

Triagon Academy

Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Academic Work

Document Notice

This policy establishes Triagon Academy's institutional framework governing the use of generative artificial intelligence tools in academic work, teaching, supervision, assessment, and related academic activities across all study programmes at Bachelor, Master, and Doctoral level. It is grounded in the principle of transparency over prohibition and applies to all assessed submissions, theses, dissertations, research projects, oral examinations, and relevant academic work by students and educators. This policy shall be read in conjunction with Triagon's Academic Integrity Policy and any programme-specific regulations.

Document type:	Institutional Policy
Proposed by:	Executive Dean
Version:	1.0
Status:	Deemed effective by the Office of the President from 1 September 2026
Scope:	All study programmes and levels
Review cycle:	Annual or as required

Contents

Preamble	2
1 Purpose, Scope, and Definitions	3
2 Core Principle and Integrity Framework	3
3 Permitted, Conditional, and Prohibited Uses	4
4 Use of AI by Educators	6
5 Disclosure Requirements by Level	6
6 Data Protection and Research Ethics	8
7 Retroactive Application and Transition Arrangements	8
8 Responsibilities	8
9 Relationship to the Academic Integrity Policy	10
Annex: Quick-Reference Summary by Level	11

PREAMBLE

Generative artificial intelligence is reshaping academic work in higher education and requires a clear, fair, and principled institutional response. Triagon Academy rejects both blanket prohibition, which is unenforceable and penalises honest students, and uncritical permissiveness, which can undermine learning, academic judgement, and institutional responsibility.

This policy is based on transparency, disclosure, proportionality, and accountability. Its focus is not simply whether AI was used, but whether academic work reflects genuine intellectual responsibility, sound judgement, and appropriate human oversight. The policy applies to students and educators alike, and it recognises that AI may be used differently across teaching, learning, assessment, supervision, curriculum development, and academic administration.

The policy is aligned with the MFHEA Learning Regulations 2025, in particular Domain 1, point 9, which requires artificial intelligence to be treated as an integral part of institutional strategy, policy, and budget, and calls for the ethical and acceptable use of AI by both educators and students, as well as its integration into curriculum design and programme learning outcomes.

The policy also reflects the European Union Artificial Intelligence Act and Triagon Academy's responsibilities as an educational institution using AI in teaching, assessment, curriculum development, and related academic processes. Triagon Academy will maintain proportionate internal governance, documentation, and human oversight for AI use in teaching, assessment, curriculum development, and related academic processes.

The policy will be reviewed annually in light of developments in AI, institutional experience, and European higher education practice, including regulatory developments under the EU AI Act. It will first be reviewed by the relevant Examination Boards for Levels 6, 7, and 8 and, where appropriate, submitted to Senate for institutional consideration and approval.

1 PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND DEFINITIONS

1.1 This policy explains the use of generative artificial intelligence at Triagon Academy in academic work, teaching, supervision, assessment, curriculum development, and related academic activities. It applies to all students enrolled in Bachelor (MQF Level 6), Master (MQF Level 7), and Doctoral (MQF Level 8) programmes, as well as to academic staff and others involved in teaching, supervision, assessment, academic support, and programme design.

1.2 This policy applies to all assessed academic work, including essays, written assignments, dissertations, theses, research projects, reflective journals, presentations, and oral examinations. It also applies to the preparation of teaching materials, feedback, supervision, curriculum-related materials, and other academic work where AI tools are used in a professional or pedagogical capacity.

1.3 In this policy, *generative AI tools* means digital tools that can produce text, code, images, summaries, analyses, or similar content in response to a prompt. Examples include tools such as ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Perplexity, Copilot, and NotebookLM.

1.4 In this policy, *high-impact AI use* means any use of AI that may materially affect teaching, assessment, progression, admission, supervision, feedback, learning support, or access to academic opportunities, including curriculum design and programme learning outcomes.

1.5 *AI as a cognitive tool* means using AI to think for you, for example by generating ideas, arguments, analyses, interpretations, or conclusions that replace your own work. If you simply accept AI output without checking or thinking critically about it, you are no longer doing the learning or academic judgement the programme is meant to support.

1.6 *AI as an expressional tool* means using AI to help communicate ideas that have already been developed and understood. This may include improving grammar, choosing better words, making sentences clearer, or helping a user express ideas in a language that is not their first language.

