AI-QA LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

Practitioner Guide

For Teachers, Programme Leaders, Learning Technologists & Student Support Teams
ASIC Standards for Growth Series: Webinar 1 - Post-Webinar Resource

Audience	Teachers, tutors, programme leaders, learning technologists, student welfare and support teams, CPD coordinators
Purpose	Practical, role-specific guidance for embedding responsible AI practice into teaching, curriculum design, student support, and professional development
Series	ASIC Standards for Growth - Webinar 1 | 24th March 2026 Practitioner Guide

Contents

Introduction: A Guide for People Who Teach & Provide Student Support

This guide is written for the people closest to students and to the daily realities of learning. If you teach, design programmes, support students, or develop colleagues, AI has already changed the context you work in. This guide is here to help you navigate that change with confidence, honesty, and good professional judgement.

There is no single right answer to most AI questions in education right now. What good practice looks like is still being worked out across the sector. What this guide offers is a principled framework, practical strategies, and honest worked examples so that you can make informed decisions for your students and your context.

A note on where you might be starting from
Some practitioners feel excited about AI and are already experimenting with it extensively. Others feel anxious, confused, or concerned about what it means for teaching, assessment, and student development. Many feel both at once.

This guide does not ask you to be enthusiastic. It asks you to be thoughtful, to understand what your institution's policies require of you, and to support your students to engage with AI in ways that serve their genuine learning.

Section 1: Guidance by Role

AI affects different practitioner roles in different ways. This section offers targeted guidance for five distinct practitioner groups. Find your primary role and read that section first - then dip into others as relevant.

Note: This document has been produced to provide guidance and support only and it is your responsibility to understand and follow the policies and procedures in place at your institution.

1.1 Teachers & Tutors

How AI changes your teaching context

Students are using AI tools whether or not you have addressed this in your teaching. Ignoring it does not make it go away and simply means that your students are navigating it without your guidance. The most effective teachers are those who engage with AI transparently: explaining what it can and cannot do, setting clear expectations, and designing learning that develops the skills AI cannot replace.

Practical strategies for teaching in an AI-enabled environment

- Be explicit about AI use in your sessions. Name it, discuss it, and set expectations clearly at the start of each module.
- Design tasks that develop skills AI cannot substitute: critical analysis, personal reflection, contextualised judgement, oral communication, process documentation.
- Use AI tools yourself to understand what they can and cannot produce. You cannot advise students well on something you have not engaged with.
- When reviewing student work, consider whether the writing is consistent with the student's demonstrated capability but do not make accusations without appropriate process.
- Involve students in conversations about AI: what they find useful, what concerns them, how they think it should be used in your discipline.

Giving feedback in an AI-enabled context

AI tools can generate feedback-like text rapidly and at scale. But **feedback is fundamentally a developmental conversation and is most effective when it is specific, relational, and tailored to the individual** student's learning journey. AI-generated feedback that is not reviewed and personalised risks being generic, inaccurate, or distorted.

> **Principles for feedback in an AI context**
>
> - Human oversight is non-negotiable; any AI-assisted feedback must be reviewed and approved by a qualified person before it reaches the student.
> - Feedback should be personalised. Generic AI output that has not been adapted to the specific student is inadequate.
> - Be transparent. If you have used AI as a drafting tool, you do not need to hide this, but you do need to own the final feedback as your professional judgement
> - The most valuable feedback tells students what to do next, not just what went wrong. This is where human expertise adds most value

1.2 Programme Leaders

Your responsibilities

Programme leaders sit at the intersection of policy and practice. You are responsible for ensuring that AI governance is coherent across your programme, that individual module-level decisions add up to a consistent, equitable student experience, and that your programme can be defended in terms of its academic standards.

Assessment design: the central challenge

The most significant responsibility AI creates for programme leaders is assessment. If your programme's assessments have not been reviewed with AI capability in mind, you cannot be confident that your awards are certifying genuine student achievement. This is not a criticism. It reflects a change in context that has affected the entire sector. The question is what you do now.

