# ual: awarding body

# Guidance on how to use generative artificial intelligence (AI) in UAL Awarding Body Qualifications

—

# Contents

# 1. Overview

## 1.1 Introduction

As an awarding body, we are committed to empowering colleges to deliver creative qualifications that prepare learners for success in an evolving world. The rise of Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly Generative AI (GenAI), is reshaping workplaces, education and society. These developments present exciting opportunities alongside significant challenges, underscoring the need to develop skills for navigating AI responsibly and creatively.

At UAL Awarding Body, we are committed to fostering innovation while preserving the integrity of our qualifications. Our approach to integrating AI in creative education is built on three core principles:

> **Curiosity**: encouraging exploration and experimentation to uncover innovative ways AI can enhance creative disciplines.

> **Authenticity**: uphold ethical use of AI, ensuring that creative work remains genuine and original. Empower learners to navigate a rapidly evolving technological landscape with integrity and confidence.

**Practical adoption**: thoughtfully integrating AI into education to ensure learners are well-prepared for its applications in their future careers.

## 1.2 Purpose of this document

The purpose of this document is to set out UAL Awarding Body's requirements around the use of AI in and for assessment:

> **AI for assessment delivery** – this term refers to the use of AI to support the delivery of assessments, including its design, administration and marking.  It involves AI systems that assist in creating assessments, delivering assessments and grading or providing feedback.

> **AI in assessment** – this term refers to the use of AI to generate or assist in the creation of evidence that is submitted for assessment purposes.

# 2. What is Artificial Intelligence (AI)?

## 2.1 Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to technologies designed to perform tasks traditionally requiring human intelligence, such as generating content, analysing data, recognising speech and making decisions. While AI holds significant potential to enhance education, its use must be approached thoughtfully and within copyright and content ownership regulation, particularly in creative disciplines.

AI technologies can be grouped into three key categories based on their capabilities and applications:

**Generative AI**

Generative AI creates content such as text, images, music or videos that closely resemble human-made work.

> **For educators**: Generative AI can assist in developing teaching resources, generating ideas or prompts and supporting lesson planning.

> **For learners**: Learners may use generative AI to brainstorm ideas, develop early drafts or explore creative possibilities as part of their learning process.

**Autonomous AI**

Autonomous AI operates independently, making decisions without continuous human intervention.

> **For educators**: It can be used for automating administrative tasks, such as scheduling and supporting basic assessment tasks like marking objective responses.

> **For learners**: Autonomous AI tools, such as chatbots or virtual assistants, can support learning by answering questions or providing additional resources. However, learners must ensure that the work submitted for assessment remains their own through appropriate and thorough investigation and critical analysis.

**Adaptive AI**

Adaptive AI learns and evolves from new data or experiences, allowing it to adjust and personalise responses.

> **For educators**: Adaptive AI can help create tailored learning experiences, such as adjusting content based on learner needs or offering detailed insights into class performance.

> **For learners**: Learners may benefit from personalised feedback or recommendations on areas for improvement, helping them better understand complex topics and refine their skills.

AI can be a powerful tool for enhancing educational practices, however it must be used responsibly and transparently. Misuse of AI, such as employing it to generate assessment evidence or relying on it for grading complex creative work, undermines the purpose of assessment and the validity of our qualifications. The following section explores potential AI misuse in assessment and the implications for maintaining academic standards and integrity.

# 3. Use of generative AI in delivery

In the context of assessment, AI can be used by learners to generate evidence for their assessments.

## 3.1 Acceptable use of AI

UAL does not prohibit the use of AI in assessment, if used in accordance with the guidelines below:

> Whether internally or externally assessed, learners must take full responsibility for their submissions, ensuring that AI use is properly documented and ethically applied and aligns with assessment requirements.

> Any AI tools used in the creation of assessment evidence must be clearly referenced, specifying their role and contribution to the final work.

> AI-generated outputs must not be presented as wholly original work. Learners must acknowledge and integrate these outputs transparently into their submissions.

> While AI can assist in generating ideas or refining outputs, the final work must reflect the learner's personal understanding, decision-making and creativity, with AI serving as a supporting tool rather than a replacement for their intellectual effort.

> Learners must maintain a record of the prompts used to generate AI outputs and include this as part of the assessment process, ensuring transparency and accountability (See **Appendix 1** for a proforma that can be used).

