



POLICY 075 STUDENT USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

If you have a disability which makes reading this document or navigating our website difficult and you would like to receive information in an alternative format, please contact: anddegree@acm.ac.uk

POLICY 075: STUDENT USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

1. SCOPE

1.1 This policy applies to all students enrolled on programmes at ACM, including all FE provision and all HE provision, including Foundation programmes, Integrated Masters programmes and Masters programmes.

1.2 This policy should be read in conjunction with ACM's Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy (Policy 007). Policy 075 provides specific guidance regarding artificial intelligence, but all definitions, investigation procedures, and penalties remain governed by the overarching Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy.

2. INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT AND POSITION

2.1 ACM believes that AI tools are transformative and disruptive, and that they will feature in many academic and professional workplaces. As an institution, ACM is committed to exploring ways in which it can utilise AI to support and facilitate deeper learning.

2.2 Rather than seek to prohibit the use of AI tools, ACM will support students in using them effectively, ethically and transparently where they wish to do so. Tools such as ChatGPT, Claude, Quillbot, CoPilot and Grammarly can help students in a number of ways. Examples might include:

- Planning or structuring written materials ethically.
- Generating graphics, images and visuals ethically to support your work.
- Helping to improve grammar – especially helpful if English is a second language.
- Deriving explanations.

3. STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1 Whilst AI tools are powerful and easy to use, they can negatively impact your learning as they can detract from the reflection and critical engagement that are essential for deep and meaningful learning. Students are always expected to engage with learning and research directly, and not use AI tools as a substitute for their own critical thought, independent analysis, or creative decision-making.

3.2 AI tools can also easily provide misleading or incorrect information, despite the output sounding confident and assured. Students who rely on these tools unethically or without caution risk losing their own skills and expertise, and may struggle to study or work without them.

3.3 Students should be aware that tools such as those listed in 2.2, whilst useful, can lead a student to commit academic misconduct if content is created that is not the student's own but is then presented as such, either intentionally or unintentionally - this could include

substantially altered wording, which students often report as being part of the pursuit of sounding 'more academic'. These tools, and others, are multi-functional. It is the student's responsibility to use these tools in a way that upholds academic integrity and to ensure you do not commit academic misconduct.

3.4 When an AI tool (such as ChatGPT, Claude, or Copilot) is used to generate text, including the presentation of ideas or arguments, you must cite it in the body of your text (in-text citation) and include it in your reference list at the end of your work. However, because generative AI can be an unreliable source that frequently lacks academic depth or accuracy, an over-reliance on AI-generated content may negatively impact your grade if, in the academic judgement of the reviewer, this is deemed to have occurred. Any generated text that is not referenced may be considered Academic Misconduct. Text that is generated and re-written may also be considered Academic Misconduct.

Academic Integrity

3.5 To our students we say: Be enquiring, be conscientious, be honest. Although the use of AI supports studying in many ways, it must not lead you to neglect your study efforts and to rely on the outputs provided by these tools - keep academic integrity uppermost in your mind because academic misconduct is always taken seriously and can negatively impact your progression and final award.

3.6 Students must always ensure they demonstrate academic integrity in their work. This means employing good judgement to ensure that AI has been used appropriately and without gaining an inappropriate advantage. It is crucial that you do not use AI tools to simply generate work and submit it without correct referencing and full disclosure. Passing off AI-generated content as your own will be treated as academic misconduct (plagiarism) in the same way as it would if the text were written/created by another individual. If AI-generated text or viewpoints are explicitly cited and declared, this will not be treated as misconduct, but may impact your grade if, in the academic judgement of the assessor, an over-reliance on AI is deemed to have occurred.

Know the Limitations of Artificial Intelligence

3.7 The use of AI has clear limitations. For example, currently-available AI tools can:

- Only simulate understanding.
- 'Hallucinate' to create plausible sounding but factually incorrect answers.
- Inherit bias and viewpoints from the training material.
- Use information that is not always up to date.

3.8 AI tools are not reliable sources. Think of them as the equivalent of asking a random stranger on the street something: the information they provide might be taken from any number of inaccurate, misleading, or misremembered sources, but made to sound convincing.

Writing Style and Academic Writing

3.9 ACM is aware that students, especially those new to Higher Education, may struggle with Academic Writing and the purpose of such writing as a skill set. Academic writing is about presenting existing, trusted sources that support *your own ideas*, which are themselves based on your research and/or your experiences throughout your learning.

3.10 The academic writing approach allows you to deliver this as a body of work that is coherent and easily accessible by a university marker. But this is different to, and does not mean, using unnecessarily fancy words to make your work sound 'smarter'. In fact, we have already seen instances of student work that has supposedly been 'improved' by AI actually become less coherent, or less in line with the Assessment task as a result of attempting to sound 'academic.' Importantly, work that has been significantly changed by AI as part of this pursuit may be in breach of Academic Integrity rules. It is important that written work remains substantially the students own.

