



INSTITUTE FOR INNOVATIVE  
TEACHING AND LEARNING (I<sup>2</sup>TL)

# Guidelines on the Use of Generative AI for Teaching and Learning

---

Version: 1.0

Date: 2026-02-16

[I2TL@uni.lu](mailto:I2TL@uni.lu)

## Table of Contents

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>GUIDELINES FOR LEARNING .....</b>	<b>4</b>
DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.....	4
COURSE GUIDELINES AS THE PRIMARY POINT OF REFERENCE.....	4
PROMPT HISTORY.....	5
<b>AI TOOLS SUPPORTED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF LUXEMBOURG .....</b>	<b>5</b>
EQUITY AND ACCESS .....	6
<b>USING GENERATIVE AI EFFECTIVELY AND RESPONSIBLY: GUIDANCE FOR STUDENTS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
PRODUCTIVE AND RECOMMENDED USES .....	6
RISKS AND LIMITATIONS.....	7
<i>Levels of risks.....</i>	7
<i>Non-permitted AI practices.....</i>	8
<i>What happens when improper use is suspected.....</i>	9
<b>GUIDELINES FOR TEACHING .....</b>	<b>9</b>
TRANSPARENCY REQUIREMENTS .....	9
AI LITERACY DEVELOPMENT.....	10
OPEN DISCUSSION WITH STUDENTS.....	10
PRIVACY, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND SAFE PRACTICE IN TEACHING WORKFLOWS.....	11
EQUITY AND ACCESS CONSIDERATIONS.....	11
<b>ASSESSMENT ADAPTATION .....</b>	<b>12</b>
TEST ASSESSMENTS WITH GENERATIVE AI .....	12
INTEGRATE GENAI INTO ASSESSMENT .....	12
DIVERSIFY ASSESSMENT TYPES .....	13
IN-CLASS ASSESSMENT .....	13
USE BACKWARD DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTIVE ALIGNMENT.....	14
FOCUS ON THE LEARNING PROCESS .....	14
<b>RESOURCES.....</b>	<b>16</b>
UNIVERSITY OF LUXEMBOURG RESOURCES.....	16
GENAI GUIDELINES FROM OTHER UNIVERSITIES .....	16
OTHER RESOURCES .....	17
<b>APPENDIX 1: EXAMPLES OF DISCLAIMERS FOR WHEN AI IS USED.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>APPENDIX 2: STUDENT CHECKLIST BEFORE SUBMITTING AN ASSIGNMENT .....</b>	<b>19</b>

## Introduction

These guidelines serve as a foundational framework for the responsible use of Generative AI tools within the University of Luxembourg’s areas of teaching, learning, and assessment. They are directed at both students and instructors (e.g., teaching and academic staff, adjunct teachers, etc.) and aim to support the integration of emerging AI technologies into educational activities.

When used appropriately, Generative AI tools can enhance productivity, creativity, and learning outcomes, and can support deeper engagement with content through exploration, iteration, and critical reflection.

At the same time, these guidelines emphasise that Generative AI must be used in a manner that preserves academic standards, protects privacy and confidential information, and ensures responsible use of all learners. The purpose is not to restrict AI use, but to develop students’ and instructors’ capacity to use AI tools critically, ethically, and transparently, particularly by verifying outputs, recognising bias, and documenting how AI contributes to the learning process.

Accordingly, the guidelines clarify principles of academic integrity and provide practical advice on acceptable and unacceptable uses, including clear expectations on disclosure. They also encourage a course-level approach to implementation, in that while the present document sets a common institutional baseline, instructors are invited to define explicit, assessment-specific rules for AI use in their course outlines, aligned with learning outcomes and assessment objectives. In this perspective, “originality” is understood not only as the production of a final text, but also as the quality of students’ inquiry, judgement, critique, and synthesis, including, where appropriate, the ability to reflect on and document their interaction with AI tools.