## 3.2 Misuse of AI

Misuse of AI is where learners have failed to adhere to the guidelines above and knowingly submit AI-generated work as their own. This is because the work submitted does not demonstrate the learner's own knowledge, understanding or abilities in relation to the assessment objectives, but rather that of the AI.

Some specific examples of the misuse of generative AI, include, but are not limited to the following:

**Writing examples**

> Copying or paraphrasing AI-generated prose, poetry or scripts for submission without personal revisions, analysis or evidence of individual style and intent.

> Using AI to generate a significant portion of a creative writing piece (e.g., a short story or screenplay (where this is being assessed)) without demonstrating their own narrative development, tone or voice.

**Visual arts and image generation examples**

> Submitting AI-generated artwork (e.g., images created using tools like DALL·E or MidJourney) as their own without significant modification or attribution to the AI tool used.

> Making minimal edits to AI-generated images and presenting them as entirely original works, failing to demonstrate the learner's own creative decisions or technical skills.

> Using AI-generated designs to fulfil parts of an assessment task, such as creating an art portfolio, without demonstrating personal artistic input or conceptual development.

> Using AI to generate 3D models (e.g. AI-driven CAD software or modelling tools) that

are directly printed using a 3D printer without any manual input, refinement or creative intervention by the designer.

**Music composition and sound design examples**

> Presenting AI-generated music compositions (e.g., tracks produced using tools like Amper Music or AIVA) as their own without significant editing, layering or integration of original elements.

> Using AI tools to generate complete tracks, soundscapes or background scores without demonstrating creative or technical contributions (e.g., arrangement, mixing or adding original elements).

> Failing to acknowledge the use of AI tools in generating musical motifs, themes or instrumentation.

> Submitting AI-generated sound effects without aligning them with the production's thematic or emotional context or showing evidence of decision making in their selection and placement.

**Film and animation examples**

> Submitting AI-generated video content, animations or special effects without integrating personal technical input, storyboarding or creative direction.

**Fashion and textiles examples**

> Relying on AI tools to create fabric patterns, garment designs or accessory concepts without demonstrating personal involvement in the creative or technical development process.

> Submitting AI-generated fashion concepts without integrating original research, sketching or hands-on techniques.

**Graphic design examples**

> Using AI-generated logos, typography or layouts without incorporating personal edits, refinements or custom design elements.

> Submitting complete marketing materials or branding packages generated by AI tools without demonstrating personal design decisions or strategy.

**Photography**

> Using AI tools to enhance or edit photographs (e.g., applying filters, retouching or generating entire scenes using tools like Photoshop's AI features) without demonstrating personal control over the editing process, creative decisions or technical adjustments.

> Submitting AI-generated images or composites as original photographs, without acknowledgement or proof of personal involvement in capturing, editing or conceptualising the work.

> Relying entirely on AI to reconstruct, enhance or modify poor-quality images for an assessment, rather than applying learned skills and techniques.

**Set design**

> Using AI to generate set designs, such as stage layouts or props, without making personal edits or modifications to reflect creative decisions or alignment with the production concept.

> Submitting AI-generated 3D renderings of stage sets without demonstrating the learner's involvement in conceptual development, technical specifications or artistic refinements.

**Costume design**

> Relying on AI-generated costume concepts without incorporating personal design elements, research or modifications to fit the character, narrative or performance style.

> Submitting AI-generated digital sketches of costumes as final designs without evidence of personal involvement in creating patterns, selecting materials or making artistic decisions.

**Lighting design**

> Generating AI-driven lighting plans or cues without adapting them to the specific needs of the production, such as thematic elements, performer placement or spatial considerations.

> Using AI-generated lighting visualisations as the sole evidence of design work, without providing conceptual justification, technical planning or evidence of learner involvement.

**Choreographic routines for performers**

> Using AI tools to generate full choreographic sequences without demonstrating personal involvement in refining movements, adapting routines to performers' abilities or aligning choreography with the narrative or music.

> Submitting AI-generated routines as original work without integrating personal creativity, improvisation or artistic decisions to reflect the production's intent.

**Acknowledgement issues**

> Failing to provide proper attribution or references when AI tools have been used as part of the creative process.

> Including intentionally incomplete, misleading or omitted references to disguise the extent of AI usage.