3.11 Make sure you focus on the substance required of the assessment brief and the learning outcomes. Speak to your tutors, who are there to support you, about what the assessment is actually asking for.

3.12 It is a breach of academic integrity to blend AI-generated ideas, arguments, or uncredited text sequences with your own content without clear demarcation, citation, and declaration.

Research authenticity and citations

3.13 The term 'research' does not only refer to work done for a dissertation or major project; it applies to any academic or creative investigation undertaken to support, develop, or inform any piece of submitted work, regardless of its FHEQ level, size or format. For the purposes of this policy and for the implementation of the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy (Policy 007), research is defined as any act of sourcing, evaluating, or utilising information to build an assignment.

3.14 Writing is the primary vehicle through which you demonstrate your critical thinking and engagement. Therefore, outsourcing the writing process to AI without full disclosure is a form of intellectual dishonesty. When a student uses AI to generate the prose, arguments, or analytical narrative of their work and presents it as their own, they are actively faking the intellectual trail of their research, mischaracterising the authenticity of their own academic development, and presenting a false narrative of academic engagement. Where such use is fully disclosed and cited in accordance with Section 3.18, it will be evaluated under standard academic marking criteria rather than as misconduct.

3.15 While students are permitted to use AI tools to suggest and locate potential research sources, they are required to independently access, read, and evaluate those sources themselves. It is an act of intellectual dishonesty to use AI tools to fabricate or "pad" bibliographies, reference lists, or in-text citations with sources the student has not personally verified. Presenting citations to sources that the student has not personally accessed, read, and academically evaluated is a breach of academic integrity. This practice falsely

represents the authenticity of the research process and misleads the assessor into believing independent research has occurred when it has not.

3.16 AI tools are known to "hallucinate" plausible-sounding but fake or inaccurate journal titles, authors, DOIs, and page numbers. Submitting work containing fabricated or partly fabricated/incorrect references (including those generated by AI) - or real references mapped onto claims they do not actually support - constitutes falsification and academic misconduct. This will be treated under the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy (Policy 007) as plagiarism.

Declaration of AI Use

3.17 Students should never pass off ideas or text taken from AI as their own, and there must be a clear and fully detailed account of how AI has been used in the work. Your assessment briefs require you to complete a Declaration of Authenticity. This includes a statement on the use of AI.

3.18 ACM prioritises academic transparency. If a student explicitly quotes, references, and declares content generated by an AI tool (e.g., citing a viewpoint generated by ChatGPT), this will not be investigated as academic misconduct. Instead, it will be evaluated academically. Students should note that AI tools are not considered rigorous academic sources (see 3.7 and 3.8), and an over-reliance on cited AI text may result in lower marks for research quality and critical engagement.

3.19 Completing the Declaration of Authenticity is a mandatory requirement of the submission process. You should complete this declaration whether you have used AI in your submission or not. It is important to be aware that any suspected AI use in a submission which is not accompanied by an appropriate declaration or referencing will be flagged for potential Academic Misconduct.

AI Detection Tools

3.20 ACM employs the latest AI detection software, which includes Turnitin's AI detector tool as a component of our academic compliance procedure. AI detection scores are treated as indicators to prompt closer review and are not ACM's sole point of reference.

Keeping Drafts of your work

3.21 Should you feel the need or desire to improve your work ethically through AI, such as those outlined in this policy, you are required to keep drafts of your work before the influence of AI. This will be requested as a part of the Academic Misconduct investigation should there be any suspicion of over-reliance on AI in your work, particularly where there is no Declaration of Authenticity apparent. Being able to show how your drafts lead to the finished work is a positive way of working with the academic integrity process.

3.22 ACM provides unlimited storage in Google Drive to every student. It is good practice and in your own interest to create, draft and store your work in your Google Drive, thereby maintaining transparency and a clear record of document creation.

3.23 Where ACM presents *prima facie* evidence of potential AI over-reliance, students will be required to provide drafts and version histories. Providing these materials is an effective way for a student to directly address the institution's concerns. Where a student is unable or unwilling to provide draft history, ACM's academic misconduct panel will make its final determination based on the available evidence before it.

4. OTHER RELEVANT DOCUMENTS

4.1 Internal Documents

- Policy 007 Academic Integrity and Misconduct
- Policy 012 Learning, Teaching, Assessment and Attainment
- Policy 061 Student Engagement and Participation
- Harvard referencing guide found on the student Canvas page

5. DATE OF APPROVAL AND NEXT REVIEW

Version	2.0
Approved on	01 September 2026
Approved by	Academic Board
Date of next review	August 2027