1.7 Anyone involved in teaching, supervision, curriculum development, or assessment under this policy must act fairly and declare any actual or possible conflict of interest.

1.8 Where AI use may fall within a regulated or high-risk educational context under applicable European Union law, Triagon Academy will apply additional governance, documentation, and human oversight requirements before deployment.

2 CORE PRINCIPLE AND INTEGRITY FRAMEWORK

2.1 All academic work submitted at Triagon Academy must reflect genuine intellectual responsibility, even where AI tools have been used during preparation. Triagon Academy's approach to AI use is based on transparency and disclosure rather than detection alone.

2.2 The key question is not "*Did you use AI?*" but "*Do you understand the work and can you take full responsibility for it?*" Where a student or educator can explain, defend, and critically discuss the substance of the work, the standard of responsible use has been met.

2.3 AI becomes problematic when it replaces human judgement, analysis, or authorship. Using AI to support work already developed by the student or educator, or to improve how ideas are communicated, is different from allowing AI to substitute for independent thinking. For example, asking AI to refine a paragraph already written is not the same as asking it to generate the paragraph independently.

2.4 Triagon Academy does not rely on AI detection software to determine whether academic work is acceptable. Such tools are not sufficiently reliable and may incorrectly flag work produced by students who use English as an additional language. Instead, Triagon evaluates understanding through the quality of the work, supervision, feedback, and oral discussion or examination.

2.5 Triagon Academy recognises that AI may support multilingual students and staff in expressing ideas clearly in a language that is not their first. This is permitted at all levels, provided that the ideas, analysis,

and conclusions remain the responsibility of the person submitting or using the work. What matters is that the thinking is human and accountable, not whether the wording was improved.

2.6 Where AI is used in curriculum development, assessment design, or other institutional academic processes, the responsible staff member must ensure that the output is reviewed, validated, and aligned with academic standards, programme learning outcomes, and applicable regulatory requirements.

2.7 Where AI use may materially affect student progression, assessment, admission, or access to academic opportunity, Triagon Academy will apply appropriate human oversight, documentation, and review before the use is implemented.

The five guiding principles of this policy

These principles summarise how Triagon expects students and staff to approach AI use in academic work, teaching, supervision, assessment, and curriculum development.

- **Transparency over prohibition.** AI use must be disclosed; the policy does not rely on blanket bans.
- **Intellectual responsibility.** Individuals remain fully responsible for claims, analysis, and conclusions in their work.
- **Learning and judgement first.** AI use is acceptable only when it supports learning and academic judgement rather than replacing them.
- **Method fit and professional judgement.** At research level, AI use must be consistent with the chosen methodology and with academic standards.
- **Fairness and inclusion.** The policy must not disadvantage multilingual users or others who may use AI for expression or support.

3 PERMITTED, CONDITIONAL, AND PROHIBITED USES

3.1 The table below summarises Triagon Academy's expectations regarding AI use in different kinds of academic work. These are general rules only. Supervisors, module instructors, and examiners may issue further guidance depending on the task, discipline, or research method. If in doubt, students should ask before submitting. Where AI use may affect teaching design, assessment design, progression, admission, or other institutional decisions, additional review and human oversight may be required before use.

