, human cognitive effort. The policy encourages a balanced approach where human judgment remains paramount.

4.6 Technical Limitations: AI systems have inherent limitations in accuracy, context understanding, and reliability. They can produce "hallucinations" (factually incorrect information) and may struggle with nuance, humour, or highly specialised topics. Users must understand these limitations. Verification through reliable, independent sources is always required.

5.0 Permitted and Prohibited use of AI in formative and summative assessment

5.1 Permitted use

- Where the assessment documentation indicates a RAG categorisation rating of Amber or Green, students may use AI for the following purposes, provided all use is declared in accordance with Section 8. Where AI tools are permitted, students must use tools available through their BACG college account (such as Microsoft Copilot via Microsoft 365) wherever possible, as these meet BACG's data protection requirements. Use of personal accounts on consumer tools (e.g. free ChatGPT, personal Google Gemini) is permitted only for non-sensitive, non-personal tasks. No confidential or personal data relating to the student, other students, staff, or BACG must be entered into any AI tool

- Idea generation or brainstorming
- Where the assessment documentation
- Understanding concepts
- Outlining basic structure or organisation of work
- Summarising research or long texts
- Surface-level proofreading (minor errors) - this can include identifying errors in spelling, punctuation, typographical mistakes or poor grammar, highlighting redundant or missing words, highlighting formatting errors,
- Finding legitimate sources and references (verified manually)
- Generating practice questions or study aids.
- Evaluating or improving AI-generated answers (where permitted within the assessment documentation)

You must critically engage with any ideas before submission and it is imperative that you properly attribute and cite the use of any AI tools.

If you have declared an inclusion need, it may have been recommended that you can use AI as a reasonable adjustment. Please seek guidance from your programme/course team to ensure you do not compromise academic integrity.

Where AI tools have been recommended as a reasonable adjustment under a Disability Support Assessment (DSA) or Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP), students should refer to Section 5.3 of this policy.

5.2 Prohibited use

It is considered **academic misconduct** unless explicitly permitted if you use AI for any of the following:

- Submitting AI-generated content as your original work.
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools.
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.
- Using AI to rewrite or edit sections or sentences of your work to improve the clarity of the argument/meaning or develop an argument or idea.
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses/ sections of AI- generated content so that the work submitted is no longer the students own.

- Using AI for correcting calculations, formulae or equations, or re-label diagrams, charts or figures.
- Using AI tools to process, store, or transmit personal data relating to themselves or others
- Using AI to produce answers for assessed questions, first drafts, starting points etc.
- Using AI to generate exam answers, assessment responses, or research findings.
- Using AI to impersonate the student in viva, interview, or discussion tasks.

Please note any use of the above to generate content that is not correctly attributed or cited, will be considered academic misconduct and, dealt with under the Assessment Malpractice and Maladministration policy (FE) POL-Q-02 / POL-HE-03 Academic Misconduct Policy (HE).

5.3 Disability Support Assessment and AI usage

Where a student has a Disability Support Assessment (DSA) recommendation or an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) that specifies AI tools as a reasonable adjustment, those tools may be used in assessed work, subject to the following conditions:

The reasonable adjustment must be formally documented and confirmed by the BACG Learning Support team prior to use in assessment.
The adjustment applies to the specific function recommended (e.g. spelling and grammar checking) and does not extend to uses not specified in the DSA recommendation.

Grammarly and equivalent tools used solely for checking spelling, punctuation, and typographical errors are permitted as a reasonable adjustment on Red-rated assessments. Use of AI rewriting or content-generation features within such tools remains prohibited on Red-rated assessments regardless of DSA status.
All use of AI tools as a reasonable adjustment must still be declared on the AI Usage Declaration form, with the DSA recommendation noted.

Students should speak to their programme team or Learning Support adviser before using an AI tool as a reasonable adjustment in an assessment where they are uncertain about scope.

BACG will ensure that the application of this Policy does not disadvantage students with disabilities and will review reasonable adjustment processes annually in line with DSA guidance."

6.0 Principles for Ethical AI Use

Students may use AI only when:

- The assessment documentation explicitly allows AI use.
- **All AI use is transparently declared**, including:
  Which tools have been used and indicates:
    - Purpose
    - Prompts or instructions given
    - How the student validated AI output

- **The student maintains academic integrity** by ensuring:
    - AI is used as a support tool, not as a substitute for intellectual effort.
    - AI-generated content is critically evaluated, checked, and integrated responsibly.

- **No confidential, personal, or sensitive information** is entered into AI tools unless approved by the institution.

