

# AUS

الجامعة الأميركية في الشارقة  
American University of Sharjah

---

# Artificial Intelligence Framework

A Framework for the Responsible and Effective Adoption of AI in  
Teaching and Learning

---

Prepared for the AUS Academic Community  
Sharjah, United Arab Emirates  
**October 2026**

# Table of Contents

---

|                                                                    |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 0. Purpose and Principles.....                                     | 1  |
| 0.1 Purpose and Scope.....                                         | 1  |
| 0.2 Guiding Principles.....                                        | 1  |
| 0.3 Definitions.....                                               | 2  |
| Pillar 1: AI Literacy, Development, and Support.....               | 5  |
| 1.1 What is AI Literacy?.....                                      | 5  |
| 1.2 Foundational Awareness.....                                    | 5  |
| 1.3 Faculty AI Literacy.....                                       | 6  |
| 1.4 Student AI Literacy.....                                       | 7  |
| 1.5 Equity and Access.....                                         | 8  |
| 1.6 Resources.....                                                 | 8  |
| Pillar 2: Teaching and Learning.....                               | 10 |
| 2.1 Human-AI Collaboration in Teaching and Learning.....           | 10 |
| 2.2 AI-Enhanced Pedagogy.....                                      | 10 |
| 2.3 AI-Enhanced Learning.....                                      | 11 |
| 2.4 Communicating Permitted AI Use to Students.....                | 11 |
| 2.5 Resources.....                                                 | 12 |
| Pillar 3: Assessment.....                                          | 13 |
| 3.1 Assessment in the Age of AI.....                               | 13 |
| 3.2 AI Assessment Approaches.....                                  | 13 |
| 3.3 Transparency and Disclosure in AI Use.....                     | 15 |
| 3.4 Assessment Support for Faculty.....                            | 15 |
| 3.5 Resources.....                                                 | 15 |
| Pillar 4: Academic Integrity.....                                  | 16 |
| 4.1 Reframing Academic Integrity.....                              | 16 |
| 4.2 Responsible Use, Disclosure, and Academic Practice.....        | 18 |
| 4.3 AI-Related Misuse and Misconduct in Teaching and Learning..... | 19 |
| 4.4 Faculty Guidance for Assessment Design.....                    | 20 |
| 4.5 Resources.....                                                 | 20 |

|                                                              |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Pillar 5: Technology, Infrastructure, and Data Security..... | 21 |
| 5.1 Institutional AI Ecosystem and Approved Tools.....       | 21 |
| 5.2 Infrastructure Readiness and Operational Resilience..... | 22 |
| 5.3 Identity, Access, and Secure Usage Controls.....         | 22 |
| 5.4 Data Privacy, Protection, and UAE Compliance.....        | 23 |
| 5.5 Cybersecurity Risk Management for AI.....                | 23 |
| 5.6 Responsible and Ethical AI Use.....                      | 24 |
| 5.7 Resources.....                                           | 24 |
| 6. Outcomes.....                                             | 25 |
| 7. Index of Links.....                                       | 25 |

## 0. Purpose and Principles

---

### 0.1 Purpose and Scope

This framework sets the institutional approach for the responsible and effective adoption of Artificial Intelligence in teaching and learning. Its purpose is to guide the responsible, ethical, pedagogically sound, and secure use of AI across the academic environment, while supporting innovation and protecting academic standards.

The framework is enabling, not prescriptive. **Faculty are not required to use AI in their courses.** Whether and how AI is integrated into teaching, learning, and assessment is a pedagogical decision that remains with the instructor, in alignment with course learning outcomes and disciplinary norms. The framework provides the institutional baseline, expectations, and support structures that apply when AI is used.

This framework applies to faculty, students, and academic support staff and is intended to:

- Enable faculty and students to use AI in ways that strengthen learning rather than substitute for it
- Provide clear, consistent institutional expectations while allowing flexibility at the course and disciplinary level
- Safeguard academic integrity, data privacy, and equity as AI becomes embedded in academic practice
- Support the institution in adapting continuously as AI tools and practices evolve

This is a living document and will be reviewed on a defined cycle, or earlier when changes in AI technology, pedagogy, or policy require it.

### 0.2 Guiding Principles

The framework is anchored in the following principles. Each is operationalized across the pillars that follow.