Activity	Permitted	Permitted with Disclosure	Not Permitted
Grammar, spell-checking, style	Using AI to correct grammar, spelling, or sentence flow in your own text.	—	—
Rephrasing for clarity; synonym substitution	Using AI to make a sentence clearer or avoid repeating the same word too often.	—	—
Literature scoping and initial mapping	Using AI to identify possible themes or search directions at the start of a project.	You must check every claim against the original sources. If AI suggests an author or article, verify it before use.	Submitting AI summaries without checking the original literature.
Brainstorming and idea generation	Using AI to generate possible angles or questions, then deciding yourself what is useful.	You must disclose AI use and still think critically about the ideas.	Using AI output as if it were your own final answer without review.
Drafting sections of text	Using AI to help refine a section you already wrote, provided you substantially revise it and understand it fully.	You must disclose this use and be able to defend the content.	Submitting AI-written paragraphs with only light editing.
Qualitative coding	Using AI to suggest possible codes for human review.	You must record which codes were suggested by AI and which were developed by you.	Letting AI do the interpretation without your own analysis.
Statistical analysis	Using AI for exploratory support, provided you verify the method and results yourself.	You must explain the method logic and assumptions.	Submitting statistical output without independent checking.
Uploading research/participant data to AI tools	Only if all data are anonymised and the use is consistent with the approved ethics application.	If there is any doubt, ethics review confirmation must be obtained first.	Uploading identifiable participant data to external AI platforms.
AI writing assistance for multilingual expression	Using AI to help express ideas clearly in a language that is not your first. This is allowed at all levels.	—	—
Generating arguments, interpretations, conclusions submitted as own work	—	—	All levels: this is academic misconduct. For example, asking AI to write your conclusion and submitting it as your own is not allowed.
Curriculum development, assessment design, or programme materials by staff	Using AI to support drafting or exploratory review, provided the staff member critically reviews and validates the output.	The responsible staff member must retain a record of the tool used and ensure the output aligns with academic standards, programme learning outcomes, and institutional requirements.	Using AI-generated material without review in materials that may affect assessment, progression, or student opportunity.

Staff use of AI in curriculum development, assessment design, and programme materials remains subject to the approval, review, and record-keeping requirements set out in Sections 4 and 8.

4 USE OF AI BY EDUCATORS

4.1 Triagon Academy recognises that academic staff may use AI tools in the preparation and delivery of teaching, feedback, supervision, assessment design, curriculum development, and routine administrative work, provided that such use is pedagogically sound, ethically defensible, and consistent with academic judgement.

4.2 AI may be used by educators to support lesson planning, the development of learning materials, the drafting or refinement of feedback, the preparation of examples or practice exercises, the organisation of administrative tasks, and the exploratory review of teaching and learning resources. In each case, the educator remains fully responsible for the accuracy, appropriateness, and academic quality of the final output.

4.3 Educators must not use AI in ways that replace their professional judgement, misrepresent authorship, compromise confidentiality, or introduce unverified content into teaching, feedback, assessment, curriculum design, or student support. Where AI materially contributes to teaching materials, assessment design, curriculum development, or other academic outputs, the use should be reviewed critically and recorded internally in accordance with institutional procedures.

4.4 Triagon Academy encourages educators to develop AI literacy as part of their continuing professional development. Staff should remain informed about the capabilities, limitations, ethical risks, and pedagogical opportunities of AI, including issues of bias, data protection, intellectual property, transparency, and the responsibilities that may arise under applicable European Union law.

4.5 AI-related considerations should be reflected, where appropriate, in curriculum design and programme learning outcomes. This may include the development of AI literacy, critical evaluation of AI-generated content, responsible tool use, discipline-specific engagement with AI-enabled practice, and assessment approaches that preserve human judgement and academic integrity.

4.6 The use of AI by educators forms part of Triagon Academy's quality assurance framework. Academic staff are expected to use AI in ways that support learning, maintain academic standards, protect data and confidentiality, and contribute to the continuous improvement of teaching, assessment, curriculum development, and programme design.

4.7 Where AI use by educators may materially affect admissions, progression, assessment outcomes, student support, or other decisions affecting students' academic opportunities, additional review, documentation, and human oversight shall be required before implementation.

4.8 Material AI use in curriculum development, assessment design, or other academic outputs should be documented in accordance with institutional procedures, including any required approval or review by the relevant academic or governance body.

5 DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS BY LEVEL

5.1 Bachelor level. If AI tools are used for an assignment, students must add a short **AI Use Note** at the end of the submission. This should usually be one to three sentences and should briefly state:

- which tool was used,
- what it was used for,
- and whether the ideas and conclusions are the student's own.

For example: *"AI tools were used to improve grammar and sentence clarity. All ideas, arguments, and conclusions are my own."* If AI output is used as content in the assignment, it must also be cited according to the required referencing style.

5.2 Master level. If AI tools are used in a dissertation or major research project, students must include a short **AI Use Statement** in the methodology section or appendix. This should explain:

- which tool or tools were used,

- at what stage of the work they were used,
- what they were used for,
- and how the results were checked.

