

AI and Generative AI Guidance



For staff and students

GC Academy Limited

Responsible use in learning teaching and assessment

Revision date 9 September 2026

Institutional approval pending

This document sets out when AI may be used, what students and staff must disclose and verify, and how concerns are reviewed fairly. It updates the existing June 2026 guidance and provides the revised text for institutional approval and publication. The assessment brief defines the permissions for each task; human academic judgement remains central to teaching, assessment and misconduct decisions.

Contents and document control

Purpose scope and principles.....	3
Student use and its limits.....	4
AI use levels in assessment.....	5
Student AI declaration.....	6
Staff practice and confidentiality.....	7
Reviewing AI related concerns.....	8
Media education and responsibilities.....	9
Review publication and preparation.....	10

Status and responsibility

This revision updates AI and Generative AI Guidance for Staff and Students, Version 1.0, June 2026, included in the accreditation documentation. The earlier version is retained. The revised text is prepared for formal adoption and publication as the institutional AI policy; the revision date does not itself establish approval or publication.

The Head of Institution owns the document. The Head of Quality Assurance Office coordinates review and version control. The QA and Curriculum Committee reviews proposed changes and Academic Board approves the academic provisions under A16 and A17. Review is annual and earlier when material developments require it, as set out in section 15.

Approval reference and date: _____

Effective date and next review: _____

Related procedures

Read this guidance with A4 Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy, A1 Academic Appeals Procedure, A3 Academic Integrity Acknowledgement, A18 Programme Design, Monitoring and Assessment Policy, A23 Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, A24 Digital Conduct and Use Policy, the Data Privacy and Usage Policy and A25 Student Records Management Policy. Assessment briefs and the applicable rubrics specify the task requirements.

The policy, operational guidance, approved assessment instructions and actual implementation records remain identifiable by version and date. Staff and students receive the current approved information before it is used. Publication, induction and recorded acknowledgement follow section 15.

Purpose scope and principles

1 Purpose

GC Academy supports responsible and transparent AI use in learning, teaching, assessment preparation and administration. This guidance protects authentic authorship, assessment validity, academic fairness, human responsibility and confidentiality while allowing educational uses appropriate to the learning outcomes.

2 Scope

It applies to students, tutors, instructors, assessors, programme leaders, administrative and quality assurance staff, and external academic partner personnel acting for the Academy. It covers study and research preparation, drafting and editing, assignments, case studies, presentations and video work, projects, examinations, teaching and feedback support, administrative communication and internal academic or operational work.

3 Definition of generative AI

Generative AI means digital tools that produce or transform content in response to prompts. This includes text, images, audio, video, code, translations, presentations, research summaries, study notes, outlines and drafts. Chatbots, writing assistants, image generators and translation or editing tools can fall within this guidance when they provide such assistance. A familiar product name does not establish permission for every feature it offers.

4 Core principles

- Academic integrity: assessed work demonstrates the student's own understanding, judgement and learning, with accurate recognition of sources and contributions.
- Transparency: disclose permitted AI assistance that materially contributes to a submission and meet the declaration requirements of the brief.
- Assessment validity: AI assistance must not replace the knowledge, skills or competence the task is designed to assess.
- Human responsibility: students and staff verify content and sources and remain responsible for the accuracy, quality and ethical acceptability of their work.
- Fairness: apply clear task conditions consistently, consider access and agreed support needs, and avoid unfair advantage or disadvantage.
- Data protection: do not place personal, confidential, student, assessment or institutional data in external AI tools without explicit appropriate authorisation.
- Tutor discretion within approved assessment design: tailor AI conditions to the module, task and outcomes through the approval and communication arrangements in A18.

Plagiarism involves presenting another person's words, ideas or work without appropriate acknowledgement. AI use is not automatically plagiarism or misconduct. It becomes an integrity concern when it breaches the task conditions, conceals required disclosure, misrepresents authorship or undermines the assessment of the student's own learning.

Student use and its limits

5 Permitted educational uses by students

Students may use AI for learning support where it is consistent with the assessment instructions and academic integrity requirements. Appropriate uses can include:

- Explaining difficult concepts and generating questions for personal practice or revision.
- Summarising publicly available material for personal study, while checking it against the source.
- Improving grammar or clarity in non-assessed preparatory work and clarifying or translating general language for personal understanding.
- Exploring possible approaches, planning an outline or checking whether an argument is clear, where the task permits this assistance.
- Practising presentation structure or interview-style questions and reflecting on the feedback received.

These examples do not authorise AI use in every assessment. The student reads the actual brief, checks the permitted category and limits, and seeks clarification where necessary. The final work must demonstrate the student's own understanding, judgement and effort.

