Senate 12.03.2026
Paper Code: SE2025.41

Queen Mary University of London

Senate

Paper Title	**AI in Assessment Policy Position paper, 2026**
Outcome requested	Senate to is asked to endorse the enclosed paper which sets out a series of policy positions on Generative AI in Assessment at Queen Mary.
Points for Senate members to note and further information	The University has published guidance to staff and students on Generative AI in student education. In October last year, Senate endorsed the proposal to develop AI in Assessment policy. As part of the Education Enabling Plan priority 1c), Assessment steering group, a working group was established, chaired by the Interim Director of QMA. The group met four times between October and January to review the University's existing guidance and relevant policies and consider whether these sufficed or further policy was required. In addition to the meetings of the working group, internal stakeholders were engaged through a range of meetings and events (November-January), Schools shared their draft AI guidelines and desk-based work was undertaken of publicly available information from other Universities. The working group concluded that a standalone AI in Assessment policy would not suffice and, instead a set of policy positions are proposed. If these are endorsed by Queen Mary, it will be necessary for existing guides and policy to be reviewed and updated accordingly so that AI is much more explicit and visible in our regulations, where appropriate. Positions on the following are proposed in the paper: 1. A new AI in Assessment taxonomy 2. Alignment with Principles of Assessment Design 3. Declaration of use of AI 4. Staff use of AI in assessment and feedback processes 5. AI detection tools
Questions for Senate to consider	Is Senate happy to endorse: a) the red, amber, green taxonomy? (section 4.1) b) the proposal that Programme-level assessment should be prioritised (Principle 1 of Principles of Assessment Design) but Programme teams are responsible for determining an appropriate range of red: amber: green assessments utilised (section 4.2)

	c) the proposal that students will be required to complete an AI declaration for all assessments? (section 4.3) d) proposed appropriate and inappropriate use of AI in assessment and feedback processes by staff (section 4.4) e) The proposed position on the use of AI detection tools (section 4.5)
Regulatory/statutory reference points	QMUL academic regulations Office for Students Condition of Registration B4 PSRB reference points
Strategy and risk	The development of policy on AI in Assessment for Queen Mary was proposed and endorsed by Senate in October 2025. The policy positions set out align with the University's strategy of developing students' AI and digital literacy whilst also taking a responsible approach to risk and ensure academic quality and standards are upheld in accordance with University and Regulator's requirements.
Reporting/ consideration route for the paper	Assuming Senate approves these policy positions, it will be necessary for owners to review and update relevant policies with approval taking place through appropriate governance processes, to allow implementation from the new academic year, 2026/27. Any major programme and module amendments required to be made resulting from these new policy positions would need to be submitted by 28 October 2026 to take effect from academic year 2027/28 in accordance with Queen Mary policy.
Authors	Professor Alastair Robertson, Interim Director of QMA and Chair of the Education and Student Experience Enabling Plan Priority One steering group.
Sponsor	Professor Stephanie Marshall, Vice Principal Education

AI in Assessment policy position paper, 2026

1. Purpose

The University has published guidance to staff and students on Generative AI, however, in October last year Senate endorsed the proposal to develop AI in Assessment policy. The purpose of this paper is to set out a series of policy positions on Generative AI in Assessment at Queen Mary.

2. AI in Education at Queen Mary- existing strategic commitments

In 2023, Queen Mary 'committed to the ethical and responsible use of generative AI and to preparing our staff and students to be leaders in an increasingly AI-enabled world' as a signatory to the Russell Group Principles on the use of generative AI tools in education.

Queen Mary's Strategy 2030 has a clear aim to be "The most inclusive university of its kind, anywhere" and specifically, in terms of Education and the Student Experience, our strategy states "We will deliver an outstanding, inclusive, world-class education and student experience, co-created with our diverse student body, enhanced by our world-leading research and latest technological developments". Further, the Queen Mary Graduate Attributes outline the knowledge, skills and behaviours that our students develop as a result of their learning experience at the university. One of these attributes is to be AI and digitally literate. This has implications for curriculum design, assessment, student support and co-curriculum opportunities.

In October, Senate received a paper from QMA and Library Services that set out the range of support available to staff and students around the use of AI in Education and to highlight a proposed direction of travel. Senate endorsed the need for:

- An AI in education strategy
- Policy around the use of AI in assessment e.g. appropriate/ inappropriate use by students, assessment of students' AI literacy, the role of AI in the assessment of students' work etc
- An AI in education pedagogic framework

All of which must be appropriate to our mission and context and aligned to our educational approach; Active Curriculum for Excellence (ACE).

