17 Generative AI

17.1 Innopharma Education Teaching Staff Generative AI Use Policy

QA Area (s)	• Programmes of Education and Training • Documented Approach to QA
Applies to	☒ Staff only ☐ Learners only ☐ Staff and Learners

17.1.1 Background

This policy governs the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools by teaching and academic staff at Innopharma Education in the preparation and delivery of teaching and learning materials. It is a companion document to the Innopharma Education Generative AI Policy and Assessment Framework, which governs learner AI use in assessment.

Generative AI tools offer genuine opportunities to enhance the quality and efficiency of course material development. At the same time, their use in assessment-related activities carries specific risks for academic integrity, quality assurance, and the validity of qualifications. This policy establishes clear expectations so that staff can engage with these tools confidently and responsibly.

This policy should be read alongside the following internal Innopharma Education documents:

- Innopharma Education Generative AI Policy and Assessment Framework
- Innopharma Education QA Manual (Particularly section 8.8, Academic Misconduct Policy)

17.1.2 Scope

This policy applies to all teaching and academic staff at Innopharma Education. It covers the use of generative AI in the following activities:

Activity	Examples
Lecture slides and teaching materials	Slide drafts, speaker notes, infographics, visual summaries
Assignment briefs	Drafting task descriptions, marking criteria, rubrics
Exam paper preparation	Draft questions, sample answers, revision materials

Learning resources	Reading guides, case studies, interactive exercises, lesson plans
Feedback templates	Standard feedback prompts, formative feedback frameworks
Administrative academic documents	Module descriptors, programme-level documentation

This policy does not govern personal or non-academic use of AI tools, nor does it apply to learner AI use, which is addressed in the Generative AI Policy and Assessment Framework.

17.1.3 Guiding Principles

Staff use of generative AI must at all times be guided by the following principles:

- Academic Integrity first: All AI-assisted materials must reflect the genuine professional expertise and judgment of the staff member. AI may assist; it may not substitute for staff knowledge, critical review, or academic responsibility.
- Transparency where appropriate: Staff should be open with colleagues, the Head of Assessment, and learners (where relevant) about the nature and extent of AI use in course materials.
- Human oversight is mandatory: No AI-generated content should be used in any academic context without being reviewed, verified, and edited by the responsible staff member.
    - Quality assurance is not delegated to AI: The accuracy, appropriateness, and alignment of all materials with learning outcomes and NFQ/QQI standards remains the responsibility of the individual staff member.
    - Data protection and confidentiality: Staff must not input learner data, sensitive institutional information, or confidential content into external AI tools.
    - Equity and bias awareness: Staff should be alert to potential bias, cultural assumptions, or inaccuracies in AI-generated content, particularly in contexts involving assessment or learner feedback.
    - Human accountability is non-negotiable: The use of AI in any academic activity does not replace human accountability. Staff remain fully accountable for all materials, content, and academic decisions, regardless of whether AI tools were used in their preparation.

17.1.4 Permitted Use of AI

The following uses of generative AI are permitted, subject to the conditions set out in the following section.

17.1.4.1 Lecture Slides and Teaching Materials

- Generating draft slide content or outlines for review and editing by the lecturer.

- Summarising complex topics to inform initial drafts of explanatory content.
- Generating analogies or illustrative examples that are then reviewed and refined.
- Generating diagrams, illustrations, icons, or other visual assets (e.g. using tools such as DALL·E, Canva AI, or Adobe Firefly) for teaching purposes, provided they are reviewed for factual accuracy, accessibility, copyright, and contextual appropriateness.
- Producing first-draft speaker notes that are subsequently edited for accuracy and personal voice.

Where AI tools are used to generate slide content or structure, staff remain responsible for ensuring materials are clear, well-organised, and appropriate for the learner audience. AI-generated layouts or visual designs should be critically reviewed before use, with particular attention to cognitive load, accessibility, and alignment with Innopharma Education's house style. Where new content is being developed by AI, a review by programme lead is required.

17.1.4.2 Assignment Briefs

- Drafting initial assignment brief structures or rubric frameworks for review by the lecturer and Head of Assessment.
- Generating example scenarios or case studies as a starting point, subject to verification for accuracy and relevance.
- Suggesting marking criteria aligned to learning outcomes, subject to lecturer and QA review.

Important: All assignment briefs and marking rubrics must be reviewed and approved in conjunction with the Head of Assessment or designee before issuing to learners, regardless of whether AI was used in their preparation. The AI Assessment Scale (AIAS) level applicable to each assessment must be set by the lecturer in this consultation process. All assignment briefs must also be submitted for internal moderation and external examination in line with standard QA processes.

17.1.4.3 Examination Paper Preparation

- Generating draft question options for review, editing, and selection by the lecturer.
- Producing sample answers or model responses for examiner reference, subject to expert review.
- Assisting with formatting or restructuring question papers at a mechanical level. Critical requirement -exam papers: AI must not be used as the sole or primary means of generating examination questions. All exam content must be critically reviewed and verified by the responsible lecturer for accuracy, level-appropriateness (NFQ), alignment with learning outcomes, and freedom from bias or error. Final exam papers must proceed through the standard QA process, including internal moderation and external examiner review.

17.1.4.4 Learning Resources

- Drafting initial versions of reading guides, glossaries, or study aids that are then reviewed and edited.

- Generating case study frameworks based on real-world scenarios, subject to verification.
- Producing formative quiz questions for review before use with learners.
- Assisting with accessible language reformulation of technical content, subject to accuracy check.

17.1.4.5 Feedback Templates a*nd Administrative Documents*

- Drafting standard feedback frameworks or prompts that are personalised and verified by the lecturer before use.
- Assisting with initial drafts of module descriptors or programme documentation, which must be reviewed through normal QA channels.