These guidelines build on the University’s previous efforts to frame the use of chatbots and AI in teaching, learning, and assessment:

- [Chatbots and student assessment](#)
- [AI Texts: Detecting the Machine](#)
- [ChatGPT: An educational ally we didn’t ask for, but have](#)
- [AI did not disturb assessment – it just made our mistakes visible](#)

These guidelines align with a European risk-based approach to AI governance, emphasising transparency, human oversight, and attention to bias and potential harm.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> European Commission. (n.d.). *AI Act: Regulatory framework for artificial intelligence*. Shaping Europe’s Digital Future. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai>

## Guidelines for learning

### Disclosure requirements

The use of Generative AI must be disclosed in accordance with the specific guidelines communicated for each course and assessment. Transparency is an element of academic rigour and integrity. It allows instructors to evaluate students' work fairly and helps students demonstrate responsible practice.

Disclosure should make the contribution of AI explicit and traceable, and should clarify how the submitted work reflects the student's own learning and judgement. As a minimum, students should document and disclose the following:

- Which tool(s) were used (e.g., Microsoft Copilot, ChatGPT, etc.).
- For what purpose the tool was used (e.g., brainstorming, outlining, proofreading, translation, code debugging, concept clarification, etc.).
- The extent of use, for instance minor support vs. substantial contribution to structure or drafting.
- What the student did with the output, including how it was edited, verified, corrected, and integrated into the final work.
- Where relevant, how sources and factual claims were validated, recognising that AI tools may generate plausible but incorrect or biased content.

See Appendix 1 for examples of disclaimers for when AI is used.

Importantly, the distinction between “original work” and “AI-generated work” should not be treated only as a binary separation of text. In many contexts, originality is demonstrated through the process, such as the quality of questions asked, the student's critical evaluation of AI output, the verification of claims, and the synthesis and argumentation performed by the student.

### Course guidelines as the primary point of reference

Instructors are invited to specify course-level expectations for AI use in the syllabus and in the information provided to students on course assessment.

**Note:** In the absence of explicit course guidelines, students may use Generative AI tools to support their learning and study practices, provided they comply with the general principles of academic integrity, transparency, and respect for third-party rights set out in these guidelines. Instructors who wish to restrict or prohibit AI use for the course are invited to state these restrictions clearly and with a short pedagogical rationale in the course outline.

## Prompt history

Instructors may request that students provide prompts and interaction history, as part of an assessment submission. A prompt history may include, for example:

- Selected prompts (or a prompt log) and a short description of iterations,
- A brief reflection on what was accepted, rejected, or corrected, and why,
- Evidence of verification (e.g., checked claims, corrected references, replaced fabricated citations).

Students are therefore advised to keep an overview of prompts and discussions where AI tools are used, and to retain this information when it may be needed for transparency, feedback, assessment, or litigation purposes.

## AI tools supported by the University of Luxembourg

The University provides Microsoft Copilot as its official supported chatbot. Students are encouraged to prioritise this tool, as it is supported within the University environment and offers stronger institutional safeguards than other public platforms.

In February 2026, the University of Luxembourg launched UniGPT, a new secure internal AI assistant designed with an understanding of institutional processes at the university, including in the areas of teaching and learning. At present, access to UniGPT is limited to University staff, who are encouraged to use it for professional, administrative, teaching, and learning-related tasks in accordance with these guidelines.

The use of any AI tool remains subject to privacy and confidentiality requirements. On AI tools, one can deactivate training mode, which means that the data submitted cannot be used for model training. However, it does not mean the data isn't stored on external servers and used for other purposes.

Therefore, sharing sensitive data is prohibited, including personal data, confidential information, health data, financial data, biometric data, and any data protected by legal or contractual confidentiality obligations.

Furthermore, users should avoid uploading copyrighted course materials (e.g., slides, lecture notes, recordings) to any AI tools unless explicitly permitted by the instructor or the rights holder. Similarly, video or audio recordings of students or instructors are prohibited without their explicit consent, and their upload to AI tools is likewise prohibited.

When Microsoft Copilot and UniGPT is accessed using a University-provided account, data processed through the tool remains within the University's Microsoft 365 environment and is not used to train Microsoft's general AI models. This does not remove the obligation to apply good judgement and respect confidentiality rules, but it provides a safer institutional default for AI-supported learning activities.

## Equity and access

Where AI use is expected or strongly encouraged, course-level instructions should be designed so that students can meet requirements using institutionally supported tools and/or clearly defined alternatives.