Assessment design principles for an AI-enabled environment

- AUTHENTICITY: Can the task only be completed meaningfully by someone with the relevant experience, context, or relationship? (e.g. a reflective account of placement, a contextualised case study)
- PROCESS: Does the assessment capture how a student arrived at their answer, not just the answer itself? (e.g. annotated bibliography, design log, recorded discussion)
- ORAL AND LIVE: Can students demonstrate and discuss their work in real time, e.g. viva, presentation, lab demonstration? (Being mindful of reasonable adjustments for individuals.)
- INTEGRATION: Does the task require students to connect multiple elements in ways that depend on their specific learning journey? (e.g. portfolio with reflective synthesis)
- ITERATION: Does the process involve drafts, feedback, and revision that is documented? (e.g. staged submission with tutor commentary)

Programme documentation: What needs updating

- Programme specification → add an AI-permitted-use statement at programme level
- Module descriptors → each module should specify what AI use is and is not permitted for that module's assessments
- Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) → review whether ILOs remain meaningful and assessable in an AI context; consider adding AI literacy as a graduate attribute where relevant
- External examiner briefing notes → ensure examiners understand your approach and any AI-related concerns they should look out for
- Student handbook → ensure AI guidance is prominent and consistent

Managing consistency across your team

One of the most common quality concerns in this area is inconsistency with students receiving different guidance on AI from different module tutors within the same programme.

As programme leader, it is your responsibility to ensure a baseline of consistency.

This does not mean identical rules for every module, as different assessments may reasonably permit different levels of AI use, but the framework within which those differences sit should be coherent and communicated clearly.

1.3 Learning Technologists

Your unique position

Learning technologists occupy a distinctive and increasingly important role in AI governance. You are often the first point of contact for staff exploring AI tools, the people who evaluate new platforms, and the professionals who support staff to understand what they are actually deploying. This makes you both a resource and a guardian.

Evaluating AI tools: What to look for

- **Transparency about the underlying model:** Who built it, on what data, with what safeguards
- **Data handling:** Where student data goes, whether it is used to train external models, and how it is stored
- **Accessibility compliance:** Does the tool meet WCAG 2.1 AA? Does it work with assistive technologies?
- **Bias and fairness:** Has the tool been tested for performance differences across demographic groups?
- **Human override:** Can a human review, correct, or override the AI's output at every decision point?
- **Vendor accountability:** Is there a clear process for reporting errors, harmful outputs, or data concerns?

Supporting staff to use AI tools responsibly

Many staff will ask learning technologists for guidance on AI tools before they ask anyone else. This is an opportunity to embed good practice at the point of adoption.

When supporting staff:

- Always refer back to institutional policy - enthusiasm for a tool should not override the procurement and DPIA/equivalent process
- Demonstrate the tool's limitations as well as its capabilities (show staff what it gets wrong, not just what it gets right)
- Help staff understand what oversight is required and understand the human review process for any AI-generated content that goes to students
- Flag accessibility concerns early

Red flags when evaluating an AI tool

- The vendor cannot explain clearly how the model was trained
- Student data is used to train the model without explicit consent
- There is no way to review, audit, or override the AI's outputs
- The tool has not been tested for accessibility or demographic fairness
- The procurement conversation is happening after the tool is already in use

1.4 Student Support & Welfare Teams

Why AI matters for student welfare

AI is increasingly embedded in student-facing services from chatbots on institutional websites to mental health triage tools. For welfare teams, this creates both opportunity and risk. AI can extend the reach of support at scale. It can also give students incorrect information, fail to escalate genuine distress, or create a false sense of having received support when they have not.