For module assignments, a short AI Use Note at the end of the submission is sufficient. If AI use went beyond simple grammar support, the note should explain this clearly. Where AI use forms part of research design, data processing, or curriculum-related project work, the statement must also describe the validation steps taken and the academic rationale for using the tool. Where the work relates to curriculum development, programme design, or institutional research, the statement should also explain the academic purpose and the basis on which the AI use was considered appropriate. If AI output is quoted, paraphrased, or used as source material, it must also be cited according to the required referencing style.

5.3 Doctoral level. A full **AI Use Disclosure Statement** is required in the methodology chapter of the thesis. This statement should give a clear account of:

- the tools used,
- the research phase or chapter in which they were used,
- the purpose of the use,
- the validation steps taken,
- and confirmation that the candidate understands and can defend all substantive content.

Supervisors should discuss AI use with candidates throughout supervision so that disclosure is addressed early rather than at the end of the process. Where AI is used in research design, analysis, or the preparation of curriculum-related outputs, the candidate must ensure that its use is methodologically appropriate and consistent with any approved ethics application. If AI output is quoted, paraphrased, or incorporated into the thesis as content, it must also be cited according to the required referencing style. The viva voce remains the final check that the thesis is genuinely the candidate's own work.

5.4 Where no AI tools were used, the student shall state this explicitly. Disclosure tells the reader that AI was used; citation is required when AI output itself is used in a way that normally requires referencing. In other words, a disclosure note is always needed where AI was used, but a formal citation is only needed when the AI-generated text, idea, or output becomes part of the academic content.

What should a good disclosure statement include?

- The AI tool used.
- What it was used for.
- When in the process it was used.
- Whether the ideas, analysis, and conclusions remain the student's own.

Statement A – No AI tools used

"No artificial intelligence tools were used in the preparation of this work."

Statement B – AI tools used

"AI tools were used in the following ways: [describe tool(s), research phase(s), and purpose]. All conceptual work, analysis, and conclusions are my own. I have critically reviewed all AI-generated content and can explain and defend every claim in this submission."

5.5 If AI use was not disclosed and later becomes apparent, this may be treated as an academic integrity issue. Undisclosed AI use in assessed work is treated as an academic integrity matter and will be handled under the Academic Integrity Policy. Where the undisclosed use affects research integrity, curriculum design, or other institutional outputs, the matter may also be referred for academic or managerial review.

6 DATA PROTECTION AND RESEARCH ETHICS

6.1 Students and educators must not upload personal, sensitive, or participant data to any external AI tool unless this is permitted under the approved ethics application, applicable data protection law, and Triagon's internal governance requirements.

6.2 Where AI tools are used to support data analysis, the user must explain this in the relevant methodology, teaching, or project documentation and must ensure that all data were anonymised, pseudonymised, or otherwise appropriately protected before any upload, processing, or transmission took place.

6.3 At doctoral level, if AI is used for data processing in a way that was not included in the approved ethics application, the candidate must first discuss this with the supervisor and, where necessary, submit an amendment to the Research Project Ethics Board before continuing. No such use may proceed until the required approval has been obtained.

6.4 If a planned use of AI may create a data protection, ethics, or confidentiality issue, the student or educator should consult the supervisor, module instructor, or Examination Office before using the tool. Where doubt remains, the material should be anonymised and approval sought before proceeding. Where AI is used in curriculum-related or assessment-related work involving personal data, the responsible staff member must obtain any additional approval required under institutional procedures.

7 RETROACTIVE APPLICATION AND TRANSITION ARRANGEMENTS

7.1 This policy applies from June 2026 and covers all assessed work submitted from that date onwards.

7.2 Students who enrolled before June 2026 and used AI tools only for expressional purposes, such as improving language, replacing repeated words, or making sentences clearer, will not be penalised for that use, provided that the ideas and content of their work are their own.

7.3 If such students no longer have the original unedited version of their text, they may submit a brief retrospective disclosure statement explaining, as far as they remember, how AI was used. No adverse consequence will be applied for good-faith expressional AI use that occurred before this policy was introduced.

7.4 This transition arrangement does not apply to AI use that replaced substantial intellectual work, such as AI-generated analyses, arguments, or conclusions submitted as the student's own work. Such cases may be handled under the applicable academic misconduct procedure. Students who are unsure whether their past AI use falls under this section should speak to their supervisor or the Examination Office.

