

FSE policy framework for the use of generative AI in education¹

Management summary¹

1. Purpose, scope, authority & precedence

Purpose. Set binding rules for responsible and effective use of **generative AI** in FSE teaching, learning, and assessment.

Scope. Applies to all FSE education activities in bachelor, master, and micro-credential programmes, and to all FSE students, teaching/support staff, and guest lecturers/partners under the FSE umbrella.

Authority & precedence. Adopted by the FSE Faculty Board. For assessment matters, the Board of Examiners applies the relevant programme **EER** and this policy in individual cases. In case of conflict, the programme's **EER prevails**; where applicable, the **WHW** prevails. Programmes align their EERs with this policy; structural deviations are justified to programme leadership and notified to the Vice-Dean Education.

Effective date & amendments. Effective 21 October 2025.

2. Core rules

Default. Generative AI may be used by default; restrictions are applied where needed to protect **assessment validity, academic integrity, or legal/ethical** requirements.

Assessment instructions. For each assessment, the **assessment instructions** (assignment sheet/LMS/rubric/syllabus) state permitted uses, any conditions (incl. disclosure), and any restrictions.

Responsibilities. Students and staff uphold **academic integrity** and comply with the assessment instructions.

Support. The faculty ensures training and student support for responsible use of generative AI.

3. Requirements

Teaching & Learning. Students may use generative AI by default, **provided** academic integrity is maintained and their own achievement remains **assessable**. Teaching/learning are designed assuming generative AI is available; where its use would undermine learning or assessment validity/integrity, restrictions or conditions are set in the assessment instructions.

Assessment & QA. Generative AI is **allowed by default**; restrictions are introduced when needed to protect assessment validity, academic integrity, or legal/ethical requirements. Where generative AI use is **not** allowed for a specific task, the module's assessment design, taken together, includes **reasonable safeguards** that make unauthorised generative AI use **unlikely** and **ineffective** for achieving a pass in the module without demonstrable personal achievement. The module assessment plans and the **programme assessment plan (toetsprogramma)** must **demonstrate measurable attainment** of module/programme ILOs and be **robust to unauthorised generative-AI use**. Within the **PDCA** cycle, programmes **review changed summative assessments** for generative-AI-related risks and record mitigations. Before awarding credits or the degree, the **BoE** must be satisfied that the assessed work credibly evidences the student's own achievement; the BoE is **not required** to investigate the precise means by which the work was produced and may, on reasonable grounds to doubt authorship, require a **verification assessment** (e.g., oral defence or supervised reproduction). Staff retain professional autonomy within this policy; structural or substantial deviations are justified with programme leadership.

Students. Students must submit work that **credibly evidences their own achievement**; generative AI may be used **only as permitted** in the assessment instructions and **must be disclosed** as required. Misrepresentation **may constitute academic misconduct** handled under the **applicable programme EER** and faculty/university regulations.

Monitoring. Implementation is monitored within the PDCA cycle using existing documentation; this policy does not create additional reporting obligations.

¹ This policy framework and the management summary was developed with assistance from generative AI (ChatGPT, OpenAI) for structuring, drafting and critical review, in line with this policy framework's transparency principle; the authors verified and approve all content. No personal data were used in prompts.

1. Introduction & policy framework statement

The rapid development of generative Artificial Intelligence (genAI) technologies presents both opportunities and challenges for higher education. To ensure high-quality, ethical, and student-centred teaching and assessment, the Faculty of Science and Engineering (FSE) has developed this policy framework for the responsible and effective use of genAI in education.

The policy framework was developed in alignment with Maastricht University's policy framework, the UM Vision on Education and Assessment, and national sector guidance such as the Npuls Handreiking for Responsible Use of AI in Education. It operationalises the core principles of these documents into requirements and implementation guidance tailored to FSE's diverse programmes and educational practices.

