

Generative Artificial Intelligence in Learning Teaching and Assessment Policy

Contents

1.	Introduction and Scope	1
2.	Foundational Principles: GAI and the NMITE Graduate	1
3.	Guidelines for Permissible and Prohibited Use	2
4.	Assessment Integrity and Authorship	3
5.	Governance, Training, and Policy Review	5

1. Introduction and Scope

- 1.1. This policy establishes the principles for the ethical, transparent, and effective use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) tools by all NMITE students and staff in relation to learning, teaching, and assessment.
- 1.2. In line with NMITE's mission to produce innovative, work-ready engineering and technology graduates, this policy adopts a permissive/integrative stance to the use of GAI. It mandates that GAI be incorporated as a professional tool to develop necessary skills, provided that its use upholds the integrity and authenticity of NMITE awards.

2. Foundational Principles: GAI and the NMITE Graduate

- 2.1. A key principle of this Policy is that use of GAI tools is permitted by default across all programmes, unless specifically restricted or prohibited in a specific Assessment Brief, with strict adherence to the transparency and integrity requirements defined herein.
- 2.2. The integration of GAI into learning and assessment is guided by the following principles, aligning with the NMITE Graduate Attributes and NMITE's Guiding Principles for Learning and Teaching:
 - 2.2.1. AI Literacy as a Core Professional Skill: NMITE embed training and learning opportunities into all taught curricula to ensure that all students become considerate, competent users of GAI. This will include understanding the tools' capabilities, ethical implications, security risks, technical limitations, and sustainability. Such learning supports the development of Graduate Attributes of bring resourceful and adaptable (I4) and Technically competent (P2).
 - 2.2.2. Authenticity and Human Judgment: GAI tools must be treated as

cognitive partners and co-pilots, not substitutes for a student's core intellectual effort or subject knowledge. Assessments test the student's critical validation and human judgment, ensuring the integrity of the work reflects the development of divergent thinking (P1) and graduates considerate of consequences (C5).

- 2.2.3. Transparency and Accountability: All uses of GAI that contribute to an assessment, whether by staff producing assessment briefs or students responding to those briefs, must be explicitly disclosed and attributed. This principle reinforces the attribute of being responsible and ethical (I3) by making transparency the primary safeguard of academic integrity.
- 2.2.4. Equitable Access: By providing NMITE-approved GAI tools, the institution will ensure that access to necessary GAI tools and training is equitable for all students, mitigating any digital or financial divide, in support of an inclusive learning environment.

3. Guidelines for Permissible and Prohibited Use

- 3.1. **Permissible & Encouraged Uses:** Students are generally permitted and encouraged to use GAI tools to augment their learning, provided they exercise continuous critical oversight and accountability. Examples below are not intended to be exhaustive:
 - 3.1.1. Ideation and brainstorming: Generating initial ideas, structured outlines, or potential approaches for challenges and projects.
 - 3.1.2. Coding assistance: Generating boilerplate code, debugging existing code, or suggesting specific functions within a project (Note: The final code must be verified, integrated, and owned by the student).
 - 3.1.3. Technical drafting and editing: Checking grammar, summarising complex technical documents (provided the original source is verified), or minor re-formatting of text.
 - 3.1.4. Personalised learning: Using GAI tools for concept explanation, Socratic dialogue, or to adapt course materials for individual study (e.g., spaced repetition or summarisation).
- 3.2. **Prohibited Uses and Professional Risks (Misconduct):** The following uses are strictly prohibited or carry significant risk of Academic Misconduct, as they compromise originality, integrity, data security, or professional responsibility:
 - 3.2.1. False Authorship: Submitting work wholly authored by a GAI tool, or submitting work which was, in part, GAI-generated (including but not limited to text, code, images, video, or data analysis) as the student's own unaided original work without appropriate declaration and acknowledgment. Breaches of this requirement will be handled by

NMITE's Academic Misconduct Policy.

- 3.2.2. Data Confidentiality Breach: Inputting any personal data, sensitive information (e.g., industry partner confidential data, proprietary project designs), or NMITE-specific learning content (e.g., seminar slides, full assessment briefs) into any GAI platform that is not explicitly approved for use by NMITE's IT Services.
- 3.2.3. Uncritical Submission: Relying on GAI-generated content without rigorous human verification. Students are held accountable for all errors, factual inaccuracies, biases, or hallucinated sources contained within their submitted work.