17.1.4.6 Assessment Marking and Correction

The following uses of generative AI are permitted in the context of marking and correcting learner assessments, subject to the conditions set out in the following section.

- Using AI tools to help apply a rubric or marking scheme consistently across a batch of submissions, where the AI output is used as a reference point only and not as a final mark.
- Generating a first-draft written feedback comment based on a learner's submission, provided this is substantially reviewed, edited, and personalised by the lecturer before issue.
- Using AI to identify patterns or common errors across a cohort's submissions to inform formative feedback or future teaching.

Important - grades and academic decisions: AI must not determine, recommend, or influence the grade awarded to any individual learner. All marking decisions, including borderline cases, remain the sole responsibility of the assessing lecturer, subject to the standard moderation process.

Important - AI detection tools: AI-based tools that claim to detect AI-generated content in learner submissions must not be used. These tools are not sufficiently reliable for use in academic contexts: they produce significant rates of false positives, meaning that learners who have not used AI may be incorrectly flagged. Any concern about the authenticity of a learner's work must be addressed through the standard academic integrity procedures set out in the QA Manual (section 8.8), based on academic judgment rather than automated detection.

17.1.5 Conditions Applying to All Staff AI Use

Regardless of the activity, the following conditions apply to all staff use of generative AI:

Condition	Requirement

Human review	All AI-generated content must be read, verified, and edited by the staff member responsible before use.
Factual accuracy	Staff must verify the factual accuracy of AI outputs, particularly in technically specialised areas such as pharmaceutical sciences, regulatory affairs, and medtech.
Condition	Requirement
Data protection	Learner data, staff personal data, and confidential institutional information must not be entered into external AI tools.
Copyright	Staff should be aware that AI tools may reproduce copyrighted material. AI-generated content should be reviewed for potential copyright issues before use in published or circulated materials.
Hallucination risk	AI tools are known to produce plausible but incorrect information (hallucination). This is a particular risk in assessment materials, exam questions, and cited references.
QA compliance	AI-assisted materials remain subject to all standard QA review and approval processes.
Professional responsibility	The responsible staff member is accountable for all materials issued under their name, regardless of the tools used in their preparation.

17.1.6 Prohibited Uses

The following uses of generative AI by staff are not permitted:

- Submitting AI-generated examination questions, marking schemes, or assessment materials without thorough expert review and editing.
- Entering learner names, student IDs, assessment results, or any other personal learner data into external AI systems.
- Using AI-generated content in official college documents (e.g. programme handbooks, QA submissions) without disclosure and appropriate review.
- Allowing AI tools to make academic judgments, such as determining grades, pass/fail decisions, or academic misconduct outcomes.
- Using AI to generate feedback on individual learner work that is issued directly to learners without review, editing, and personalisation by the lecturer.
- Representing AI-generated content as wholly original staff-authored work in contexts where this distinction is material (e.g. published research or formal QA documentation).

- Using AI to determine, recommend, or adjust the grade awarded to any individual learner.
- Using AI-based detection tools as evidence of learner academic misconduct. Such tools are insufficiently reliable for this purpose and must not be used in any academic integrity process.

17.1.7 Transparency and Declaration

Innopharma Education is committed to a culture of transparency around AI use. In line with this:

- Staff are encouraged to note AI use in the preparation of major course documents (e.g. in a version history note or internal cover sheet), particularly for assessment materials.
- When AI tools have been used in the preparation of assessment briefs or exam papers, this should be noted for the Head of Assessment at the point of submission for review.
- Innopharma Education will not require staff to declare AI use in routine operational tasks (e.g. drafting a routine email) but does expect transparency in all academic and assessment-related contexts.

17.1.8 Specific Responsibilities

17.1.8.1 Individual Lecturers and Academic Staff

- Familiarise themselves with this policy and the companion learner AI policy.
- Apply the conditions in this policy to all AI-assisted work.
- Ensure that any AI-generated content used in assessment materials is reviewed with the Head of Assessment.
- Participate in professional development on AI literacy and ethical AI use as provided by the College.
- Raise concerns about AI-related academic integrity issues through appropriate channels.
- AIAS level must be set when the brief is drafted, and the brief must clearly state permitted AI use. The lecturer determines the AIAS level in consultation with the Head of Assessment or designee.

17.1.8.2 Head of Assessment

- Provide guidance to lecturers on appropriate AI use in assessment design.
- Review and approve AI-assisted assessment briefs and exam papers through the standard QA process.
- Monitor assessment materials for consistency and alignment with this policy.
- Report patterns of concern to Academic Council.

- The Head of Assessment or designee will consult with the lecturer to ensure the AIAS level chosen for each assignment is appropriate, consistent, and aligned with learning outcomes.

17.1.8.3 Innopharma Education Responsibilities

- Provide regular professional development opportunities on responsible AI use for staff.
- Maintain and update this policy in line with developments in AI technology, sector guidance, and HEA frameworks.
- Ensure this policy is reviewed before each semester by the Assessment & Academic Integrity working group.
- Consult with staff and industry representatives to ensure the policy remains current and fit for purpose.

17.1.9 Non-Compliance

Breach of this policy -for example, issuing unreviewed AI-generated assessment content to learners, or entering learner personal data into an external AI tool -may constitute a breach of the College's QA obligations and data protection responsibilities. Such matters will be addressed through the relevant HR or QA processes.

Where AI misuse by a staff member contributes to academic misconduct by a learner (e.g. through unclear or inaccurate assessment briefs), this will be taken into account in any review.

17.1.10Monitoring and Review

The implementation of this policy will be monitored and reported to the Academic Council.

This policy will be reviewed before each semester by the Assessment & Academic Integrity working group for accuracy and any updates in policy. Please see Section 18 for further information.