## Using Generative AI effectively and responsibly: guidance for students

### Productive and recommended uses

In general, using Generative AI as an assistant is permitted when this is consistent with the course policy and properly disclosed. Acceptable uses should support learning, critical thinking, and skill development, rather than replace students' intellectual work. Users remain fully responsible for the accuracy, integrity, and quality of any work produced with AI support.

The Generative AI may be used in the following learning settings:

- Concept clarification and tutoring, such as requesting explanations of theories, methods, or terminology, with independent verification where appropriate.
- Generating practice materials, for instance in the form of self-quizzes, flashcards, worked examples, revision questions - all checked for correctness and alignment with course content.
- Planning learning tasks, for example study plans, reading strategies, or ways to approach a complex assignment, without outsourcing the substantive academic work.
- Brainstorming and idea generation, in the form of suggesting topics, angles, hypotheses, alternative approaches, and counterarguments.
- Outlining and structuring the information, in the form of proposing headings, argument flows, comparison matrices, or concept maps that can be further refined by the student.
- Summarising text and condensing permitted materials, for instance a student's own notes and instructor-approved texts. Please be aware that summaries can omit nuance and introduce inaccuracies.
- Editing, proofreading and grammar checks for improving grammar, coherence, clarity, and tone, yet without altering the intellectual substance beyond what is allowed.
- Translation of short segments or drafts, followed by human review, and subject to course rules on language production and assessment objectives.

- Coding assistance in the form of debugging, explaining errors, writing small code snippets, improving readability and documentation, followed by testing and validation by the user.

Where aligned with learning outcomes, courses may allow or require students to use AI as a critical tool, for instance by asking students to evaluate AI answers, identify weaknesses, verify claims, and correct errors generated by an AI tool. When used as a critical tool, this approach can support process-based originality and strengthen critical thinking of students in the Generative AI use.

## Risks and limitations

### Levels of risks

AI use involves different levels of risk. The differing levels of risk are not reasons to avoid the use of AI, but may serve as a prompt to apply stronger efforts towards verification, bias awareness, and methodological rigour. Many universities now operationalise this through “levels of AI assistance” frameworks that clarify what is permitted for a given task.

Below are examples of low, moderate, and high risks.

<b>LOW RISK</b>	<b>MODERATE RISK</b>	<b>HIGH RISK</b>
<i>typically acceptable with disclosure, subject to course policy</i>	<i>acceptable only with careful verification and clear boundaries</i>	<i>requires explicit permission and strong safeguards, often inappropriate in assessment</i>
<u>You are the source of the content</u> , and use AI for surface-level support (e.g., proofreading, grammar check, formatting, language polishing).	You use AI to <u>explore topics you are still learning</u> and can verify with reliable course materials and scholarly sources.	You rely on AI for <u>claims you cannot verify</u> , for specialised advice, or for “authoritative” sources of the information you seek.  <b>Note:</b> AI can produce plausible but incorrect information (and be overconfident about it), including hallucinations and fabricated citations.
<u>You know the topic and answer</u> and use AI to organise your own ideas, while all substantive claims and evidence remain yours	You use AI for <u>summarising or synthesising complex material</u> . You must check for omissions, distortions, and invented details.	You use AI in ways that <u>replace the assessed learning objective</u> (e.g., generating the core argument, analysis, or solution where the task is

(e.g., summary of known content, comparison between points of views).

designed to measure your own reasoning).

---

*Adapted from Parmentier and Vicens (2025)<sup>2</sup>*

### Non-permitted AI practices

Unless explicitly authorised by the course guidelines, the following uses are non-permitted and may constitute academic misconduct:

- Submitting text, code, images, or other outputs generated fully or partly by AI as if they were entirely one's own work, where this exceeds permitted "assistance" and is not disclosed.
- Using AI to produce the central intellectual contribution, such as the argument, analysis, interpretation, and solutions, when the assessment is designed to evaluate the student's own reasoning.
- Generating or altering data to create fake datasets, results, quotes, references, or evidence for essays, reports, or research outputs.
- Citing non-existent sources supplied by AI without verification, including fabricated DOIs, titles, or quotations.
- Running outputs through multiple AI tools to conceal AI involvement. Using prompts intended to bypass institutional integrity mechanisms or mislead instructors.
- Using AI to impersonate another person or to produce submissions under another identity.
- Entering personal sensitive data (e.g. health, biometric, financial, political or religious data), whether relating to oneself or others, into University-provided AI tools, or uploading copyrighted or protected materials without authorisation.
- Sharing personal data relating to another person, or copyrighted or protected materials, with external AI tools without an authorisation. The use of external AI tools with one's own personal data remains the user's responsibility and should be approached with caution.
- Uploading copyrighted or unauthorised course materials, for example lecture notes, slides, and recordings, to AI tools without permission or licensing.
- Using AI in a manner that violates the course's rules and guidelines, including use during lectures, exams or other controlled assessments.

