

Guidance on the use of Generative AI outputs for assessment and reducing risk of AI misuse

This guidance outlines Glasgow Kelvin College's position on the use of generative AI in assessments. While AI can support learning and skill development, its use in assessments must be carefully managed to maintain academic integrity.

This document focuses on generative AI. However, there may be circumstances where learners use AI as part of assistive technologies. Assistive technologies are designed to support learning, communication, and accessibility. Common examples include text-to-speech software, screen readers, dictation tools, translation apps, and spelling or grammar checkers. Many of these tools now incorporate AI to enhance their effectiveness. Reference to AI from now on is targeted at generative AI.

Glasgow Kelvin College encourages the use of AI as a learning tool and supports the development of AI skills for the workplace. However, AI tools cannot be used by learners in their assessments to create assessment evidence that is being marked to assess knowledge, understanding or skills.

Please refer to SQA guidance for full details - [Generative AI in assessment: academic session 2025–26](#) (SQA, Generative AI in assessment: academic , 2025).

There are some circumstances where AI can be used in assessment. However, these will be specific to the curriculum area and should be considered, carefully, by each team during standardisation meetings. Where the answer is yes to any of the questions below, then AI cannot be used as part of the assessment (Unless it specifically states AI use in the unit specification).

1. Will the use of GenAI tools substitute for the acquisition of key skills, knowledge and understanding by learners?
2. Will the use of GenAI tools undermine the need for learners to demonstrate genuine evidence of their skills, knowledge and understanding?
3. Are marks awarded for the activity which will be undertaken by GenAI?

Assessment conditions cannot be changed and must be maintained as stated in the unit specification. It may be possible to change the assessment type through discussion and agreement with the qualification support manager.

Some students may be permitted to use AI tools to aid as part of their additional support strategy. This will be planned and communicated by the learner support team.

Where AI cannot be used - Evidence submitted for achievement of units must be generated by the students. Students cannot use AI to generate material of any sort, in part or whole, for unit assessments. This should be treated as plagiarism.

Managing AI risk in assessments

Provide clear guidance to learners on acceptable AI use. The college has created a guidance tool for students, students can also speak to their lecturer if unsure. It is recommended that students are made aware of this as soon as possible on their course. The student code of conduct has also been updated to include the responsible use of AI.

The next step should be to consider the type of assessment, and the risk involved. Can AI be used to generate the content? If the answer is yes, then you should take some reasonable steps to reduce the risk to ensure that the work submitted is the students own. An assessment risk register has been created, this includes possible mitigation (Table 1)

Teams should also consider if there are any aspects of the assessment that can be generated by AI. If this is the case, learners should be given specific instructions and they should note where they used AI, and what tool they used.

Any work generated by AI and submitted as evidence, where AI use is not permitted, should be considered plagiarism. The college has now produced a decision tree to follow in this circumstance, which is available on the college AI intranet page.

Table 1 – Assessment type risk register with suggested mitigation approaches

Evidence Type	Risk	Comments	Mitigation Approaches
Essay/dissertation/report	High	AI can generate plans and full content; students may use it to enhance their own writing.	Use plagiarism and AI detection tools; require drafts and reflective commentary; include in-class writing components.
Audio files	High	AI can create music, speeches, and perform mastering tasks.	Require submission of project files and logs; include reflective statements; assess live performance or process.
Report on practical activity carried out in class	Medium	Theory explanations are high risk; personal evaluation is lower risk.	Focus assessment on personal reflection and direct observation; require annotated photos or video evidence.
Open book assessment in class under supervised conditions	Medium	AI may be accessible if internet is allowed.	Use Impero software, clarify permitted resources; monitor internet use; use question formats that require personal insight or application.
Video production	Medium	AI tools can generate clips and deepfakes; tech is becoming more accessible.	Require storyboard and production logs; assess originality and process; include peer or tutor review.
Project work	Medium	Practical elements may be AI-free, but written components are at risk.	Include checkpoints and progress reviews; require reflective logs; assess practical outcomes directly.
Product design	Medium	AI can generate design concepts, but students usually build the product.	Require sketches, prototypes, and design rationale; assess hands-on product.

			creation and iteration process.
Video evidence of skill	Low	AI use is difficult and requires expertise; assessors know students and context.	Use known environments and tasks; verify with assessor knowledge; pair with other evidence types.
Closed book assessment in class in supervised conditions	Low	No internet access; AI use is not possible.	Maintain strict administration of secure assessments.
Presentation in class	Low	Delivery is low risk; visual aids could be AI-generated.	Focus on delivery and understanding; require Q&A; ask for development notes or drafts.
Witness testimony of skill	Low	Employer review helps detect false claims.	Use trusted witnesses; pair with other evidence; verify with workplace context.
Images to show achievement of a skill	Low	AI could generate images, but hard to fake candidate accurately.	Pair with testimony or video; require time-stamped or contextual images; verify with assessor knowledge.