Governing student-facing AI tools in welfare contexts

Non-negotiable requirements for welfare-related AI

- Every AI welfare tool must have a clear, tested escalation route to human support.
- The knowledge base behind any student-facing chatbot must be regularly reviewed for accuracy. Incorrect information about deadlines, bursaries, mental health services, or processes can cause real harm.
- Students must be told they are interacting with an AI, not a human - both an ethical requirement and a safeguarding one.
- Safeguarding routes must be explicit and tested; if a student discloses risk to themselves or others, the AI must route this immediately to a trained human.
- Welfare teams must maintain oversight of what the AI is saying (samples of conversations should be reviewed regularly).

Supporting students who are anxious about AI

Some students are anxious about AI - whether about their own use, about AI replacing human feedback, or about the fairness of AI-related conduct processes. Welfare teams play an important role in normalising honest conversations about these concerns.

- Acknowledge that AI anxiety is legitimate and widely shared
- Help students understand what their institution's AI policies actually say (as with many other areas, student concerns can arise from misunderstanding or inconsistent communication)
- Where a student has been referred to a conduct process relating to AI, support them to understand the process and their rights and escalate if they feel the process has been unfair
- Be alert to AI-related stress as a contributor to broader mental health concerns

1.5 CPD Coordinators & Academic Developers

Designing AI CPD that makes a difference

AI CPD is largely ineffective if it follows a pattern similar to: a whole-staff briefing, a few optional workshops, and a Moodle module nobody reads. The result is that a small number of confident staff become very capable, while the majority remain uncertain or uninformed.

Effective AI CPD needs to be differentiated, targeted, practical, and embedded in real workload.

It needs to address different levels of confidence and different role requirements. It also needs to be evaluated for not just whether staff attended, but whether their practice changed.

A tiered approach to AI CPD

Tier	Target Audience	Focus	Example Provision
Foundation	All staff (including part-time and professional services)	What AI is, what institutional policy requires, how to report concerns	30-minute online module; induction session for new staff; annual refresh
Practitioner	Teaching staff, programme leaders, student-facing support staff	AI in assessment design, feedback, academic integrity, inclusive practice	Half-day workshop; peer learning sets; observation with AI focus
Specialist	QA staff, learning technologists, data teams, DPO	Technical evaluation, bias auditing, DPIA process, procurement	External provider CPD; sector network participation; case study analysis
Leadership	Senior leaders, governors, committee chairs	Strategic risk, governance duties, inspection expectations	Briefing sessions; this resource pack; board development input

Measuring the impact of AI CPD

- Pre and post-training confidence surveys
- Classroom observation or peer review with an AI-focused lens
- Changes in assessment design, tracked through programme review
- Reduction in AI-related conduct cases or complaints
- Staff ability to articulate the institutional AI policy and apply it in their context

Section 2: Academic Integrity in Practice

Academic integrity in the age of AI is one of the most complex and contested areas practitioners face. This section does not offer simple answers, because there are none. Instead, it offers a principled framework, practical strategies, and a set of worked scenarios to support your professional judgement.

2.1 The Spectrum of AI Use in Student Work

AI use by students is not binary. It exists on a spectrum, and where a particular use falls depends on context: the assessment brief, the module guidance, the programme expectations, and the institution's policy. Practitioners need to understand this spectrum to respond proportionately and fairly.

Use Type	Example	Likely Status	Response
Transparent support	Grammar checking, brainstorming initial ideas, generating a reading list to explore	Permitted in most contexts	Normalise and teach students how to use these functions well
Permitted assistive use	A student with dyslexia uses AI to help structure written expression - disclosed on submission	Permitted with disclosure; protected under accessibility provisions	Support and facilitate; ensure declaration process is accessible
Permitted with disclosure	Paraphrasing a draft section, generating code that is then reviewed and adapted - declared on form	Permitted where policy allows; requires honest declaration	Accept with declaration; check declaration is accurate and reflective
Grey zone	AI used to draft significant portions of text; student has revised substantially but authorship is unclear	Depends on assessment brief, module guidance, and extent of revision	Refer to assessment brief and policy; may require conversation with student before any formal action
Policy breach	AI-generated content submitted without disclosure, against explicit module guidance	Conduct concern requires formal process	Follow academic conduct procedure; ensure fair and consistent process; log in AI Incident Log
Serious misconduct	Wholesale submission of AI-generated work as original, with active concealment	Formal misconduct	Formal investigation; proportionate consequence; log; trend analysis

2.2 Worked Scenarios

Use the following scenarios to support discussion and develop professional judgement.

