

APPROVED

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

**SENATE: ACADEMIC QUALITY AND STANDARDS COMMITTEE
TEACHING, LEARNING AND STUDENTS**

31 MARCH 2026

Present: Professor Jenn Hallam (Chair), Professor Andrew Brass, Professor Naomi Chambers, Professor Hannah Cobb, Professor Sarah Dyer, Professor Scott Heath, Professor Rebecca Hodgson, Dr Jen McBride, Professor Andrew Mawdsley, Dr Katie Moore, Professor George Moulton, Rhianna Patel, Professor David Schultz, Alec Severs, and Professor Fiona Smyth.

Apologies: Professor Rob Appleby, Amrit Dhillon, and Dr Simon Merrywest.

In Attendance for all items: Dr John Marsh (Senior Governance Manager), Emma Stansfield (Teaching and Learning Officer), Sarah Williams (Teaching and Learning Manager), and Jane Holland (Governance Manager) (minutes).

1 Introduction

Noted: The Chair welcomed members to the extraordinary meeting which had been convened to further discuss development of the new AI in Teaching and Learning Policy. The draft Policy had been presented to the 11 March AQSC (TLS) and the feedback received at the meeting, and additional comments after the meeting, had been used to update the draft Policy. The Committee would be supported with this information to make an informed decision prior to recommending the Policy to 22 April Senate for approval.

2 AI in Teaching and Learning Policy

Received: the AI in Teaching and Learning Policy.

Noted:

- a) the Policy had been updated to remove the requirement for Faculties to keep a risk register of AI-related matters. Faculties would review the implementation of the AI Policy once per semester through their Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees, enabling staff and students to contribute, including feed-in via the Student Voice Committee;
- b) the Policy clarified expectations relating to group work, including the support to be provided to students and the responsibilities of academic staff. Work was being undertaken with Faculties where AI-related issues were already emerging, to understand the resources needed;
- c) an update was provided on the development of case studies. There was a focus on supporting Programme Directors and identifying existing practice that could be used to model resources for adapting within Faculties and co-designing these with the Programme Directors. Consideration was being given to how students could be supported with assessments in line with the Policy;
- d) members discussed the clarity of assessment briefs in relation to AI use. Examples were provided of assessment briefs that either guided students through appropriate use of AI or set out supported assessments, such as the provision of datasets or structured tasks. It was noted that assessments could be designed to require students to undertake alternative but equivalent activities (for example, using literature searches), where AI use was permitted;
- e) regarding the identification of malpractice, students were not required to adopt a single agreed position on the use of AI within group work. The importance of clearly defining malpractice and putting appropriate support in place in advance was emphasised;

- f) section 2.1.4 "... prior to beginning the activity" implied that students were required to agree how generative AI would be used within group assessments. Members agreed that the wording required clarification and should be rephrased to make expectations clearer; **Action: Associate Vice-President (Teaching Excellence and Innovation)**
- g) clarification was sought on whether consent for transcription (section 2.1.5) applied in all cases or only where AI was used, and whether this was covered elsewhere in University policy. **Action: Teaching and Learning Officer**
- h) members discussed staff use of AI in teaching activities, and the use of University-provided AI tools. Staff should adhere to local ethical procedures relating to the handling of project data from humans and generative AI, and members queried whether this was addressed in existing University AI or Ethics guidance, or an additional sentence would be added to the Policy to provide clarification; **Action: Associate Vice-President (Teaching Excellence and Innovation)**
- i) rapid changes to assessment practice had occurred during, and since, the COVID-19 pandemic. A strong case could be made for changes being made to assessments on a short- to medium-term basis;
- j) the UMSU Faculty Officer (FHums) raised concerns about the use of AI by staff to generate non-standard teaching materials, including lecture materials, and feedback. Responsible use of AI would be reaffirmed and engagement with staff would be undertaken to support teaching quality;
- k) there was a need for transparency within the Policy. Students were not currently required to explain how AI was used within assessments in categories B, C and D. Academic staff were not required to declare if they generated teaching materials and study guide materials using AI;
- l) concern was raised about the range of views expressed during Policy development, and the need for the development process and governance oversight to be clearly articulated. The covering report to Senate would clearly set out the policy development process and oversight arrangements. **Action: Senior Governance Manager/Teaching and Learning Manager**
- m) a member raised concern that not comments and feedback had been taken into consideration, including whether the Policy title appropriately reflected its scope. The comments would be reviewed to ensure these were reflected in the updated Policy; **Action: Associate Vice-President (Teaching Excellence and Innovation)**
- n) Faculties would undertake a review of the impact of the AI Policy at least once a semester. The Policy would be reviewed and updated annually;
- o) the UMSU Faculty Officer (FHums) emphasised that policies should be student-friendly, open and honest. Students would continue to be actively involved in discussion and development of policy; **Action: Associate Vice-President (Curriculum and Quality)/Associate Vice-President (Teaching Excellence and Innovation)**
- p) the Chair proposed to hold additional, informal meetings with the Committee members for continued engagement and discussion;
- q) the cover paper to the report to Senate members would be drafted in a reflective, narrative-style and would be sent in the first circulation to Senate on 8 April to provide a window for comments ahead of 22 April Senate.

Agreed: to recommend the AI in Teaching and Learning Policy to Senate, subject to amendments as discussed.