7.0 Assessment Design and AI Assignment Categorisation

7.1 Teaching staff, where possible, will consider designing AI-resilient assessments for students that assess the process of learning rather than just the final product, such as in-person demonstrations, live presentations, or reflection on the AI-assisted process. (reference 'Designing AI-Resilient Assignments to Reduce Academic Misconduct C-AI-04)

7.2 Teaching staff are encouraged to design AI-resilient assessments by:

- Incorporating staged submissions (drafts, reflections, research logs).
- Using personalised, contextualised, or experience-based tasks.
- Combining written work with viva-style follow-up questions.
- Requiring authenticity statements describing the student's process.
- Including in-class or synchronous components to validate understanding.
- Integrating AI critique tasks (e.g., evaluate and improve AI output).

7.3 Teaching staff should generate unique viva questions and critique exercises that verify authentic student understanding.

7.4 Teaching staff will design assessments that appropriately incorporate or restrict AI use. Clear and explicit guidelines will be provided to students for each assignment, outlining what is permitted and what is prohibited. **Initially, all assignments will be rated RED unless told otherwise.**

7.5 Each assessment you are given will have a 'RAG' categorisation rating to indicate the acceptable use of AI in each assessment. Below is an example of the 'RAG' categorisation ratings. Teaching staff should refer to the AI in Assessment Scale- Guidance for Teaching Staff (C-AI-03)

AI Permission: Red

This assignment has an AI Permission of Red

This means you cannot use AI in any way as part of your summative assessment.

Please refer to the assignment brief for more details

AI Permission: Amber

This module has an AI permission of Amber

If explicitly permitted by the Module Leader, you may then use AI to assist you in completing specific tasks, when producing your assessment. In this category making use of Generative AI in ways that are not allowed or not declaring its use or referencing it correctly, will be subject to academic misconduct procedures. (ref section 5.2)

Please refer to the assignment brief for more details

AI Permission: Green

This module has an AI Permission of Green

You are expected to use AI as a companion in your learning and when producing your assessment. Typically for addressing larger or more complex problems or for demonstrating your skills in using AI tools and critically evaluating the content produced and examining the limitations in your area of study within your assessment. You must still acknowledge how you used Generative AI, to demonstrate academic integrity.

Please refer to the assignment brief for more details

Regardless of what category the assessment falls under, remember your assignments must be your own work, spoken or written in your own words and therefore represent your own voice.

8.0 Referencing AI and acknowledging its use

Students must adhere to the following standards regarding the use of AI in assessments.

8.1 Declaration Requirements:

8.1.1 **Mandatory Declaration:** Use of AI must be declared in all submitted academic work. Example- brainstorming, drafting, or editing. When submitting evidence to be formatively or summatively assessed, the Assessed work: Generative AI Usage Declaration form (ref C-AI-01) must be completed and uploaded to Moodle with your assessment evidence (even if no AI was used)

Students must submit a declaration with every piece of evidence to be assessed. Failure to provide a declaration may be treated as a breach of assessment regulations.

8.1.2 **Specify Tool and Purpose:** The declaration must specify which AI tools were used (e.g., Copilot, ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini) and for what specific purpose (e.g., "for idea generation on the essay topic," "for grammar and syntax checks," "to summarise a research paper").

8.1.3 **Describe Extent**: The declaration should describe the extent of AI assistance received, providing a clear and honest account of its role in the work.

8.2 Academic Integrity Standards:

8.2.1 **Demonstrate Understanding:** Students must be able to demonstrate a full and independent understanding of any content within their evidence submitted for assessment.

8.2.2 **No Direct Copying:** Direct copying from AI outputs without proper attribution constitutes academic misconduct, equivalent to plagiarism. AI tools should supplement, not replace, critical thinking and original analysis.

8.2.3 **Final Work is Your Own:** The final evidence submitted for assessment, must represent the student's own understanding, insights, and critical analysis.

8.2.4 **Referencing AI Sources:**
When referencing AI assistance in evidence submitted for assessment, use the following format: This work was assisted by [AI Tool Name] on [Date] for [Purpose], as declared in the appendix.

Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, a student's acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated.

The student must retain a copy of the question(s) (**prompts**) and computer-generated content (**The AI's response**) for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (**such as a screenshot**) and provide a brief explanation of how it was used. This must be submitted with the work the student submits for assessment.

If an AI tool has been used which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work. Using the BACG's standard style of referencing (Harvard referencing). Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students should ensure that they independently verify the AI-generated content, and then reference the sources used.

Important: Just saying you used AI doesn't mean it's allowed. It must still meet the assignment's RAG categorisation rating for AI acceptable usage.

9.0 BACG's Generative AI detection process and Academic Misconduct

We have robust safeguards in place to protect academic integrity and standards to ensure that all students are assessed fairly and consistently. We do this through:

9.1 Submission of assessed work

All student evidence submitted for assessment must be submitted in PDF format and uploaded to the appropriate course/ module Moodle page. Along with a completed 'Assessed Work: Generative AI Usage Declaration' (ref C-AI-01)

BACG use **Turnitin**, a sector-wide plagiarism tool, along with its **AI detection plug-in**, which provides a *risk rating* indicating the potential use of generative AI. If your work receives an **AI risk rating above 20%**, it will undergo further review to confirm your evidence submitted for assessment is your own original work.