1. **Pedagogy First.** AI is adopted in service of learning outcomes, not the other way around. Tools are selected and integrated based on their educational value.
2. **Human-Centered.** A qualified human, whether faculty or student, remains the decision-maker and is accountable for the outcome at every stage. AI augments human judgment; it does not replace it.
3. **Ethical and Responsible Use.** AI use across the institution reflects shared values of fairness, honesty, accuracy, and respect for intellectual property and

data privacy. Faculty communicate AI expectations clearly, and students disclose AI use as required by course and institutional policy.

4. **Academic Integrity as a Learning Culture.** Integrity is built through skill development, clear expectations, and assessment design, not primarily through surveillance or detection.
5. **Flexibility and Adaptability.** A single institutional framework sets the baseline, while faculty retain flexibility to adapt AI use to their course and discipline. Recognizing the pace of change, the framework is treated as a living document and is reviewed and updated on an ongoing basis, with attention to ensuring equitable access for all faculty and students.

The table below summarizes where each principle is primarily operationalized across the five pillars:

| Guiding principle                        | Where it is primarily operationalized |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Pedagogy First                           | Pillars 1, 2, and 3                   |
| Human-Centered                           | Pillars 2, 4, and 5                   |
| Ethical and Responsible Use              | Pillars 1, 4, and 5                   |
| Academic Integrity as a Learning Culture | Pillars 3 and 4                       |
| Flexibility and Adaptability             | Pillars 2 and 3                       |

### 0.3 Definitions

- **Academic Integrity.** A commitment to honesty, responsibility, fairness, trust, and accountability in learning, teaching, assessment, and academic work.
- **AI-Assisted Work.** Academic work in which AI tools support part of the process, such as brainstorming, outlining, language editing, structuring, feedback, summarizing, coding, or translation.
- **AI Detection Tool.** A tool that attempts to estimate whether content was generated by AI.
- **AI-Generated Work.** Work produced wholly or substantially by an AI tool, especially where the tool has generated the main content, argument, analysis, solution, code, or final output.
- **AI-Integrated Assessment.** Assessment that incorporates AI as a learning partner, requiring students to critique, improve, or document its contribution (see Pillar 3).

- **AI Literacy.** The knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to understand, evaluate, use, and critically engage with AI. AI literacy spans four areas: technical understanding, evaluative skills, practical application, and ethical considerations. It is differentiated for students, faculty, and staff.
- **AI-Resilient Assessment.** Assessment designed to make student thinking visible and difficult to outsource to AI (see Pillar 3).
- **AI-Restricted Assessment.** Assessment in which AI use is limited or prohibited, with independent student performance required (see Pillar 3).
- **Artificial Intelligence (AI).** Machine-based systems that, given a set of objectives, generate outputs such as predictions, recommendations, content, or decisions.
- **Attribution.** The formal acknowledgement and citation of AI-generated content within academic work, distinct from disclosure (which states *that* AI was used; attribution shows *how* and *where*).
- **Course-Level AI Policy.** The instructor's stated rules on AI use within a specific course, set in alignment with the institutional AI policy and the course's learning outcomes (typically expressed as AI-Permitted, Partially Permitted, or Not Permitted).
- **Disclosure.** A student's statement of how AI was used in producing a piece of academic work, in accordance with course and institutional policy.
- **Generative AI (GenAI).** A subset of AI that produces new content, including text, images, audio, video, or code, in response to prompts. This framework focuses primarily on GenAI.
- **Hallucination.** AI-generated content that is fluent and confident but factually incorrect or fabricated (e.g., invented citations or data).
- **Human-in-the-Loop (HITL).** The principle that a qualified human must review, verify, and take responsibility for AI-assisted decisions or outputs before they shape learning, assessment, or academic judgment.
- **Intelligent Tutoring System (ITS) / AI Tutor.** An AI-driven tool that provides explanations, practice, and feedback to students outside formal class time, simulating aspects of one-on-one tutoring.
- **Large Language Model (LLM).** An AI model trained on large volumes of text to understand and generate natural language (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, Copilot, Gemini).
- **Personalized (Adaptive) Learning.** An approach in which content, pacing, and feedback are tailored to individual learner needs, often supported by AI systems that adjust in real time based on student performance.
- **Permitted AI Use.** AI use that is explicitly allowed by institutional policy, course guidance, or assignment instructions.