**Please note**: the examples provided above are illustrative; some may be acceptable in certain contexts, such as when the work is not being assessed. If you're unsure about whether something is an acceptable use of generative AI, please contact the UAL Awarding Body Academic Standards team: academic.awarding@arts.ac.uk

Any misuse of AI will be considered as malpractice and will be dealt with in accordance with the UAL Awarding Body Malpractice and Maladministration Policy. Centres are reminded to alert UAL Awarding Body as soon as they suspect malpractice, including the misuse of AI.

## 3.3 Clarity on what is meant by "their own work"

When using AI to support the generation of assessment evidence, the work may be classified as the learner's own if the following conditions are met:

> the learner actively guides the process, making key decisions about the structure, content and presentation of their work. AI outputs can inform or support the work but cannot replace the learner's intellectual contributions.

> the learner demonstrates critical engagement with any AI-generated content by evaluating, refining and integrating it into their final submission. This ensures the output reflects their understanding, analysis and original perspective, rather than being AI-led.

> the work must have sufficient original learner-created content to enable valid assessment. Even when AI is appropriately referenced, an over-reliance on AI-generated material risks rendering the submission unfit for assessment if the learner's own input is insufficient.

> the learner defines the purpose and context of the work, including providing original prompts or instructions to the AI. These inputs must be included within the assessment evidence to show how the learner shaped the final outcome.

> the learner takes full responsibility for the final submission, ensuring it aligns with the assessment criteria and any other relevant requirements.

> the learner explicitly references how AI was used and explains its role in their process. This transparency demonstrates their ownership of the work and clarifies that AI was used as a tool rather than the primary creator.

By ensuring that AI is used as a support rather than a substitute, learners can develop work that remains authentic, assessable, and reflective of their own skills and understanding.

# 4. Centre responsibilities

## 4.1 During teaching

During teaching of the course, centres are expected to (where appropriate):

> make learners aware of their individual centre malpractice and/or academic misconduct policies

> ensure that teachers and assessors are familiar with mainstream AI tools, their risks and AI detection tools

> clearly explain to learners what constitutes acceptable and unacceptable use of AI in assessment

> ensure learners understand their responsibility for authenticity. Learners must recognise that by signing the authentication form, they are declaring that the work they submit for assessment is their own original creation and that any use of AI has been appropriately referenced.

> inform learners of the implications of submitting work that has been AI generated as their own

> record and address any concerns of learners using AI unacceptably before assessment and moderation.

> monitor real-time use of AI tools to observe how learners use AI for learning, development and assessment

> provide sufficient guidance to support appropriate and ethical use of AI for assessment and learning purposes.

## 4.2 AI and ethics

The integration of AI tools in education and creative processes offers exciting opportunities to enhance learning and creativity. However, it also introduces ethical considerations that centres must address to ensure fairness, accountability and the integrity of assessments.

Centres play a crucial role in guiding learners and implementing policies for responsible AI use. Below are key ethical considerations for centres when integrating AI into assessments.

Centres must (as far as reasonably possible):

> encourage learners to critically assess AI-generated outputs for potential biases, inaccuracies or ethical concerns. Teaching learners to evaluate and refine AI-generated material fosters analytical skills and ensures that submissions reflect personal understanding and originality.

> consider how AI might benefit or disadvantage learners with diverse needs, including those requiring accommodations. AI tools should enhance inclusivity, not create barriers to participation, ensuring every learner has a fair opportunity to succeed.

> guide learners in ensuring that AI-generated content aligns with ethical principles. This includes avoiding material that perpetuates stereotypes, reinforces biases or causes harm. AI use should support positive and ethical outcomes in creative and academic work

> ensure that sensitive or personal information is not shared or stored within AI tools without proper safeguards. This includes using AI platforms that comply with data protection regulations and ethical standards, protecting learner and institutional data from misuse.

> establish clear policies on AI usage and ensure these are communicated effectively to both learners and staff. Learners must be guided to adhere to these policies and meet the specific requirements of the assessment task, including transparency about how AI tools were used.

> strive to provide equal access to AI tools for all learners, preventing disparities in resource availability from unfairly impacting assessment outcomes. This may involve offering access to AI tools within the centre or supporting learners who may not have the same technological resources at home.