In case of doubt, students should consult their instructor or supervisor before engaging with AI tools.

---

<sup>2</sup> Parmentier, J.-F., & Vicens, Q. (2025). *Enseigner et former* (3rd ed.). Dunod.

Appendix 2 provides a checklist that students may use before submitting an assignment and aims to safeguard students against any potential misuse of Generative AI.

### What happens when improper use is suspected

In case of a substantiated suspicion of unauthorised AI use in an assessment, staff must follow the [University of Luxembourg's disciplinary procedure for academic fraud and plagiarism](#).

Any case must be grounded in solid evidence and handled with due process, recognising that a presumed “detection” is not, by itself, a sufficient basis for a determination of misconduct. As such, a disciplinary case can only be pursued if there is solid evidence of improper use of AI. This reinforces the importance of assessment designs that make process and reasoning visible.

## Guidelines for teaching

### Transparency requirements

Instructors are invited to ensure that expectations on Generative AI use are explicit, assessment-specific, and consistently communicated to students. In practice, this means:

- Communicate course expectations early and clearly, and revisit them regularly, for instance before each academic year and assessment.
- Include a written GenAI statement in each course outline or syllabus, specifying some ground rules and expectations, as follows:
  - What is permitted, restricted, required, or prohibited for the course and its assessment;
  - What disclosure is expected from students, for instance an AI acknowledgement, prompt excerpts where relevant; and
  - How AI-related practices align with the learning outcomes, in the sense of why the rule exists, not only what the rule is.
- Treat the course guidelines/syllabus as the primary reference point for students. Where no guidelines/syllabus is provided, students should be instructed and reminded regularly on the institutional default rule – i.e., that AI use is permitted within the framework of the current institutional guidelines.
- Show example and transparency by disclosing any instructional use of GenAI, for instance for quiz drafting, proofreading, sample feedback, etc., particularly where it may affect learning materials, or assessment guidelines.

## AI literacy development

Instructors are invited to develop their own AI literacy and, where appropriate, to embed it as a learning competence for students. AI literacy can be pursued along the following complementary dimensions:

- Follow the key debates of AI in education to gain practical understanding of what Generative AI tools can and cannot do, including typical failure modes such as fabrication, overconfidence, and prompt sensitivity. This understanding should be developed on an ongoing basis, particularly as AI tools evolve and updated versions are released regularly.
- Try out text and image generators on authentic teaching tasks, for instance in drafting prompts, generating alternative explanations, creating practice questions, and reflect on limitations and risks.
- Familiarising with the ethical and legal literacy linked to the AI use in higher education, for instance on aspects such as academic integrity, privacy, confidentiality, copyright/IP awareness, and responsible data handling.
- Recognising AI “synthetic fluency” in evaluating argument quality, identifying missing evidence, and strengthening academic voice and reasoning.
- Designing learning activities and assessments that make students’ reasoning and process visible, and that encourage critical use of AI rather than avoidance.

In the future, training and one-to-one consultations on the abovementioned dimensions will be available through the [Institute for Innovative Teaching and Learning \(I<sup>2</sup>TL\)](#) at the University of Luxembourg.

To contribute to knowledge exchange in the area of digital literacy, instructors are encouraged to contribute to a shared institutional knowledge base, for example by participating in regular Teaching Days at the University of Luxembourg to exchange effective teaching and assessment practices that successfully develop critical AI literacy.

## Open discussion with students

Instructors are invited to have regular discussions about AI use with students. The goal is to develop critical engagement and responsible judgement when students use AI or encounter AI-generated products.