6 Restricted or prohibited uses by students

Students must not use AI to gain an unfair advantage, impersonate competence, conceal assistance or bypass the independent work required by the assessment. In particular:

- Do not submit AI-generated text, analysis, a presentation script or an examination answer as your own unaided work.
- Do not use AI to complete writing, reasoning, reading, communication or professional judgement that the brief requires you to demonstrate independently.
- Do not use AI in an examination or controlled assessment where it is prohibited, or exceed the stated limits on planning, language or content assistance.
- Do not present invented sources, quotations, references, data or other evidence as genuine, or submit AI-assisted content without the necessary accuracy checks.
- Do not omit a required declaration, give false information about AI use or use AI to support plagiarism, unauthorised collaboration or contract cheating.
- Do not upload confidential or personal information without the authorisation and safeguards required in section 11.

Where an approved task explicitly assesses AI-assisted professional practice, follow its limits, verify the output and identify the AI contribution. Permission to use AI never authorises deceptive attribution or fabricated evidence. A declaration does not make prohibited assistance permissible. Suspected breaches follow section 12 and A4; the presence of AI assistance alone does not determine a case.

AI use levels in assessment

7 Setting the conditions for each task

The following five categories are retained from the June 2026 guidance. They are AI-use categories, not qualification levels. The brief states the applicable category, permitted activities and limits, declaration requirements and any tools or features relevant to the task. Do not assume that a category automatically includes every permission described in another category.

Level 0 No AI use permitted

AI tools must not be used for the assessment task. This applies where the task evaluates unaided knowledge, writing, reasoning, examination performance or communication competence. Any approved support arrangement must be clarified and recorded before use.

Level 1 AI use for study support only

AI may support background learning, revision or personal study, but not preparation of the submitted assessment. Students must not include AI-generated text, analysis or structure in the final submission.

Level 2 AI use for language and presentation support

AI may improve grammar, spelling, clarity or formatting within the brief's limits. Ideas, argument, analysis and substantive content remain the student's own. The student checks the changes and remains responsible for the submission.

Level 3 AI use for brainstorming or planning

AI may generate ideas, outlines or possible approaches within the brief's limits. The student independently develops, verifies and writes the final submission. AI suggestions do not replace the student's own analysis.

Level 4 AI assisted work permitted with declaration

AI may form part of preparing the submission where the brief permits it, with a clear declaration of how it was used. This can support tasks assessing critical evaluation of AI outputs, digital media practice, communication technology or professional workflows. The student still demonstrates and explains the required individual contribution and judgement.

Approval and communication

The tutor or programme team proposes the conditions against the learning outcomes. The Head of Institution coordinates readiness and approval within the approved specification under A18; material changes follow Academic Board approval. QA checks that the brief, rubric and student information agree. Publish the conditions before assessed work begins.

Tutor clarification does not independently change the approved brief. Any change after release is formally reviewed for academic need and fairness, approved by the competent authority and communicated with adequate notice. A permission given for one task does not extend to another. Students ask the tutor or module coordinator before using a tool if the instruction is unclear.

Student AI declaration

8 Disclosure for the submitted work

Declare permitted AI assistance that materially contributes to the work and complete any declaration required by the brief. Identify the tool and version where known, purpose and extent of use, affected sections or material, verification undertaken and the permission reference. Use this record or the equivalent declaration in the combined Assessment Rubrics for Assignments and Case Studies, as directed by the brief. One complete linked record is sufficient; duplicate forms are not required.

Select the truthful status below. For no AI use, mark tool-related fields “Not applicable”. For permitted use, identify each tool and complete the original declaration wording below. Add response space or numbered continuation pages as needed. Retain the declaration with the actual submission.

Student name or identifier: _____

Programme, module and assessment task: _____

AI use status: No use / Permitted use declared below

Brief version and permission reference: _____

Tool and version where known: _____

Purpose and extent of use: _____

Affected sections or material and verification undertaken: _____

Confirmation for permitted use

I confirm that I used generative AI only in accordance with the assessment instructions. I used the tool for the following purpose: _____. I reviewed, checked and edited the output and accept full responsibility for the final submitted work.

Confirmation for no use

I confirm that I did not use AI in preparing or completing this submitted assessment. This statement applies to the identified task and is selected only when accurate.

Student confirmation and date: _____

Submission or linked declaration record reference: _____

A3 records general acknowledgement of institutional responsibilities and procedural rights. It does not replace this task-specific declaration or certify future work. Declaring AI use does not authorise a prohibited activity, prove achievement of the learning outcomes, admit misconduct or waive the right to respond and appeal.