Note: AI-detection software may be used only to inform, not determine suspicion and will **not** be the sole evidence in misconduct proceedings.

9.2 Enhanced Scrutiny of Assessment Work

It is now standard practice that evidence submitted for assessment will be subject to more detailed scrutiny. A member of your programme team will contact you promptly if this happens. The steps in **Appendix 1** may then take place.

10.0 Support for Students

BACG is committed to ensuring all students understand and can apply this Policy. The following support will be in place from September 2026:

Student AI Acceptable Use Policy (POL-IT-15) and AI in Assessment Policy (POL-C-10): issued to all students at enrolment and available on Moodle. Covers what AI is, the RAG rating scale, what is and is not permitted and what happens if it goes wrong.
AI Induction Session: a structured 20–30-minute session delivered during induction week for all Level 3 and above students, covering the RAG rating scale, how to complete the Assessed Work: Generative AI Usage declaration form and where to get help.

Checklist for Students to follow to prevent AI Academic Misconduct C-AI-02 issued to all students at induction and available on Moodle. Provides a step-by-step pre-submission reference.

Programme team guidance: all students are encouraged to speak to their programme leader or course team if they are unsure about AI use in a specific assessment. Tutors have been briefed and can advise.

Further workshops on academic integrity and critical AI use will be delivered by the Learning Zone team throughout the academic year and communicated to students through Moodle.

11.0 Review and update

Given the pace of change with AI, it is likely that this policy will be reviewed frequently. Formally, this policy will be reviewed at least annually to ensure it remains current and reflects:

- technological developments
- changes in educational practice
- feedback from staff and students
- Institutional and regulatory requirements

All staff and students are expected to familiarise themselves with this policy.

12.0 Related Documentation

• Assessed Work: Generative AI Usage Declaration	C-AI-01
• Checklist for Students to follow to prevent AI Academic Misconduct	C-AI-02
• AI in Assessment Scale- Guidance for Teaching Staff	C-AI-03
• Designing AI-Resilient Assignments to Reduce Academic Misconduct	C-AI-04
• Student AI acceptable use policy	POL-IT-15

Contact Information

For questions or feedback regarding this policy, please contact:

Vicky Nelson

Quality Assurance Manager

Email: Quality@bacoll.ac.uk

Phone: 01388 443069

Appendix 1 - Guidance for teaching staff

After student assessment evidence has been submitted via Turnitin, including the AI detection plug-in tool. If the report shows a 'risk factor' score for use of AI that exceeds 20%, further scrutiny of the student assessment evidence is required.

This further scrutiny is very likely to constitute the '**Informal Stage**' of the academic misconduct or assessment malpractice process. Please refer to:
Assessment Malpractice and Maladministration policy (FE) POL-Q-02
Academic Misconduct Policy (HE) POL-HE-03.

The following steps may take place, not always in this order. They are not all mandatory, but will help to create a bigger picture to inform the decision making, on the authenticity of the student's assessment evidence.

i. Initial Contact with the student

Contact will be made with the student verbally and via email requesting that they provide further evidence. This could include:

- Screenshots showing AI use
- Assessment drafts
- Research notes
- Any other preparation materials

The additional evidence will be required within **48 hours.** This is to enable any concerns to be closed out quickly.

ii. Face-to-Face Meeting (Viva Voce)

Students will be invited to a meeting where they will be asked questions to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of their submitted assessment evidence. The questions / discussion will focus on, but not limited to:

- Specific content and topics
- Ideas / suggestions
- Approach to research and chosen literature

Notes will be taken / recorded.

iii. Programme Team Review

The programme team conduct a detailed review of students' assessment evidence, considering:

- Previous writing style
- Recent academic ability and progress
- Prior assessed work and grade profile
- General classroom participation and performance
- Unusual patterns in written structure, rationalisation and reasoning, or citation style.
- Fabricated examples or inaccessible sources (unable to verify).
- Observations based on changes between draft and final submissions.
- Answers that are very generic or repetitive

iv. Authorship Analysis

Turnitin's authorship tools can be used to compare student submission evidence with previous work. This analysis can examine:

- Writing patterns
- Academic level
- Style and structure
- Similarities and differences
- Timestamps and creation data

This ensures no single automated report leads to an accusation of academic misconduct / assessment malpractice.

After this additional scrutiny, if concerns remain, the matter may progress to the '**Formal Stage**'. Non ethical use of AI will be considered academic misconduct and the relevant policy will be initiated in accordance with level of study. Assessment Malpractice and Maladministration Policy (POL-Q-02) for FE. Academic Misconduct Policy (POL-HE-03) for HE.