7.5 Where educators used AI in teaching, supervision, curriculum development, or administrative work before this policy came into force, any retrospective review shall focus on whether the use was pedagogically appropriate, ethically defensible, and consistent with the institution's obligations on confidentiality, academic judgement, data protection, and programme quality.

8 RESPONSIBILITIES

8.1 *Students* are responsible for understanding and following this policy, disclosing AI use honestly and clearly, taking full responsibility for all work they submit, and asking their supervisor, module instructor, or the Examination Office before submitting if they are unsure whether a planned use of AI is permitted.

8.2 *Supervisors, module instructors, and other educators* are responsible for explaining the institution's expectations about AI use early and clearly, discussing AI use with students throughout the programme, using AI in their own teaching, supervision, curriculum development, and academic work in accordance with this policy, checking that students understand their work through questions, feedback, and oral discussion, and reporting suspected academic misconduct through the relevant procedure.

8.3 *The Examination Office* is responsible for maintaining this policy, ensuring that students and staff

receive it at enrolment or appointment, answering questions about interpretation and procedure, maintaining any required institutional records or registers, and coordinating with academic staff in cases of suspected misconduct or policy clarification.

8.4 *The relevant Examination Board* is responsible for reviewing the policy annually, recommending revisions where necessary, and ensuring that it remains aligned with current academic practice, institutional requirements, curriculum development, and applicable regulatory and accreditation requirements.

9 RELATIONSHIP TO THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

9.1 Undisclosed AI use in assessed work constitutes an academic integrity matter.

9.2 Any breach of this policy shall be dealt with under Triagon's Academic Integrity Policy, with any sanction determined according to the severity, intent, scope, and impact of the violation. Minor negligent breaches may result in a warning and resubmission. Intentional undisclosed AI use in graded work will normally result in a fail for that assessment. Substantial AI fraud may result in suspension or expulsion.

9.3 Students and educators are encouraged to read Triagon's Academic Integrity Policy for full details of the misconduct levels and applicable sanctions. Where AI use raises wider concerns about research integrity, curriculum development, or institutional processes, the matter may also be referred for additional academic or managerial review.

ANNEX: QUICK-REFERENCE SUMMARY BY LEVEL

This summary gives the main rules at each study level. When in doubt, always ask before submitting.

	Bachelor (MQF 6)	Master (MQF 7)	Doctoral (MQF 8)
What matters most	You must understand your work and be able to explain it in your own words.	You must understand, explain, and critically discuss your analysis and argument.	You must be able to defend every claim in your thesis, especially in the viva.
Expressional AI use	Allowed for grammar, clarity, and wording. Add a short note if used.	Allowed for grammar, clarity, and wording. Disclose in a statement.	Allowed for grammar, clarity, and wording. Disclose in the methodology chapter.
Cognitive AI use	Allowed only if you critically check it and still do the thinking yourself.	Allowed only if you critically check it and can explain how you used it.	Allowed only if it fits your research method and you can justify it.
Disclosure format	AI Use Note: 1–3 sentences at the end of the submission.	AI Use Statement in the methodology section or appendix.	Full AI Use Disclosure Statement in the methodology chapter.
How understanding is checked	Through assignment discussion or instructor questions.	Through dissertation/module discussion and supervisor feedback.	Through supervision and the viva voce examination.
Multilingual support	AI may be used to help express your ideas clearly in English or another language.	AI may be used to help express your ideas clearly in English or another language.	AI may be used to help express your ideas clearly in English or another language.
Data protection	Do not upload identifiable personal data to AI tools.	Do not upload identifiable personal data to AI tools.	Do not upload identifiable personal data to AI tools; anonymise data and check ethics approval first.
If you breach the policy	Minor breaches: warning and resubmission. Intentional undisclosed use: fail for assessment.	Intentional undisclosed use: fail for assessment. Substantial AI fraud: fail for module.	Substantial AI fraud: suspension or expulsion. Ghostwritten thesis: degree revocation possible.

Triagon Academy will maintain proportionate internal governance, documentation, and human oversight for AI use in teaching, assessment, curriculum development, and related academic processes.

If you are unsure whether a planned use of AI is allowed, ask your supervisor or module instructor before submitting your work.