Staff practice and confidentiality

9 Staff guidance on AI in teaching

Staff may use AI to prepare examples, discussion prompts, draft quiz ideas, alternative explanations and generic feedback examples, or to improve non-sensitive teaching materials. It can support exploration of communication and media practice and the preparation of simplified explanations or alternative formats. The tutor reviews every material before use for accuracy, sources, suitability, bias and alignment with the learning outcomes.

AI output is not used uncritically as authoritative academic content. Staff retain responsibility for teaching decisions and record material assistance where needed for transparent review. An AI-produced alternative format is checked for the actual learner's needs; its production alone does not demonstrate accessibility.

10 Staff guidance on AI in assessment

Design assessment so that the evidence demonstrates the intended learning outcomes. Use the approved brief and rubric to explain permitted AI, declaration and individual-contribution requirements. Personal reflection, practical application, case-specific analysis, presentations and oral explanation can provide evidence of the student's own reasoning when they form part of the approved assessment design.

In group work, identify and assess each student's attributable contribution. A shared product, activity count or peer rating alone does not establish individual attainment. In presentations and Final Projects, retain the relevant work, questioning and assessment evidence under the applicable procedures.

Assessors apply academic judgement to the work and criteria. Any AI-assisted preparation of feedback or other assessment material requires human verification before release. AI output does not substitute for the authorised marker, moderation, Board of Examiners validation or the independent case decision. Do not introduce an unannounced scored task to test authorship. A concern about authenticity follows the fair review in section 12.

11 Data privacy and confidentiality

Students and staff must not enter personal, confidential or sensitive information into external AI tools unless this is explicitly authorised and appropriate under the Data Privacy and Usage Policy. This includes student identities, assessment records and grades, personal data in assignments or case studies, unpublished institutional documents, confidential staff information, complaints and appeals, and commercially or institutionally sensitive material.

Check the authorised purpose, information to be shared, access and applicable handling conditions before use. Use only the information necessary for that purpose and preserve the required safeguards. Removing a name alone does not establish that the material is suitable to share. If the conditions are unclear, obtain clarification through the institutional data-privacy route before transferring information.

Academic approval of a tool for a task does not by itself authorise disclosure of confidential data. A3 acknowledgement and an AI-use declaration are not blanket consent to external processing. Records follow A25 and the applicable privacy and digital-conduct requirements. Report an actual privacy or security concern through the relevant institutional incident route; do not treat it as a student misconduct finding without the proper procedure.

Reviewing AI related concerns

12 Academic misconduct related to AI

Potential concerns include undeclared or prohibited AI use, false declarations, fabricated sources or data, misrepresented authorship, impersonation of competence and AI-supported plagiarism, collusion or contract cheating. A4 sections 3 to 5 govern the review and first-instance decision; A4 section 7 and A1 govern independent appeal. Staff misconduct and wider ethical concerns follow A23 and the applicable procedure.

Screening and academic review

Initial technical or administrative screening records the work, tool or report, date, relevant settings and observed concern. It does not decide whether misconduct occurred. The tutor or assessor examines the approved brief, actual submission, declaration, source accuracy, relevant drafts or previous work, LMS context and the student's explanation. Record what each item supports and any limitations; an activity log is not proof of authorship or learning.

Similarity and AI-detection outputs are indicators. A positive result does not establish misconduct; no alert does not establish originality. False or inconclusive results and changes in tools or models are considered. No percentage or threshold automatically changes a grade, establishes a breach or triggers a sanction. Staff evaluate the evidence available for the actual case without promising reliable identification of every AI-assisted submission.

Notice and independent decision

Where a concern remains after academic review, the student receives the allegation, relevant rule and supporting evidence in writing and an opportunity to respond before formal referral. The student can present evidence, request a meeting and appropriate access or support, answer material new information and receive a reasoned written decision. QA registers the case, checks completeness and conflicts and coordinates notice; it does not decide the merits.

Unconflicted Academic Board members appoint three independent academic voters, including a senior academic chair, under A16 and A17. The original assessor, referrer or person involved in the merits cannot decide the case. All three participate and decide by majority under A4, with non-voting QA support and substitutes or external members where needed. Only authorised proportionate sanctions apply. The Head of Institution arranges implementation without replacing the finding.

Direct independent appeal

A misconduct appeal goes directly to the independent Appeals Panel under A1 within ten working days of notification, without an informal return to the original tutor. Grounds include procedural irregularity, unfairness or bias, conflict, relevant new evidence not reasonably available earlier, inadequate consideration of mitigating circumstances, an unsupported finding or a disproportionate sanction.

Three independent voters, including a senior academic chair, decide by majority. Original assessment, moderation, referral, first-instance decision or implementation involvement excludes a person from deciding the appeal. QA provides non-voting procedural support. Under A1, the Panel can uphold the decision, vary the sanction within A4, set it aside or remit the case to a differently constituted Panel.