Note: The presented scenarios should not be used as examples of definitive answers.

SCENARIO
A student submits an essay that seems unusually well-written compared to their previous work. You suspect AI use.

Suggested approach: Do not make assumptions. Review the assessment brief. Does it explicitly address AI? Speak to the student informally and ask them to talk you through their work, how they developed their argument, and what sources they found most useful. Their response will tell you more than any detection tool.

Why this works: *AI detection tools have significant false-positive rates and are not reliable evidence of misconduct. A student conversation, if well-handled, is both fairer and more informative.*

SCENARIO
A student discloses that they used AI to help write their assignment but your module guidance doesn't mention AI at all.

Suggested approach: Thank the student for their honesty. Review what your programme's overarching AI policy says. If there is no clear prohibition in the module guidance, it is very difficult to treat this as a conduct matter and doing so unfairly may expose your institution to appeal. The priority is to update your guidance before the next assessment.

Why this works: *Gaps in guidance hurt students and institutions alike. Where guidance is absent, the benefit of the doubt should go to the student. BUT the guidance should be updated immediately.*

SCENARIO
A student asks to use AI tools in an assessment because they have a diagnosed processing difficulty and find written expression challenging.

Suggested approach: Treat this as an accessibility matter first. Consult your institution's disability support team and relevant policies. In most cases, a student using AI as an accessibility aid, and disclosing it as so, should be accommodated. Design your assessment to evaluate learning rather than unaided expression where possible.

Why this works: *AI can be a legitimate and powerful accessibility tool. Blanket prohibitions may indirectly discriminate against students with certain disabilities. Disclosure-based approaches are generally more equitable.*

SCENARIO
You are asked to review a student's work using an AI detection tool. The tool flags it as 80% likely to be AI-generated.

Suggested approach: Do not use this figure as evidence of misconduct. AI detection tools produce outputs based upon probability, not determinations of fact. A high detection score may indicate AI use, or it may reflect a student's writing style, a paraphrased source, or the tool's own limitations. Any formal conduct process must be based on evidence, not an algorithm's output.

Why this works: *Using AI detection tool scores as the basis for conduct proceedings is procedurally unfair and is likely to be challenged successfully at appeal. These tools may support your concern but they cannot prove it.*

Section 3: Inclusive & Accessible AI Practice

AI creates new opportunities for inclusive learning and new risks of exclusion. Practitioners have a responsibility to ensure that AI tools and AI-related policies do not inadvertently disadvantage students from particular backgrounds or with particular needs.

3.1 AI as an Accessibility Tool

For many students, AI tools are genuinely transformative as accessibility aids. Text-to-speech, grammar and expression support, vocabulary assistance, and cognitive scaffolding can significantly reduce barriers for students with dyslexia, processing difficulties, autism, English as an additional language, and other circumstances that affect written expression.

> **Principles for accessible AI policy**
>
> - Blanket prohibition of AI tools may indirectly discriminate, always consider accessibility implications before restricting AI use in an assessment context
> - Disclosure-based approaches are generally more equitable than prohibition and allow legitimate use while maintaining academic integrity
> - Work with your disability support team to define which AI uses are protected accessibility accommodations and should not be treated as conduct concerns
> - Ensure that your AI acceptable use guidance explicitly addresses accessibility use cases, so that students who use AI for these purposes do not feel stigmatised or anxious about disclosure

3.2 Algorithmic Bias and Fairness in Learning Analytics

If your institution uses learning analytics (systems that track student behaviour, predict outcomes, or identify students at risk) you need to understand that these systems can encode and amplify existing inequalities.