- **Prompt / Prompt Engineering.** The input given to an AI tool, and the practice of crafting inputs to obtain useful, accurate outputs.
- **Prohibited AI Use.** AI use that is not allowed in a specific course, assignment, assessment, or institutional context.
- **Responsible AI Use.** The use of AI tools in ways that are permitted, transparent, ethical, proportionate, and consistent with the learning outcomes of a course or assessment.
- **Verification.** The act of a human reviewing, fact-checking, and taking responsibility for an AI-generated output before it is used in a learning, teaching, or assessment context. Verification is the practical expression of the Human-in-the-Loop principle.

## Pillar 1: AI Literacy, Development, and Support

---

This pillar focuses on building a shared institutional foundation of AI knowledge, skills, and responsible practices across students, faculty, and staff.

### 1.1 What is AI Literacy?

AI literacy refers to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to understand, evaluate, use, and critically engage with artificial intelligence systems. It extends beyond operational proficiency with AI tools to include the ability to interpret outputs, recognize system limitations, and make informed judgments about appropriate and responsible use.

As AI technologies become increasingly embedded in teaching and learning, AI literacy is no longer optional but essential. It spans four areas:

**Technical understanding:** knowing what AI systems are, the basic principles behind how they operate, and what they can and cannot do. This does not require technical or engineering expertise, but rather conceptual literacy sufficient to support informed engagement.

**Evaluative skills:** the ability to assess AI outputs for accuracy, bias, reliability, and limitations.

**Practical application:** using AI tools effectively in academic and professional activities, including learning, teaching, problem-solving, and content creation.

**Ethical considerations:** understanding issues such as fairness, privacy, transparency, accountability, and the societal impact of AI.

### 1.2 Foundational Awareness

The institution promotes the development of AI literacy among all members, including students, faculty, and academic support staff. The aim is to ensure that all members of the institution's community have a shared baseline understanding of AI systems, their appropriate use, their limitations, and their implications for teaching, learning, assessment, and academic support.

This is supported by the following:

- **Institution-wide orientation and guidance**  
Providing accessible guidance on relevant policies, approved AI tools, licensed platforms, responsible use expectations, and available support channels.

- **Faculty development and training**  
Offering professional development opportunities that help faculty understand AI tools, communicate expectations to students, design appropriate learning activities, and evaluate AI-supported work.
- **Student-facing AI literacy support**  
Embedding AI literacy into student orientation, first-year learning, academic skills development, library instruction, writing support, and course-level guidance.
- **Practical resources and examples**  
Developing templates, FAQs, syllabus language, disclosure guidance, prompt-use examples, and discipline-sensitive scenarios to support consistent practice.
- **Support for academic staff and student support units**  
Equipping advisors, tutors, librarians, and other academic support staff with shared guidance so they can respond consistently to student and faculty needs.
- **Ongoing updates and review**  
Reviewing and updating AI literacy materials regularly as technologies, institutional policies, and teaching practices evolve.

### 1.3 Faculty AI Literacy

Faculty AI literacy focuses on the pedagogical, curricular, and assessment-related use of AI systems to enhance teaching and learning while maintaining academic integrity and learning outcomes.

#### **Pedagogical Applications include:**

- Using AI to produce course materials, personalize feedback, generate assignments, summarize real-time student responses, and tutor students
- Using LLMs to simulate personas, experts, peers, graders, and to ask students questions rather than just answer them
- Designing AI-integrated assignments that preserve learning objectives
- Identifying and overcoming hidden barriers: AI as a tool for students who lack prerequisite skills (e.g., coding, language, visual arts)

*Related pillars: Pillars 1 and 2*

#### **Ongoing Faculty Support Structures include:**

- Regular faculty development workshops, AI-literacy events, and communities of practice
- A Teaching & Learning Centre that connects faculty development with policy

- Peer-led dissemination of successful AI-integrated teaching practices and case studies

Faculty are expected to develop the following core competencies, each connected to the relevant pillars:

- **Understanding AI capabilities, limitations, and risks**  
Faculty should understand what AI tools can and cannot do, including common risks such as hallucinations, bias, fabricated sources, overconfident outputs, and inappropriate use.  
*Related pillars: Pillars 1, 4, and 5*
- **Using AI for teaching and learning purposes**  
Faculty may use AI to support course preparation, teaching materials, examples, discussion prompts, learning activities, formative feedback, simulations, and student engagement, where appropriate.  
*Related pillars: Pillars 1 and 2*
- **Designing and adapting assessments for an AI-enabled environment**  
Faculty should understand how AI affects assessment validity, authorship, originality, and evidence of learning, and should be able to design or revise assessments accordingly.  
*Related pillars: Pillars 3 and 4*
- **Communicating responsible AI expectations to students**  
Faculty should provide clear course- and assignment-level guidance on whether AI use is permitted, restricted, or prohibited, including expectations for disclosure, verification, and citation where relevant.  
*Related pillars: Pillars 3 and 4*
- **Protecting data, privacy, and institutional information**  
Faculty should understand which materials should not be entered into AI tools, including student work, grades, feedback, unpublished research, assessment materials, confidential records, and sensitive institutional information.  
*Related pillar: Pillar 5*

## 1.4 Student AI Literacy

Student AI literacy focuses on enabling responsible, critical, and effective use of AI as part of academic development.

Key elements include:

- Understanding how generative AI systems work, including strengths and limitations such as hallucinations and bias (related pillars: Pillars 1 and 4).

- Developing skills to critically evaluate and appropriately cite AI-generated content (related pillars: Pillars 3 and 4).
- Treating AI literacy as a core academic competency alongside information and digital literacy, integrated across disciplines rather than confined to electives (related pillar: Pillar 1).
- Training in responsible use including data privacy, attribution and recognizing AI-generated misinformation (related pillars: Pillars 4 and 5).
- Guidance on navigating diverse course-level AI usage policies and expectations (related pillars: Pillars 2 and 3).

## 1.5 Equity and Access

Equitable access is a central requirement of institutional AI adoption. Not all students, faculty, and staff have equal access to devices, tools, or prior exposure to AI systems.

This includes:

- Provision of institutionally licensed AI tools where appropriate to ensure equitable access
- Reduction of disparities arising from differences in prior exposure, resources, or technical capability
- Providing support for low-resource or underprepared users
- Accessible and assistive AI options for students with disabilities, in line with the institution's accessibility standards
- Clear guidance and training to help users with less prior exposure build baseline AI skills
- Transparency about which AI tools are institutionally provided, so that cost is not a barrier to participation

## 1.6 Resources

### 1. AI Hub

Link: [AI Hub](#)

### 2. Guidelines and Best Practices for Using AI Platforms

Link: [AUS AI Guidelines and Best Practices](#)

### 3. All IT policies and procedures

Link: [IT Policies](#)

## Pillar 2: Teaching and Learning

---

This pillar addresses how AI changes the actual work of designing and delivering education, and how the institution supports faculty in navigating that.

### 2.1 Human-AI Collaboration in Teaching and Learning

AI augments teaching and learning; it does not replace human judgment at the heart of education. At every stage, a qualified human - faculty or student - remains the decision-maker and is accountable for the outcome. AI is a co-pilot, not the pilot: it assists with drafting, explaining, and supporting practice, but the human directs the work and owns the result. Every AI output should be verified by a human before it shapes a decision or is treated as knowledge.

### 2.2 AI-Enhanced Pedagogy

AI-enhanced pedagogy refers to the use of AI to enrich teaching, learning, course design, and student support in ways that strengthen educational outcomes and experiences. Key dimensions of AI-enhanced pedagogy include:

#### *Personalized and Adaptive Learning*

- AI tutoring systems and intelligent feedback tools that respond to individual student needs
- Tutor bots that answer questions the way course staff would, increasing student confidence and engagement outside class hours
- AI tools that help students who struggle with prerequisite skills (writing, coding, language access) get into the substance of learning faster

#### *Course Creation and Re-Design*

- Using GenAI to augment (not replace) creativity, as a thought partner in early-stage assignment design, for generating visual aids, simulations, and games
- Rethinking course design to embed AI as a collaborator in the learning process, not just a tool students use on the side
- Discipline-specific guidance on where AI adds pedagogical value (coding courses differ from law, medicine, or the humanities)

#### *Assessment*

- See Pillar 3

## 2.3 AI-Enhanced Learning

AI-enhanced learning refers to the use of AI as a learning partner that helps students engage with content, build skills, practice concepts, and reflect on their learning. Key dimensions of AI-enhanced learning include:

### *AI for Learning Materials*

- Using AI to understand concepts (explain, analogies, step-by-step)
- Using AI for practice (quizzes, problems, retrieval practice, spaced repetition)

### *AI for Academic Skills*

- Reading support (summaries, concept maps, question generation)
- Writing support (outlines, clarity edits, argument testing)
- Research and information literacy (finding sources, evaluating credibility, citing properly)

### *Thinking with AI (Not Just Producing with AI)*

- Asking better questions; refining prompts for learning
- Critiquing AI outputs; improving reasoning
- Reflecting on learning: what changed in my understanding?