The written outcome gives reasons and action within fifteen working days of receipt of the formal appeal. Exceptional delay is explained with a revised expected date. Use the published LMS appeal channel or alternative institutional contact; report access or timing difficulties promptly for consideration under A1. Records preserve evidence, response, reasons and authorised implementation. A declaration or acknowledgement does not waive these rights.

Media education and responsibilities

13 AI in communication and media education

AI can be a legitimate subject of study or professional practice in communication, journalism, public relations, digital content and visual media. Approved tasks can ask students to evaluate AI-generated communication, compare human and AI-assisted work, examine ethical risks, assess misinformation and bias, reflect on limitations and demonstrate their own editorial judgement.

For example, a task may require a student to compare an AI-generated communication draft with verified source material and explain the corrections made. This is an illustrative activity, not an additional approved module or assessment. The actual brief specifies permission, evidence, criteria and the individual contribution required.

AI-supported creative or professional work still needs accurate attribution, verified sources and a reasoned explanation of choices. Any group activity retains evidence of each student's work and judgement. The assessor evaluates the specified learning outcomes rather than the mere use of an AI tool.

14 Responsibilities

Students read the brief, follow the permitted-use conditions, protect data, verify content and sources, disclose assistance and retain the evidence required for the task. They seek clarification when unsure and ensure that submitted work represents their own learning and competence.

Tutors, instructors and assessors make task conditions clear, use approved rubrics, apply rules consistently and support responsible use. They verify AI-assisted teaching and feedback materials, examine concerns fairly and refer cases through A4 rather than deciding a sanction themselves.

Programme leaders coordinate consistency across modules, check alignment with learning outcomes and review recurring questions or problems. The Head of Institution coordinates readiness, appropriate resources and staff preparation and implements authorised outcomes. Academic Board retains the academic approval powers in A16 to A18.

Administrative staff provide the current information, support access, record actual acknowledgements and preserve the required records. Any screening role remains separate from academic judgement. Partner personnel follow the same institutional conditions and reporting routes when working for GC Academy.

The Head of Quality Assurance Office coordinates policy alignment, version control and anonymised monitoring. The QA and Curriculum Committee examines recurring issues and proposed improvements. The independent Academic Integrity Panel and Appeals Panel retain their own case powers; routine QA review does not reopen their individual findings.

Review publication and preparation

15 Review and controlled updates

Review this guidance annually and whenever significant technological, educational, regulatory or ethical developments require an earlier change. Consider student and tutor questions, feedback, moderation findings, actual integrity cases and appeals, and evidence about AI tools and educational practice. The principles of transparency, authentic authorship, validity, fairness, human responsibility and data protection remain the basis of the policy.

Operational guidance on particular tools and detection methods is checked and updated when relevant changes arise rather than waiting for the annual policy review. Academic and technical staff provide current evidence to QA on suitability, limitations, settings and support needs. Record the source, date, review conclusion and any restrictions in the existing QA documentation. Do not assume that a tool's earlier performance applies unchanged after an update.

The Head of Institution coordinates the use of current, appropriate tools reasonably available for the intended purpose. Technical advice does not certify detection accuracy or transfer academic decision-making to a provider. Material changes to policy or assessment conditions follow Academic Board and A18 approval arrangements; operational notes cannot silently alter student obligations or appeal rights.

Publication and version control

Before programme commencement, the Academy formally approves and publishes the revised document as its institutional AI policy on the official website and through the LMS. QA maintains the controlled current version and records approval, effective date, publication locations and change history. Earlier versions remain identifiable so that the rules applicable to a particular task can be established.

Students, staff and external academic partner personnel receive clear current guidance. The brief states the applicable AI category, limits and declaration requirements before assessed work begins. Record actual access and communication, and replace superseded instructions through the controlled process.

Preparation and evidence of use

Before the first student intake, relevant academic, administrative and QA staff and partner personnel receive updated preparation under A7 and A21. It covers permitted and prohibited use, plagiarism and AI misuse, detection limitations, contextual evidence review, privacy, student response rights, conflicts, independent decisions and appeal. Record participation, understanding, unresolved needs and follow-up in the existing staff preparation records.

Students receive the guidance through induction and module preparation and acknowledge the relevant requirements through A3 and the applicable learning-agreement arrangements. Task-specific declarations remain linked to actual submissions. Provide practical examples and an accessible clarification route; record actual acknowledgement and follow up missing completion.

The Annual QA Calendar supports monitoring of consistency, case timelines, appeals and recurring guidance needs. Improvement actions in the Quality Enhancement Log identify the evidence, owner, due date, expected result, completion and effectiveness. A revised policy, blank declaration or rehearsal is distinct from completed training, publication or a real programme case; record each according to what has actually occurred.