Topics to discuss may include:

- Acceptable and unacceptable uses in the specific course, including concrete examples.
- Transparency in the use of AI as academic practice, not merely compliance, and how it supports fair evaluation and learning feedback.

- Verification and epistemic caution when using AI, especially regarding hallucinations, fabricated references, and the need to triangulate claims with reliable sources.
- How AI-generated outputs may reproduce stereotypes, bias, and discrimination or systematically omit perspectives, and how students should detect and mitigate this.
- What students lose when they bypass practice, and what they gain when they use AI to support iteration, critique, and refinement.
- Short-, medium-, and long-term implications in the consistent use of AI for the educational gains, professional domain, and societal life.

### Privacy, confidentiality, and safe practice in teaching workflows

Instructors should apply a privacy-by-design approach in their teaching practice by following these non-exhaustive guiding principles:

- Refrain from inputting sensitive student data or confidential institutional information into external AI tools.
- Refrain from uploading copyrighted teaching materials into external tools unless the material is under the ownership of the instructor.
- Use institutionally supported environments, and AI tools (e.g., UniGPT) for teaching practice, classroom experimentation and staff productivity uses.

### Equity and access considerations

Instructors are invited to ensure that course design and assessment methods are inclusive and equitable for all students, with particular attention to the following considerations:

- Where the use of AI is required for an assessed activity, instructors should provide pathways that can be completed using UL-supported tools and/or external AI tools that do not require a premium subscription. Students with access to paid or premium tools should not be placed at an advantage over those without such access.
- Where AI use is permitted but not required, instructors should remain attentive to unequal access and avoid designing assessment expectations that implicitly advantage students with premium tools.
- Instructors should be attentive to students who may have ethical, pedagogical, or other principled objections to using AI. In cases where AI use is permitted, but not required, students may opt not to use AI, provided they still meet the assessment requirements.
- If a course requires the use of AI for assessed work and a student seeks an exemption based on reasonable adjustments, the request should be handled through the Committee for Reasonable Adjustments (CAR) and the usual procedure for inclusion. Following on decisions of CAR, reasonable adjustments for students must be taken into account in

teaching and assessment design. This includes ensuring that AI-related requirements do not create additional barriers for students with inclusion and accessibility needs.

## Assessment adaptation

Except for controlled, in-person assessment settings, instructors should assume that many students will have access to and may use Generative AI tools.

The objective is therefore to protect the validity of assessment and strengthen learning, not to rely primarily on detection of AI use. Current [sector guidance](#) increasingly emphasises that AI-detection outputs are unreliable as sole evidence and that assessment design must do more of the integrity work.

Assessment adaptation should begin with a clear course-level AI statement that specifies restrictions in the AI uses by assessment type. A practical approach is to indicate the specific level of AI assistance that is expected, for instance none, editing only, permitted with disclosure, required with critique, etc., and align that choice with learning outcomes.

## Test assessments with Generative AI

Instructors are encouraged to “stress-test” assessment briefs by entering them into one or more Generative AI tools and reviewing the quality and limitations of AI-produced responses. This can help identify where an AI could complete the task without demonstrating the intended learning outcomes. It can also support the refinement of prompts, constraints, and evidence requirements, and clarify what students must provide to demonstrate their reasoning and learning process in the assessment.

If instructors test an assessment in this way, they should inform students that it has been stress-tested and explain what this implies for assessment expectations.

## Integrate GenAI into assessment

Rather than designing tasks that can be completed by AI with minimal student engagement, instructors are encouraged to design tasks that require students to demonstrate judgement, critique, and verification.

Examples include:

- Ask students to compare multiple AI-generated approaches and justify selection.
- Ask students to critique an AI-generated answer using course concepts and disciplinary standards.

- Ask students to revise an AI draft and justify each substantive correction.
- Ask students to verify claims, replace weak or fabricated references, and document evidence used.

When applied appropriately, this approach can support process-based originality and strengthen students' critical AI literacy.

### Diversify assessment types

A resilient assessment strategy typically combines multiple formats so that students demonstrate learning through different modalities. This also provides an opportunity to innovate in teaching and learning approaches.