3. AI in assessment policy working group

As part of the Education Enabling Plan priority 1c), Assessment steering group, a working group was established, chaired by the Interim Director of QMA. Membership of

DRAFT

the group is outlined in the **Appendix**. The group met four times between October and January to review the University's existing guidance and relevant policies and consider whether these sufficed or further policy was required.

3.1 Existing Queen Mary guidance and policy

The following University guidance was considered as part of the working group's review:

- University AI principles, guidance and policies - Queen Mary Academy
- the Russell Group Principles on the use of generative AI tools in education
- Staff guide to generative AI
- Student guide to generative AI
- AI guide for PGR students
- Staff online QM Plus course, Critical AI Literacy: Essentials for Educators
- Student online QM Plus course, Introductory AI

The following existing policies were also considered by the group:

- Assessment and Feedback Strategy
- Principles of Programme Design
- Principles of Assessment Design
- Academic Regulations
- Assessment Handbook
- Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy

It is important to note that in the above list of policies, the only one that explicitly mentions AI is the Queen Mary's Academic Integrity and Misconduct policy, section 31e. under "Types of Academic Misconduct".

3.2 Stakeholder engagement

Members of the working group were invited to discuss the topic informally within their Faculty/ School/ Professional Service to help inform discussions at working group meetings. In addition to the meetings of the working group, stakeholders were engaged through the following events/ fora:

- Centre for Excellence in AI in Education symposium "AI for Educators: Sharing current Practice, Shaping Future Directions" on 5th November
- Directors of Education away day on 20th November
- Programme Directors forum on 15th December

DRAFT

At all three events, staff were given the opportunity to provide reflections on current practice, opportunities and concerns regarding AI in assessment and outputs are available here: Shaping Future Directions: AI in Assessment at Queen Mary.

A fourth, important engagement was held at the Joint Directors of Education/ Programme Directors Education Townhall meeting on 12th January where the draft policy positions in this paper were shared and discussed. EQSB endorsed the proposals in this paper at its meeting on 11th February.

3.3 External reference points

Several Schools at Queen Mary are currently developing draft AI guidelines including Law, SBBS, SBM, SSE, IoD and WIPH and these were shared with the group. In addition, some desk-based work was undertaken of publicly available information from other UK Universities as well as the University of Sydney, Australia.

4. AI in Assessment Policy Positions

The working group concluded that a standalone AI in Assessment policy would not suffice and, instead the following set of policy positions are proposed. If these are endorsed by Queen Mary, it will be necessary for existing guides and policy to be reviewed and updated accordingly so that AI is much more explicit and visible in our regulations, where appropriate. The following positions are proposed:

4.1 New AI in Assessment taxonomy

All assessments at Queen Mary need to be categorised and explicitly badged using a three tier traffic light system as follows:

Red: AI tools are prohibited
Assessments need to be designed in such a way that the use of AI tools by students is not possible and there must be a strong rationale for the use of such assessments e.g. PSRB requirements, achieving specific module learning outcomes, satisfying the University academic quality and standards requirements. Examples of relevant assessment types include some laboratories/ practicals/ competency-based assessments, vivas, discussion-based assessments, in person invigilated exams etc.

Amber: AI tools are permitted for assistance and co-creation
This category is for assessments that allow the use of AI to support learning but use is not necessarily required by students. Use of AI tools by students must be in appropriate ways that are clearly set out in the assessment brief. Examples might include written essays, lab report where there are formative/draft and summative stages are designed. A more comprehensive list of examples of appropriate and inappropriate use of GenAI

DRAFT

for educational purposes are already available (Staff Guide to Generative AI - Queen Mary Academy, AI for Student Learning and Research) and are being reviewed annually as technology develops.

Green: AI tools are required

For this category of assessment students will be required to use GenAI tools and the learning outcomes will include the achievement of the graduate attribute – AI and digital literacy, by demonstrating appropriate, ethical and effective use of AI to solve complex problems, make evidence based, human-judgements etc. An example would be developing software, working with AI to build codes, check and critique the AI outputs to then finesse/finalise the final product. Again, the assessment brief should clearly set out appropriate and inappropriate use of GenAI for the assessment set.