The policy framework provides clear expectations, support, and protection for teaching staff and students. It aims to foster meaningful learning, uphold academic integrity, and enable all members of the FSE community to use genAI in a responsible, innovative, and well-supported manner.

This framework supplements the programme Education and Examination Regulations (EERs) and applicable university policy. In the event of any inconsistency, the relevant EER and university policy prevail.

2. Scope & applicability

The policy framework applies to all activities related to teaching, learning, and assessment under the responsibility of FSE. It is intended for all teaching staff, students, support staff, and guest lecturers involved in FSE education, regardless of their primary faculty affiliation or employment contract. All FSE students and staff are expected to be familiar with this policy framework and to act in accordance with its recommendations. Where educational activities involve collaboration with other faculties or external partners, the applicable policy framework depends on where the activity takes place. Students and staff coming into FSE to take or teach courses are bound by the FSE policy framework, while FSE students and staff participating in activities hosted by another faculty are bound by that faculty's framework, unless otherwise agreed by the deans of the respective faculties.

3. Core principles & objectives

The following principles and objectives provide the foundation for this policy framework. They clarify what FSE aims to achieve in the context of genAI and the key values that guide its implementation across all educational activities.

Core principles

- Meaningful learning: Education and assessment must support genuine learning, critical thinking, and personal academic growth (in line with UM's Vision on Education and the CCCS principles).
- Academic integrity: Allowed uses of genAI must preserve the valid assessment of the student's own achievement and must not compromise academic integrity.
- Autonomy with accountability: Teaching staff are trusted to make responsible decisions about the integration of AI within the boundaries of this policy framework and are supported by clear institutional backing.
- Inclusivity and support: The faculty strives to provide staff and students with information, training, and support to use genAI competently and responsibly in the educational context.
- Continuous development: This policy framework will be periodically reviewed to reflect new developments in technology, education, and professional practice.

Objectives

1. Ensure high-quality, ethical, and meaningful education and assessment within FSE in an era of genAI.
2. Provide clear and practical guidance for staff and students on the responsible use of genAI in all educational contexts.
3. Safeguard academic integrity and enable the fair assessment of individual student achievement.
4. Support staff and students in developing the competences needed to engage critically and constructively with AI, both within and beyond their studies.
5. Promote awareness of and response to evolving risks of AI for assessment validity within programme design.

4. Policy framework for teaching, assessment & quality assurance

This policy framework clarifies expectations for teaching staff (including Programme Directors and Course Coordinators) regarding the use of genAI in teaching, learning, and assessment. The primary responsibility is to ensure that the achievements of each student can be fairly and reliably assessed.

Teaching and learning

- Students are allowed to use genAI in principle, provided academic integrity is maintained and their own achievement remains assessable.
- Teaching staff are encouraged to explore and integrate genAI in ways that enhance meaningful learning, critical thinking, and student engagement.
- Teaching staff should communicate transparently with students about when and how the use of AI is permitted, and what expectations apply to each task or assessment.

Assessment & quality assurance

- Where genAI use is not allowed for a specific task, assessments should make unauthorised genAI use unlikely.
- GenAI does not alter the requirement that the programme assessment plan evidences attainment of the programme ILOs and remains robust to unauthorised generative-AI use.
- GenAI may be used by default; restrictions are introduced when needed to protect assessment validity, academic integrity, or legal/ethical requirements.
- Programme and module intended learning outcomes (ILOs) must remain achievable and measurable as genAI evolves.
- As part of the PDCA cycle, programmes review changed summative assessments for generative-AI-related risks to ensure ILOs can still be measured.
- If there is reasonable doubt about authorship, the Board of Examiners may request a verification assessment (e.g., oral defence) to confirm the student's own achievement.

Programme autonomy

- Within the boundaries of this policy framework, teaching staff retain professional autonomy to determine how best to integrate or restrict AI in their courses, provided that quality and fairness are safeguarded.
- Teaching staff are expected to act in accordance with this policy framework. Any structural or substantial deviation from this policy framework should be clearly justified and discussed with programme leadership.