Options include:

- Oral examinations, including short defences of written work;
- Project-based work with oral presentation;
- Group work, with oral presentation;
- In-class written assessments without devices;
- Practical demonstrations, studios, labs, or applied tasks;
- Video explanations and reflective walkthroughs;
- Facilitated debates or structured discussions;
- Continuous assessment that include different modalities as emphasized above.

If you have questions or require further information on adaptive and innovative teaching and learning methodologies, please contact [I2TL@uni.lu](mailto:I2TL@uni.lu).

### In-class assessment

Controlled assessments can reduce opportunities for unauthorised assistance and strengthen confidence in authorship.

However, over-reliance on in-class exams can narrow what students can demonstrate and may increase stress and inequity. A balanced approach is therefore recommended, in that where feasible, to include at least one secure and authenticity-check component, for instance short oral defence, in-class problem-solving segments, alongside other assessments that evaluate higher-order learning.

## Use backward design and constructive alignment

Assessment adaptation may follow a backward design and constructive alignment.<sup>3</sup> This approach begins by clarifying what students should be able to do by the end of the course, and then aligning teaching activities and assessment methods so that they directly support and validly measure those outcomes at an appropriate standard.

The specific steps that may be taken are:

1. Define intended learning outcomes at course, unit, or assessment level, using suitable taxonomies where helpful (e.g., Bloom, SOLO), and specifying both the expected competence and the level of performance.
2. Identify what credible evidence of achievement looks like, including what would demonstrate mastery beyond surface-level recall or fluent text generation, for instance in relation to reasoning steps, methodological choices, interpretation of evidence, discipline-specific judgement, or reflective critique.
3. Design assessment tasks and criteria that are aligned with those outcomes, ensuring that the assessment requires the intended cognitive work and makes it visible, for examples through staged submissions, oral defence, annotated evidence, or AI critique and verification components where relevant.
4. Align teaching and learning activities with the same outcomes, so that students have structured opportunities to practise the skills that will be assessed, for instance through source evaluation, argument construction, critical review of AI outputs, and verification routines.
5. Review alignment across levels, for example at the institutional, programme, and course level, to ensure coherence and fairness for diverse student cohorts.

The backward design and constructive alignment approach are robust ways to ensure that GenAI does not undermine assessment validity. Rather than relying on avoidance or detection, constructive alignment enables instructors to design pedagogically coherent assessments in which students must demonstrate the intended learning, whether or not AI tools are available.

## Focus on the learning process

Learning is a developmental process in which students progress from one state of understanding and competence to another. While students may begin at different starting points, the objective is for all learners to reach clearly defined learning outcomes.

---

<sup>3</sup> Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing Teaching Through Constructive Alignment. *Higher Education*, 32, 347–364.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871>

Assessment and teaching practices can foreground this learning process by, for example:

- Requesting draft versions of student work to document development and revision.
- Breaking large assignments into smaller, sequenced components, supported by formative feedback at each stage.
- Integrating peer assessment and self-assessment activities to encourage reflection, judgement, and responsibility for learning.

Emphasising the learning process helps make students' reasoning and progression visible and supports deeper engagement, particularly in contexts where Generative AI tools are available and potentially widely used in the learning and assessment processes.

## Resources

### University of Luxembourg resources

[Institute for Innovative Teaching and Learning](#): Provides guidance and resources to support the scaling up of teacher development, the digitalisation of education processes, and offers guidelines and funding for educational innovation for instructors and students.

[Education Quality Office](#): Official documents made available by the VRAE Office to the academic community of the University, including academic rules and procedures, handouts, templates, and forms.

[Academic conduct](#): Here, students and instructors can find information on academic conduct and misconduct criteria, as well as guidance on the procedures to be followed in cases of fraud, attempted fraud, and plagiarism.

[Student Assessment](#) procedure: Provides the guidelines and resources linked to the student assessment at the University of Luxembourg.