- A prediction model trained on historical data will tend to reproduce historical patterns, including patterns of disadvantage and underrepresentation
- Students from underrepresented backgrounds, mature students, students with caring responsibilities, or students with disabilities may behave differently in ways that models interpret as 'at risk' even when they are not
- Interventions triggered by algorithmic predictions can feel intrusive, stigmatising, or presumptuous, particularly for students who were not actually struggling

What practitioners should do:

- Ask your institution's data team whether your learning analytics system has been audited for demographic bias and, if not, request this
- Ensure that algorithmic flags are treated as prompts for human conversation, not as determinations (a data point is not a diagnosis)
- Be transparent with students about how their data is used; students have a right to know if their behaviour is being analysed and what it might trigger

3.3 Ensuring AI-Generated Content Is Accessible

AI tools are increasingly used to generate teaching materials, captions, summaries, and resources. This is an opportunity to improve accessibility at scale, but only if it is done carefully. AI-generated content can contain errors, inappropriate language, or inaccessible formatting.

Content Type	Common Accessibility Risks	What to Check
Auto-generated captions	Errors with technical vocabulary, accents, and proper nouns; no punctuation	Review all captions before publishing; prioritise high-stakes content
AI-generated text resources	Dense, complex sentence structures; unclear headings; poor use of plain English	Check reading level; restructure for clarity; add meaningful headings
AI-generated images	No alt text generated; images may be misleading or culturally inappropriate	Always add descriptive alt text; review images for cultural appropriateness
AI summarisation tools	May omit nuance, context, or important caveats; not reliable for complex academic content	Treat AI summaries as drafts only; always review before sharing with students
AI chatbot responses	May include inaccurate information, broken links, or guidance that does not apply to your institution	Maintain an auditable knowledge base; review chatbot responses regularly

Section 4: Curriculum Design & AI Literacy

AI literacy will increasingly be recognised as a graduate attribute that employers expect and that students will need throughout their working lives. This section supports programme leaders and teachers to embed AI literacy into curriculum design in a meaningful way.

4.1 What AI Literacy Means for Your Subject

AI literacy is not a single, universal set of competences. It looks different in a nursing programme than in a computing degree, creative arts course, or business module. The most effective AI literacy development is disciplinary - rooted in the specific practices, ethical frameworks, and knowledge domains of your subject.

Questions to help you identify what AI literacy means in your discipline

- What AI tools are currently used by practitioners in your field? Are graduates expected to be able to use them?
- What ethical questions does AI raise in your discipline? (e.g. data bias in healthcare, creative authorship in the arts, automation and employment in business)
- What critical thinking skills do students need to evaluate AI outputs in your field?
- Are there professional regulatory requirements that address AI for example, in healthcare, law, or social work?
- What does responsible AI use look like in the kinds of work your graduates will do?

4.2 Mapping AI Literacy Across a Programme

AI literacy development should be progressive, building from awareness in year one to critical application and professional judgement in final year. The table below offers a framework for mapping this progression.

Level	Core AI Literacy Outcomes	Example Assessment Evidence
Foundation / Year 1	Understands what AI tools are and how they work at a basic level. Can identify AI use in everyday contexts. Knows institutional policy and what responsible use means. Can complete an accurate AI declaration.	Reflective journal entry on AI in their field; completed declaration on first assessment; tutorial discussion
Developing / Year 2	Can critically evaluate AI-generated content in their discipline. Understands key ethical issues (bias, privacy, authorship). Can use AI tools as a starting point and develop the output with their own analysis and judgement.	Annotated comparison of AI-generated and human-expert content; case study analysis with ethical evaluation; assessed discussion of AI use in a practical task
Advanced / Final Year	Applies disciplinary judgement to AI use in professional or research contexts. Evaluates risk and benefit of AI tools for specific tasks. Understands regulatory or professional frameworks relevant to AI in their field. Can justify their approach to AI use.	Dissertation methodology section addressing AI use; professional practice portfolio; capstone project with reflective account of AI decisions made

4.3 Involving Students in AI Policy Design

One of the most effective ways to ensure that AI policy is understood, trusted, and applied is to involve students in shaping it. Students who have contributed to the development of AI guidance are more likely to understand its purpose, accept its requirements, and apply it honestly.