5. Policy framework for students

- Students are expected to submit their own work. Where genAI is used, students must follow the assessment instructions, disclose such use when required, and uphold academic integrity.
- Submitting work that does not represent a student's own achievement prevents teaching staff and examiners from reliably assessing learning and may be treated as academic misconduct, with consequences under faculty and university regulations.
- Where any external assistance is used (including AI tools, services, or people), it must be acknowledged in line with the assignment instructions.
- If there is reasonable doubt about the authorship or originality of submitted work, students may be required to provide clarification or evidence that the work is genuinely their own.
- Any attempt to circumvent this framework or to misrepresent achievement may be treated as academic misconduct.

6. Support & professional development

This policy framework outlines the faculty's commitment to supporting staff and students in responsibly integrating genAI into education and describes the forms of support and professional development offered.

- FSE is committed to providing ongoing support and professional development opportunities for teaching staff regarding the integration of genAI in education and assessment.
- This support includes, but is not limited to: genAI-focused workshops that address shared educational principles and challenges across disciplines, while facilitating discussion on context-specific applications; training sessions;

access to practical materials and policy framework; individual advice; and opportunities for peer learning and the sharing of best practices.

- The faculty ensures that students have access to explicit support and training to use genAI responsibly and effectively as part of the curriculum.
- The scope and form of support for staff and students will be regularly evaluated and adapted to evolving needs and technological developments.
- Responsibility for organising and monitoring support and training lies with the FSE Educational Support Office, in close collaboration with programme leadership and central university support services (such as EDLAB and the University Library).

7. Responsibilities, compliance & review

This section defines roles, responsibilities, and review processes to ensure this policy framework is effectively implemented, monitored, and updated.

- All teaching staff, students, and support staff involved in FSE educational activities are expected to act in accordance with this policy framework.
- Programme Directors are accountable for ensuring that this policy framework are implemented and communicated within their programme.
- Programmes review changed summative assessments for genAI-related risks as part of the PDCA. The results and any redesign plans are documented in line with normal programme processes.
- The FSE Educational Support Office provides guidance and monitors the implementation of the policy framework, in collaboration with programme leadership and relevant university bodies. It will also review programme reports to identify common challenges and effective practices, support continuous improvement across programmes, and share insights and resources with teaching staff and leadership.
- Compliance with this policy framework is monitored through the existing PDCA-cycle for programme quality assurance. Annual programme reviews should document AI-related risk assessments, redesign actions, staff support needs, student feedback on genAI use, and reflections on external alignment with workfield expectations.
- This policy framework will be reviewed and, if necessary, updated to reflect technological, educational, and policy developments. Updates will be informed by feedback from staff and students, as well as developments at the university and national level.

Definitions

Assessment: All forms of evaluating student achievement, including exams, assignments, presentations, or other forms of evidence.

Board of Examiners (BoE): The faculty body responsible for monitoring and upholding academic integrity and the quality of assessment.

Generative AI (genAI): Artificial intelligence technologies capable of generating content (such as text, images, code, or audio) that resembles human-created material.

Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs): The specific knowledge, skills, and competences that students are expected to achieve in a module or programme.

Module: Any educational unit within a programme, including courses, skills trainings, projects, or similar components.

PDCA-cycle: Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle, the faculty's annual process for quality assurance and continuous improvement.

Programme: A coherent set of modules leading to a degree or qualification, such as a bachelor's or master's programme.

Teaching Staff: All instructors, Course Coordinators, or educators responsible for teaching and assessment activities within FSE.

References / Source Documents

[Maastricht University Policy Framework Generative Artificial Intelligence](#)

[UM Vision on Education](#)

[UM Vision on Assessment](#)

[Npuls Handreiking: Toetsing en Examinering in het tijdperk van AI](#)