### GenAI Guidelines from other universities

Imperial College London. <https://www.imperial.ac.uk/admin-services/library/learning-support/generative-ai-guidance/>

KU Leuven. <https://www.kuleuven.be/english/education/student/educational-tools/guidelines-for-students-on-the-authorised-use-of-genai>

Monash University. <https://www.monash.edu/student-academic-success/build-digital-capabilities/create-online/acknowledging-the-use-of-generative-artificial-intelligence>

Stanford University. <https://uit.stanford.edu/security/responsibleai>

University of New South Wales. <https://www.teaching.unsw.edu.au/ai/ai-assessment-guidance>, and <https://www.unsw.edu.au/student/managing-your-studies/academic-skills-support/toolkit/ai>

University of Oxford. <https://www.ox.ac.uk/students/life/it/guidance-safe-and-responsible-use-gen-ai-tools>, and <https://www.ox.ac.uk/research/support-researchers/research-practice/policy-generative-ai-research>, and <https://libguides.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/using-ai-to-support-academic-work/prompting-guidance>

## Other resources

European Commission. (n.d.). *AI Act: Regulatory framework for artificial intelligence*. Shaping Europe's Digital Future. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/regulatory-framework-ai>

Jisc National Centre for AI. (2025). *AI detection and assessment – an update for 2025*. <https://nationalcentreforai.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2025/06/24/ai-detection-assessment-2025/>

OECD. (2026). *OECD Digital Education Outlook 2026: Exploring effective uses of generative AI in education*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/062a7394-en>

Oxford Academic (Oxford University Press). (n.d.). *Author use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)*. <https://academic.oup.com/pages/for-authors/books/author-use-of-artificial-intelligence>

Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency. (2024). *Gen AI strategies for Australian higher education: Emerging practice*. <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2024-11/Gen-AI-strategies-emerging-practice-toolkit.pdf>

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research>

## Appendix 1: Examples of disclaimers for when AI is used

When Generative AI tools are used in the preparation of written documents, clear and explicit disclaimers should be included to ensure transparency and academic integrity. Such disclosures help clarify the contributions of the author and the AI tool and support the fair evaluation of the work. Disclaimers may be placed as footnotes, in an appendix, within the main text, or at the end of the document, at the author's discretion and in line with course requirements.

Below are illustrative examples of disclaimers<sup>4</sup> that instructors and students may include in their written work, depending on the nature and extent of AI use:

### Brainstorming and idea generation

- Microsoft Copilot was used during the early drafting stage to support brainstorming and idea generation.
- Microsoft Copilot was consulted to generate initial suggestions for the structure and arguments of this work.

### Editing and proofreading support

- This paragraph was proofread with the assistance of Microsoft Copilot to improve grammar and clarity.
- Microsoft Copilot was used to rephrase this paragraph to enhance clarity and readability.

### Translation assistance

- This translation was generated using Microsoft Copilot and subsequently reviewed and corrected by the author.

### Coding assistance

- Portions of the code included in this document were generated using Microsoft Copilot and were then tested, reviewed, and manually adapted by the author.

### Content generation

- AI-generated content (Microsoft Copilot) was used as an initial draft and was substantially revised by the author.
- This paragraph was drafted using Microsoft Copilot based on the author's outline and conceptual framework.

---

<sup>4</sup> These examples were generated by Microsoft Copilot based on the author's input, then revised by the author.

## Appendix 2: Student checklist before submitting an assignment

### Check your course rules

- I read the course AI policy (syllabus / assignment brief).
- For this specific assessment, AI use is:
  - allowed  restricted  prohibited.
- If the policy was unclear, I asked the instructor before using AI.

### Use AI only in permitted ways

- I used AI only for the purposes explicitly permitted, such as brainstorming, language clarity, code debugging, etc.
- I did not use AI in prohibited ways, such as generating the final answer/argument when disallowed, fabricating references/data, bypassing detection, etc.

### Verify everything that matters

- I checked factual claims against reliable sources or course materials.
- I did not rely on AI-generated citations unless I verified each source exists and is relevant.

### Protect data and copyright

- I did not paste personal, sensitive, confidential, or third-party private information into AI tools.
- I did not upload copyrighted course materials to external AI platforms without permission.

### Prepare your disclosure (if required by course or instructor)

- I included a Disclaimer (see Appendix 1) stating:
  - o tool(s) used;
  - o purpose (what I used it for);
  - o what I kept vs changed;
  - o how I verified outputs.
- If required, I attached:
  - prompt log  drafts  other (specify) .....

### Final responsibility

- I can explain and defend the work in my own words, including in an oral follow-up.
- I am confident the submission reflects my own learning and meets academic integrity expectations.