What can you do to reduce the risk?

Certain types of course work evidence are at a higher risk of AI plagiarism than others. To address this, you may have to change the delivery style of the course. This may include some of the following (JCQ, revision one 2024):

- Where appropriate, allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be done in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate each student's whole work with confidence.
- Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure that work is underway in a planned and timely manner and that work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages.

- Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident that the student understands the material.
- Consider whether it's appropriate and helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain that they understand it and that it reflects their own independent work.
- Do not accept, without further investigation, work which staff suspect has been taken from AI tools without proper acknowledgement or is otherwise plagiarised – doing so encourages the spread of this practice.
- Issuing tasks for centre-devised assignments which are, wherever possible, topical, current and specific, and require the creation of content which is less likely to be accessible to AI models trained using historic data.
- Where possible, issue assessment tasks that are personalised to the learner, e.g. reports on an individual project, real case studies identified by the learner, responses that address knowledge areas by referring to a specific case or primary research.

It may be possible to change the assessment. Some unit specifications allow for this. You do not have to use the ASP/ SQA provided assessment. Many unit specifications allow for alternative assessment approaches. You may wish to change a unit assessment to reduce any risk that you have identified. Changes to assessment approaches should be discussed and agreed with the SQA qualifications manager to ensure integrity of the qualification.

The aim of mitigating risk is to give you confidence that the work submitted has been generated by the student who submitted it. You can never be 100% sure, but you need to be reasonable assured that the work is genuinely from the person that submitted it.

Identifying misuse of AI

AI-generated work submitted where AI use is not allowed is considered plagiarism. Use the college's decision tree to address suspected cases. It is advised that learners complete a declaration of authenticity and assessment tasks indicate where AI can be used, if at all.

The college has created an intranet page with lots of useful resources and information for staff use [Artificial Intelligence at GKC - Home](#)

Appendix 1

Potential indicators of AI misuse (JCQ, revision one 2024)

If the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication that the student has misused AI:

- a) A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations*
- b) A default use of language or vocabulary which might not accord with the qualification level*
- c) A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected~
- d) Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors)
- e) A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which might be notable for some subjects
- f) Instances of incorrect/inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered
- g) A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work
- h) A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended this
- i) A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected
- j) A lack of specific local or topical knowledge
- k) Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themselves, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected
- l) The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output
- m) The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten
- n) The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth and variety or to overcome its output limit
- o) The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content
- p) Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.

*Please be aware, though, that AI tools can be instructed to employ different languages, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content.

~However, some AI tools will produce quotations and references.

Appendix 2

Declaration of Authenticity

I, **[Full Name]**, a student of Glasgow Kelvin College, registration number **[GK Number]**, hereby declare that the attached coursework titled **[Coursework Title]**, submitted for **[Course Name and Unit Name]**, is my own original work. I affirm that all sources of information and material used for this coursework have been duly acknowledged. I understand that any false claim in relation to the authenticity of this work constitutes academic misconduct, which may result in disciplinary action as per the college's regulations. I also confirm that this work has not been submitted for any other assessment.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

This declaration should be completed and signed before submitting any coursework to ensure the integrity of the academic work presented.

References

JCQ. (revision one 2024). *AI use in Assessments: Protecting the integrity of Qualifications*. Joint Qualifications Council.

JISC. (2023). *Student Perceptions of generative AI*. JISC.

JISC. (Third edition 2023). *AI in Tertiary Education*. JISC.

SQA. (2024, May 20). *SQA Generative artificial intelligence (AI) in assessments*. Retrieved from [www.sqa.org.uk: https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/107507.html](https://www.sqa.org.uk/sqa/107507.html)