## 4.3 During formative assessments

Centres are permitted to use AI to support formative assessments (e.g. homework, class work), provided its role is transparent, complements teaching rather than replaces it and aligns with their internal centre policies. AI can, for example:

> offer learners feedback to refine their ideas and skills

> assist educators in identifying trends or gaps in learning across a cohort

> provide opportunities for self-directed learning and practice.

The use of AI in formative assessments should be framed as a tool for learning, not as a definitive measure of performance or achievement.

## 4.4 During summative assessment

Centres are required to implement a robust and well-rounded authentication process to detect the misuse of AI or chatbots in the generation of assessment evidence. Our general view is that such an approach not only supports the integrity of the assessment process but also equips centres to identify instances where learners may have used AI tools to produce their work as early as possible. By integrating effective authentication measures, centres can uphold the validity and reliability of qualifications while addressing emerging challenges in the digital landscape.

To minimise the potential of AI misuse, UAL Awarding Body requires centres to:

> provide sufficient supervision during the assessment process to detect potential misuse of AI or malpractice

> maintain oversight and hold regular discussion / touch points with learners to develop familiarity with learners' work, enabling better detection of inconsistencies

> adhere to the assessment requirements outlined in externally set assessment papers, as well as the corresponding 'Assessment Instructions and Guidance for Teachers, Tutors and Supervisors'. This includes complying with conditions related to resources, which may involve blocking or restricting access to AI or chatbot websites during specific periods of the assessment

> remind learners that misuse of AI or chatbots constitutes malpractice (cheating) and ensure they sign a Candidate Authentication form to confirm that the work submitted is their own

> require learners to appropriately reference any AI or chatbot-generated content submitted, reducing the risk of it being flagged as malpractice by plagiarism detection tools

> require learners to maintain comprehensive records, including the questions or prompts used when generating work with AI, as well as their thought processes, drafts and revisions

Where plagiarism or malpractice is suspected, centres must notify UAL Awarding Body immediately upon discovery and implement their centre's Malpractice and Maladministration Policy. All notifications must be submitted to centreQA.awarding@arts.ac.uk

## 4.5 Plagiarism detection tools

While plagiarism detection software, including AI-powered tools, can provide valuable insights into the authenticity of learner submissions, they have limitations. These tools may not effectively detect nuanced forms of creative plagiarism, such as paraphrased content or original work heavily influenced by existing material.

As a result, plagiarism detection tools should not be relied upon in isolation. Instead, they should be integrated into a broader academic integrity strategy that may includes:

> requiring learners to present and explain their creative or thought processes to demonstrate originality.

> using multiple plagiarism detection tools to cross-check submissions for greater accuracy

If you have questions regarding your investigation into suspected malpractice, please refer to our Malpractice and Maladministration Policy and supporting guidance. You are also welcome to contact Centre Monitoring at centreQA.awarding@arts.ac.uk for support.

## 4.6 When marking summative assessments

UK qualifications regulators prohibit the use of AI for marking summative assessments. Final summative assessment decisions for a unit/component, such as assigning a grade (including pass/fail outcomes) or mark, must be made by the assessor.

**Why?**

> Summative assessments are designed to evaluate learners' creative thinking, originality and problem-solving skills. These elements currently require nuanced, human judgement to assess effectively.

> AI tools, while powerful, cannot currently fully understand or evaluate the personal and contextual aspects of creative work that are central to UAL Awarding Body qualifications.

> Marking and grading must remain grounded in professional expertise to ensure fairness, consistency, and alignment with intended learning outcomes. Maintaining human oversight in assessment is essential for upholding academic integrity and sustaining public confidence in the credibility and value of our qualifications.

## 4.7 When providing feedback from assessment

All feedback, whether for formative or summative assessment, must be specific, tailored to the assessment and the work submitted, and personalised to the learner's needs rather than generic.

If AI tools are used in generating feedback for assessments, centres should:

> clearly explain how AI tools were used, both to learners and in any accompanying documentation. For example, include a transparency statement such as: Feedback provided to learners has been generated with the assistance of AI tools and reviewed by the assessor to ensure alignment with learning outcomes and individual performance.

> retain original notes, drafts or prompts used in conjunction with AI tools as evidence of the process and to demonstrate the assessor's oversight and decision-making

> ensure that all AI usage complies with GDPR regulations. This includes:

> avoiding the uploading of learners' work or identifiable information (e.g., names, student IDs)

into open or unsecured AI systems

> ensuring that any data shared with AI tools is anonymised where possible and securely managed to protect learners' privacy.