### *Communication and Collaboration*

- Using AI in group work (roles, versioning, documenting contributions)
- Presentations and oral explanations (practice + feedback)
- Professional communication skills (emails, reports) with learning intent

## 2.4 Communicating Permitted AI Use to Students

Clear communication of AI use expectations is essential to a fair and consistent learning environment.

The institution maintains a **course-level policy (see resources section)** that sets institution-wide expectations, while allowing flexibility at the course level so instructors can choose to adapt AI use to the norms and learning outcomes of

their discipline - a model also used by Harvard, MIT, Stanford, Princeton, and Yale.

## 2.5 Resources

1. **CITL (Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning)**
  - a. **AI Hub**  
Link: [AI Hub](#)
  - b. **CITL certification programs - Certificate in Teaching and Learning Excellence (CTLE), Course [Re]Design Certificate (CRC), and Certificate for University Teaching (CUT)**  
Link: [CITL Certification Programs](#)
  - c. **Course-level policy**  
Link: [AUS AI Policy](#)
2. **AUS Library**
  - a. **AI Literacy @ AUS LibGuide**  
Link: [AI Literacy @ AUS LibGuide](#)
  - b. **Reflect Learn Connect LibGuide**  
Link: [Reflect Learn Connect LibGuide](#)

## Pillar 3: Assessment

---

This pillar addresses how artificial intelligence changes the design, implementation, and interpretation of assessment in higher education. It focuses on ensuring that assessments continue to measure meaningful learning while recognizing that AI tools are now widely accessible to students.

Rather than relying primarily on detection or restriction, the framework emphasizes assessment design that makes student thinking visible, supports learning, and aligns with evolving academic and professional practices.

### 3.1 Assessment in the Age of AI

AI tools can generate essays, summaries, code, and solutions to complex problems. As a result, traditional assessment formats that focus primarily on final written outputs may no longer accurately reflect student understanding.

This requires a shift toward assessments that evaluate:

- Reasoning and decision-making
- Disciplinary thinking
- Application of knowledge
- Learning processes, rather than only final products

In practice, this means focusing less on the final answer alone and more on how the student reached it. Greater attention is given to the reasoning behind responses, the choices made, and the student's ability to explain or apply their thinking. The emphasis shifts from verifying outputs to understanding how learning is demonstrated.

To address this shift, the framework proposes a set of assessment approaches that account for the presence of AI tools while preserving academic standards and learning outcomes.

### 3.2 AI Assessment Approaches

#### 3.2.1 AI-Resilient Assessments

AI-resilient assessments are designed to make student thinking visible and to make it difficult to outsource entirely to AI. These approaches prioritize reasoning, process, and context-specific application, ensuring that learning remains the central focus.

Rather than attempting to prevent AI use entirely, these assessments are designed so that AI alone is insufficient to complete the task meaningfully.

Examples include:

- Multi-stage assignments (proposal, draft, reflection, final submission), where each stage reveals progression of thinking

- Requiring students to explain their reasoning, assumptions, or methodological choices
- Incorporating in-class components, checkpoints, or brief oral explanations
- Requiring an application to course-specific materials, datasets, case contexts, or discussions that AI does not have direct access to

AI-resilient assessments also include authentic and applied assessment tasks that mirror real-world or disciplinary practice. These forms of assessment evaluate judgment, synthesis, and communication, which remain difficult to automate.

Examples include:

- Case analyses using real or evolving datasets where interpretation matters
- Simulations or scenario-based decision-making tasks with no single correct answer
- Presentations, debates, and oral explanations that require articulation and defense of ideas
- Project-based or portfolio assessments that show development over time
- Collaborative problem-solving activities where roles and contributions are visible

These approaches promote deeper engagement while reducing the risk that AI tools replace student thinking.

### ***3.2.2 AI-Integrated Assessments***

In some contexts, AI can be incorporated into assessment as a learning partner rather than a shortcut. This approach recognizes that AI will increasingly be part of professional practice and enables students to develop responsible and effective use of it.