4.2 Alignment with Principles of Assessment Design

The University's Principles of Assessment Design should be adhered to at all times. As part of the University's new Curriculum 2030 Framework, all programmes are required to assess students' AI and digital literacy (a Queen Mary Graduate Attribute). When Programme teams are developing an AI in assessment strategy for their Programme, Programme-level assessment should be prioritised (Principle 1 of Principles of Assessment Design) and teams are responsible for determining an appropriate range of red: amber: green assessments utilised to ensure academic quality and standards are upheld in accordance with University and Regulator's requirements, and students' digital and AI literacy are developed. Teams need to ensure that assessments are inclusive (principle 3) and reasonable adjustments for students with declared learning needs and disabilities must be made.

4.3 Declaration of use of AI

To facilitate good academic integrity practice and further students' critical engagement with AI, students will be required to complete an AI declaration for all assessments. In the case of "red" assessments this declaration should state that AI tools have not been used, for amber and green assessments students will be required to outlining the purposes for which Gen AI was used in the preparation of their submission that are line with what has been specified in the assessment brief such as generating ideas, planning, drafting, formative learning, technical skills development etc, referencing the appropriate tools. For some assessments staff may require students to provide prompts used and the main assessment may include a critical analysis by the student on GenAI-created outputs, their usefulness, accuracy etc.

Misuse of AI by students will be considered a breach of the University's Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy.

DRAFT

4.4 Staff use of AI in assessment and feedback processes

It is recognised that there is a growing number of AI tools which have the potential to assist staff with assessment and feedback processes. However, just as is the case for our students, staff need to use AI in ethical, appropriate and effective ways that are in line with the University's AI policy and IT guardrails. Staff must adhere to data protection legislation and cyber security policy and familiarise themselves with software tools data storage policies prior to utilisation. AI tools can be used to assist educators but not to make assessment decisions.

Appropriate usage of AI in assessment: using institutionally authorised AI-assisted assessment and feedback platforms to enhance consistency and specificity in marking and improve feedback turnaround times.

Inappropriate usage of AI in assessment: uploading student work into a generative AI tool (e.g. ChatGPT) to automatically assess, mark or write feedback without staff reviewing, critiquing, modifying and deciding on marks and feedback to the student.

There are implications here in terms of updating the University's data protection privacy notice for students to explicitly include potential AI tools in assessment processes.

4.5 AI Detection tools

At the time of writing there is no valid and reliable AI detection tool and, as such, Queen Mary does not endorse their usage by staff. If inappropriate use of AI in an assessment is suspected, staff should follow the Investigation Procedure in the University's Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy.

5. Recommendation

It is recommended that the proposed set of University policy positions on AI in assessment outlined above are endorsed. The paper will then be sent to the University Strategy Group (20th January), EQSB (11th February) then Senate (12th March) for final approval.

6. Next steps- implication for existing University policies

Assuming Senate approves these policy positions, it will be necessary for owners to review and update relevant policies with approval taking place through appropriate governance processes.

Following EQSB's endorsement of the paper, on 11th February, the Chair of the working Group met with QMA and DGLS representatives. It is recommended that the University's newly agreed positions on the use of AI in assessment needs to be made explicit within

DRAFT

the proposed new Curriculum 2030 framework which will consolidate some key reference points such as the existing Assessment and Feedback Strategy, and the Principles of Assessment Design. Other reference points that will need reviewing and updating in light of the policy positions in this paper include:

- Assessment Handbook, including section 5. Marking Policy
- Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy
- Data protection privacy notice for students

In terms of implementation timescales, if Senate endorses these positions, necessary policy updates will be submitted to EQSB in May then Senate in June this year. This would mean that any major programme and module amendments that would need to be made resulting from these new policy positions would need to be submitted by 28 October 2026 (Academic Development - Directorate of Governance and Legal Services) to take effect from academic year 2027/28 in accordance with Queen Mary policy (Amendments-to-Programmes-and-Modules).

DRAFT

Appendix. AI in Assessment Policy working group membership

Professor Alastair Robertson (Chair)

Professor Chie Adachi, FMD

Stephen Buckingham, S&E

Richard Chantler, HSS

Professor Ian Curran, FMD

Haylee Fuller, DGLS

Tushar Goyal, QM Student Union

Simon Hayter, DGLS

Professor Rachel Male, HSS

Professor Tony Michael, then Chair of EQSB Assessment sub committee*

Dr Alistair Morey, Library Services

Dr Emily Salines, QMA

Dr Stephen Taylor, HSS

Surjit Uppal, TELT

*Now Professor Deborah Rafalin, Deputy Vice Principal, Education.

DRAFT