

GUIDANCE ON USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN MARKING AND FEEDBACK

1. Introduction

Emerging research shows that students respond positively to feedback which has been supported with transparent and responsible AI use, as seen at [Harvard](#), [Humboldt University of Berlin](#), [EPFL, Switzerland](#), and [Queens University Belfast](#). There is growing evidence that ethical and transparent use of AI can improve the quality and timeliness of feedback, enhancing the student experience.

Educators' use of AI should be grounded in professional integrity, ensuring that technology supports—rather than substitutes—their academic judgement. Being transparent with students about when and how AI is used fosters trust, strengthens dialogue, and models the ethical practices we expect them to follow in their own work.

The following guidance is designed to support effective, secure and transparent use of GenAI to:

- Enhance the quality and robustness of marking and feedback on student assessed work.
- Ensure students can be confident that assessments at the university are subject to human oversight.
- Foster dialogue and trust between markers and students.

The guidance also sets out the universal principles that must be applied *whenever* Gen AI tools are used in this manner.

2. Appropriate Use Cases of AI tools in Marking and Feedback

Where agreed by the Departmental Director of Education Student Experience, markers may use Gen AI tools to:

- 2.1 Correct spelling and grammar in human-generated feedback.
- 2.2 Adjust the tone of human-generated feedback to ensure it is empathetic and supportive.
- 2.3 Adapt notes/reflections on student assessments to ensure the feedback [aligns to an appropriate framework](#) or marking criteria.
- 2.4 Participate in a university-approved pilot to enhance feedback quality under the AI enablement strategy.
- 2.5 Help design marking criteria or rubrics that align with module intended learning outcomes.
- 2.6 Assist with summarising key themes emerging from human-generated feedback on multiple assessments submissions.

UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES FOR USE OF AI IN ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK

3. In all cases, markers *must always*:

- 3.1 Ahere to the [University AI Policy](#) and [University Intellectual Property Policy](#), bearing in mind that student work is by default the intellectual property of the student.
- 3.2 Ensure **human oversight** over all marking and feedback processes. This means:
 - 3.2.1 Student assessed work must be read by a human subject expert marker.
 - 3.2.1 A human subject expert marker must review and approve any output resulting from AI use in marking and feedback, before it is confirmed and released to students.
 - 3.2.2 Feedback and marks must be reviewed and confirmed by a human subject expert marker/moderator as accurate, consistent, aligned to [university expectations](#) and free of bias.
- 3.3 Employ a consistent process of feedback and marking across an assessment. This includes consistent use of AI tools across a team of markers on an assessment.
- 3.4 Ensure tools used for this purpose are included in the [AI catalogue](#) and are approved up to **Level 4-Restricted** in the [Information Classification Scheme](#), unless:
 - The tool is embedded in existing education technology products i.e. the VLE and has been approved for usage; or
 - The tool is part of an approved pilot to enhance feedback quality under the University's AI Enablement Strategy and the students in question have given their explicit and informed consent.
- 3.5 Be transparent with students about any use of AI in marking and feedback, just as we require transparency from students in their assessment submissions (see guidance below).
- 3.6 Ensure that marking meets the University's marking procedures which can be found in [Chapter 5](#) of the [Assessment Progression and Awarding Handbook](#) .

4. In all cases, markers *must never*:

- 4.1 Share student work with any tool for summative marking/feedback purposes:
 - 4.1.1 Outside of existing education technology licensed and supplied by the university or within the AI catalogue
 - 4.1.2 That is not **that is not approved up to Level 4 – Restricted**.
 - 4.1.3 Unless undertaken as part of an approved pilot to enhance feedback quality under the University's AI enablement Strategy
 - 4.1.4 Unless the students in question have given their explicit and informed consent.
- 4.2 Share with any tool or platform not licensed by the university, **any material** that contains sensitive or identifying information, or that is in violation of the University's Intellectual Property Policy.

5. AI Transparency

Markers **must** be committed to transparency where they use AI tools to support feedback and marking. They should consider using an AI declaration (suggested template below) as part of their dialogue with students about assessment and feedback, well before marking commences.

Your feedback has been written by a human marker with support from AI tools, in line with university guidance. AI has been used to: (tick boxes as appropriate)

- Check spelling, grammar and sentence structure*
- Ensure the tone is constructive*
- Confirm mapping to the marking criteria*
- Other (please state):*

All feedback has been reviewed and approved by a human before releasing to students and used in line with the university's rules on data protection, [intellectual property](#) and information security.

Published May 2026