By maintaining transparency and documenting the process, centres can ensure that AI enhances the learning experience while preserving the integrity of the assessment process. This approach can be extended to summative assessments, provided that the final decision and feedback remain the responsibility of the assessor.

# 5. UAL Awarding Body responsibilities

UAL Awarding Body remains steadfast in its commitment to upholding the highest standards of assessment integrity. As part of this commitment, we want to clarify the following:

## 5.1 Externally set and marked assessments

All externally set and marked assessments will continue to be evaluated by human expertise. This ensures that the assessment process benefits from professional judgement, nuanced understanding and the ability to consider the individual context of learners.

## 5.2 When generating feedback

Where UAL Awarding Body marks an assessment, assessor feedback will continue to be written by experienced professionals to ensure it is meaningful, tailored and supports centres in improving teaching and learning practices. While AI may be used to enhance grammar and clarity, ensuring the feedback is precise and accessible, it will not influence the content or the professional judgement of assessors. The use of AI will be strictly limited to improving the presentation of feedback, maintaining the integrity and expertise of the assessment process.

## 5.3 AI Research and innovation

We recognise that the use of AI in education is a rapidly evolving area. To this end, we will:

> keep centres informed about our research and developments regarding the use of AI in assessment

> engage with centres to gather feedback and ensure that our approach to AI reflects the needs and expectations of learners, educators and stakeholders

> provide guidance and support to help centres navigate the implications of AI on teaching, learning and assessment practices.

> ensure that any requirements related to AI are proportionate, practical, and do not place an undue burden on centres.

UAL Awarding Body's approach to AI research and innovation is based on the following principles:

> ensuring that AI is used to complement, not replace, human judgement in ways that reflect real-world applications of skills and knowledge

> leveraging AI to develop new methods of supporting learners and educators, such as improving administrative efficiency or enhancing formative feedback

> ensuring that AI enhances the validity, fairness, and reliability of assessments. Every innovation should strengthen our core goal of accurately measuring learner achievements.

## 5.4 Engagement with centres

We look forward to working together and sharing more on the potential of AI in a way that strengthens the integrity and value of UAL Awarding Body qualifications.  Should you have any questions or insights, we welcome your feedback as we navigate this exciting area of development. Please contact qualdev.awarding@arts.ac.uk

## 5.5 AI malpractice and maladministration

We will ensure that all claims of AI misuse are thoroughly investigated in accordance with our Malpractice and Maladministration policy. This includes reviewing evidence provided by centres, conducting detailed evaluations and taking appropriate action- including the application of UAL Awarding Body sanctions policy to maintain the integrity and credibility of our qualifications

Our policy and supporting guidance can be found here. Any questions about malpractice and maladministration can be directed to centreQA.awarding@arts.ac.uk

# 6. Contact us

For questions on AI in formative assessment delivery, including acceptable and unacceptable uses of generative AI for specific subject areas please contact the **UAL Awarding Body Academic Standards team** academic.awarding@arts.ac.uk

For questions relating to malpractice and maladministration policy including how to conduct investigations please contact the **UAL Awarding Body Centre Monitoring team** centreQA.awarding@arts.ac.uk

For questions relating to research and innovations and for anything relating to this AI guidance document please contact the **UAL Awarding Body Qualifications and Assessment** team qualdev.awarding@arts.ac.uk

**Note**: This document was developed by assessment and academic professionals with the assistance of AI tools to improve clarity and accuracy. The final content was reviewed and approved by human oversight.

# 7. Appendix 1: Prompt proforma

**Prompt Proforma**

This proforma is designed to help you clearly document and showcase your use of creative prompts. By completing this form, you are laying the groundwork to ensure the work you produce with assistance from AI can be authenticated.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Candidate name:** | |
| **Generative AI tool used:** | |
| **Date:** | |

**List of prompts or questions**
Briefly describe the creative prompt(s) or idea(s) used:

| |
|---|
| |

**How was the tool used?**
Describe the context in which the prompts were used:

| |
|---|
| |

**Visual or reference attachments**
Attach any visuals, drafts or reference materials generated or utilised with this prompt (e.g., sketches, photos, videos, screenshots of responses)

| |
|---|
| |