4. Assessment Integrity and Authorship

- 4.1. **Maintaining Integrity in Authentic Assessment.** Given NMITE's project-based, authentic assessment strategy, integrity is maintained by assessing the verifiable human contribution – the engineering process, critical analysis, and solution deployment – rather than simple content generation.
 - 4.1.1. Assessment-Specific Rules: Each Module Leader must clearly specify the permitted, prohibited, or required use of GAI in the assessment brief. Students must adhere to these instructions.
 - 4.1.2. Process of Verification: NMITE retains the right to use academic judgment, *viva voce* examinations, and practical demonstrations to verify the student's critical thinking, knowledge and skill acquisition.
- 4.2. **Mandatory Declaration of Transparency.** For all assessed work, students must include a Declaration of Transparency that explicitly states the nature and extent of GAI use. This mandatory disclosure shifts the focus from detection to transparency and accountability.
- 4.3. Minimal Use is defined as the routine and established use of widely accessible digital tools that do not generate or substantively alter the ideas, intellectual content, or core structure of the assessed work. This includes standard spell checkers, grammar correction software, and basic word processing auto-correction features. Use at this level is not considered GAI use for the purposes of the Declaration of Transparency or the GAI Use Audit Log.
 - 4.3.1. Disclosure Requirement: The student must attach one of the following statements to their submission:
 - 4.3.1.1. Statement 1 (No AI Use): "I declare that no part of this submission has been generated by GAI software for content creation. Any minor use (e.g., spelling/grammar checking) falls within NMITE's definition of Minimal Use."

4.3.1.2. Statement 2 (GAI Use Acknowledged): “I declare that parts of this submission were supported by or include contributions from GAI tools and that use of those tools was in line with NMITE’s Generative AI Policy and the Assessment Brief. I confirm that all GAI output has been critically reviewed, validated, and integrated as my own work. My specific GAI usage is detailed below.”

4.3.2. Process Documentation: If Statement 2 is used, the student must:

4.3.2.1. Retain the interaction with the GAI tool including all prompts, responses and source data provided, so that it can be inspected if required; and

4.3.2.2. Provide along with the submission of the assessment a brief log outlining:

- the specific GAI tool(s) used (e.g., Microsoft Copilot, Google Gemini, ChatGPT);
- the purpose of the use (e.g., structuring the report, debugging code, providing feedback); and
- the extent of human review/modification. This mandatory process documentation reinforces professional practice and ensures transparency.

4.4. **Referencing and Citation.** Where GAI output is included in the assessed work (e.g., a short code segment, an illustrative image), it must be clearly referenced. Following sector best practice, the author of the work should cite the GAI tool using the “Software” format of the referencing style being used, where appropriate, including the tool name, version, and the date the content was generated, as exemplified below:

4.4.1. Harvard (Author-Date) style:

Developer. (Year of Generation) *Name of AI Tool, response to prompt: ‘xxx’*. Available at: URL (Accessed: Day Month Year).

Google. (2025) *Google Gemini response to prompt: ‘Generate initial structural report outline for an FHEQ Level 5 engineering project’*. Available at: <https://gemini.google.com/chat> (Accessed: 23 October 2025).

4.4.2. IEEE style:

Name of AI Tool, Developer, Version used (if available), Day Month Year.

Google Gemini, Google, Version 1.5 Pro, 23 Oct. 2025.

5. Governance, Training, and Policy Review

- 5.1. **Staff Capability and Modelling:** NMITE will ensure all academic staff receive professional development in GAI pedagogy, enabling them to design resilient assessments, incorporate ethical GAI use into curriculum delivery, and model transparent use in the learning environment.
- 5.2. **Secure Tool Provision:** NMITE will identify, approve, and provide institutional access to secure GAI platforms (e.g., Microsoft Copilot or Google Gemini) where data security and intellectual property protection are contractually guaranteed.
 - 5.2.1. Students are required to utilise this/these approved platform(s) for all work involving sensitive data or original ideas.
 - 5.2.2. Where a student is found to have entered NMITE data or intellectual property provided to them by NMITE into the course of their studies into a tool which is not institutionally approved, the matter will be dealt with under the Student Disciplinary Policy.
 - 5.2.3. Where a student believes he or she has legitimate reason to need to use and alternative GAI tool from those provided institutionally – e.g. for the purposes of comparison, or in the context of a specific individual project with industry, he or she must first seek approval from the Head of Learning and Teaching who will consult with the Head of IT to ensure appropriate security arrangements are in place.
- 5.3. **Continuous Review:** Recognising the speed of technological development and its implications for assessment validity, this policy, along with all GAI-related guidance, will be subject to a mandatory, continuous review cycle (biennially, or more frequently if required) to ensure it remains valid, ethical, and aligned with the evolving professional requirements of the engineering sector.

Author of Policy	Academic Director
Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) completed	TBC
Date Policy (Re)Approved	
Version Number	1.0
Approval Authority	Academic Council
Date of Commencement	September 2026
Amendment Dates	N/A
Reason for update	New policy
Date for next review	
Related Policies, Procedures, Guidance, Forms or Templates	General Regulations for First Degrees, Assessment Policy, Academic Misconduct
Policies superseded by this Policy	N/A
Summary of changes made to this version	N/A