- **Invite student representatives** to participate in AI policy working groups
- **Use student focus groups** to test the clarity and fairness of draft AI guidance before publication
- **Build module-level discussions of AI into teaching time** - ask students what they find useful, what worries them, and what feels fair
- **Share the outcomes of student consultation openly** (telling students “we asked, here is what we heard, and here is what we did” builds trust)
- **Revisit student views regularly** - the landscape changes, and so do student experiences

Closing Note: You Are Not Expected to Have All the Answers

The practitioners who navigate AI most effectively are not those who are most certain but those who are most honest. Honest about what they know and do not know. Honest with students about the complexity of this landscape. Honest with their institutions about what is and is not working.

The sector is working through these questions together. The fact that you are reading this resource, thinking about these issues, and taking your responsibilities seriously is itself a form of good practice.

Keep talking to colleagues. Keep listening to students. Keep asking questions.

A final checklist for practitioners

- ☐ I know what my institution's AI policy says and can explain it to students
- ☐ I have reviewed my assessments with AI capability in mind and can explain how they remain valid
- ☐ I give students clear, specific guidance on AI use in my modules in the brief and at the start of teaching
- ☐ I use AI tools myself and understand their limitations
- ☐ I know how to report an AI-related concern and where to find support
- ☐ I treat students fairly and consistently when AI concerns arise, following institutional process
- ☐ I continue to develop my own AI literacy and support colleagues to do the same

Appendix A: Plain English Glossary

This glossary explains key terms you may encounter. It is deliberately non-technical.

Term	Plain English Explanation
Generative AI	AI systems that can produce text, images, code, or other content in response to a prompt. Examples include ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot, and Google Gemini.
Large Language Model (LLM)	The type of AI that powers most text-based AI tools. It has been trained on vast amounts of text and predicts what words or sentences should come next.
DPIA (Data Protection Impact Assessment)	A legal assessment UK institutions must complete before using any system that processes personal data in a high-risk way.
DPO (Data Protection Officer)	The person in a UK institution responsible for data protection compliance. They should be involved in all AI procurement decisions.
AI Incident Log	A record of instances where AI tools produced problematic outputs, caused complaints, or were used inconsistently with policy. A governance essential.
Learning Analytics	The use of data about student behaviour (logins, submissions, attendance) to identify patterns, predict outcomes, or target support. These systems carry fairness risks.
Algorithmic Bias	When an AI system produces systematically unfair outcomes for particular groups, for example, being less accurate for students from certain backgrounds.
Academic Integrity	The expectation that student work is their own, honestly presented. AI changes what this means in practice and requires policy to be updated.
Acceptable Use Policy	A document that defines how staff and/or students may use AI tools. It should cover both permitted and prohibited uses, and consequences for misuse.
Authorship Declaration	A statement that a student submits alongside assessed work, confirming whether AI was used and in what way. Increasingly common in higher and further education.
Hallucination	When an AI tool confidently produces incorrect information e.g., fabricating a reference or a statistic. A significant risk in educational contexts.
Open-source AI	AI models whose underlying code is publicly available. These may be deployed by institutions directly, which creates different governance responsibilities.
Agent / Agentic AI	An AI system that can take sequences of actions autonomously to complete a goal — not just responding to a single prompt —but planning steps, using tools, browsing the web, writing and executing code, or interacting with other systems with minimal human input.

Term	Plain English Explanation
	Unlike standard generative AI, agentic AI can initiate actions, not just produce content. *Note: This raises additional leadership and governance questions around oversight, accountability, and unintended consequences*.