Examples include:

- Asking students to analyze or critique AI-generated answers for accuracy, bias, or completeness
- Using AI tools to generate alternative perspectives, then asking students to evaluate and refine them
- Requiring students to improve, correct, or build upon AI-generated outputs
- Assignments where students document how AI contributed to their work and where it fell short

In this model, the emphasis moves away from whether AI was used, and toward how effectively it was used. Students are expected to demonstrate sound judgment, critical engagement, and responsible use of available tools.

### ***3.2.3 AI-Restricted Assessments***

Faculty may choose to implement assessments, or components of assessments, in which AI use is restricted or prohibited to ensure independent demonstration of learning. This is particularly important when:

- establishing baseline knowledge or skills
- verifying individual competency
- preparing students for contexts where independent performance is required

Examples include:

- In-class exams and quizzes that are conducted without AI access
- Oral assessments or live problem-solving tasks
- Early-course diagnostics used to identify support needs
- Specific components within a broader assignment that must be completed independently
- 

### 3.3 Transparency and Disclosure in AI Use

Clear expectations should be established regarding when, how, and whether students may use AI tools in assessments. Transparency allows instructors to evaluate the student's contribution and learning process, rather than only the final output. Disclosure norms and the AI-use statement are defined in Pillar 4 (Section 4.2).

This may include:

- Explicit instructions on AI use within each assignment (e.g., allowed for brainstorming but not final writing)
- Student disclosure statements describing how AI was used and for what purpose
- Guidance on attribution or citation of AI-generated content where required
- Reflection prompts asking students to evaluate the strengths and limitations of AI in their work

### 3.4 Assessment Support for Faculty

Adapting assessment practices in response to AI requires institutional support. Teaching and learning centers play a central role in supporting experimentation and sharing best practices.

Support should include:

- Workshops on AI-resilient and AI-integrated assessment design
- Examples of redesigned assignments across disciplines
- Repositories of AI-informed assessment strategies and templates
- Opportunities for faculty to pilot, test, and refine new approaches
- Spaces for peer sharing and discussion of what works in practice

### 3.5 Resources

1. **AI Hub**  
Link: [AI Hub](#)

## Pillar 4: Academic Integrity

---

Pillar 4 sets out how the institution upholds academic integrity in an AI-enabled learning environment. This pillar positions academic integrity as a shared educational responsibility as it clarifies shared expectations around authorship, acceptable assistance, and transparency for both faculty and students, and it emphasizes integrity as a foundation for learning, trust, and academic standards. Academic integrity in the age of AI depends on consistent institutional expectations, discipline-sensitive teaching practices, transparent communication, and fair procedures.

The AUS Student Academic Integrity Code and Student Handbook remain the core institutional references for academic integrity standards, student rights and responsibilities, and procedures for handling allegations of academic misconduct.

### 4.1 Reframing Academic Integrity

AI-enabled learning environments require the institution to revisit how academic integrity is understood, communicated, and practiced. Academic integrity has traditionally been associated with preventing plagiarism, cheating, unauthorized collaboration, and misrepresentation of work. These concerns remain important, but generative AI introduces new complexities because students and faculty now have access to tools that can generate, revise, summarize, translate, analyze, code, and present academic work with increasing speed and sophistication.

In this context, academic integrity should be framed not only as a matter of compliance, but as a core condition for meaningful learning. The appropriate use of AI is determined by the expectations of the learning activity, the transparency of its use, and the extent to which the work demonstrates the student's own understanding and contribution. Academic integrity therefore requires shared understanding among students, faculty, academic support units, and administrators about what counts as original work, what forms of assistance are acceptable, and how evidence of learning can be demonstrated and assessed.

Students need to understand why integrity matters, how AI can support or undermine learning, and how to make responsible decisions in different academic contexts. Faculty need support in communicating expectations clearly, designing assessments that preserve meaningful evidence of learning, and responding fairly to concerns about misuse. At the institutional level, academic integrity in the age of AI depends on coherence across policy, pedagogy, assessment, student support, and disciplinary practice.

Therefore, this pillar is concerned with the following key issues:

- **How GenAI changes the integrity landscape**

Generative AI tools make it possible to produce essays, reports, code, translations, summaries, problem solutions, presentations, discussion posts, and other academic outputs with minimal effort. This changes the conditions under which academic work is produced and submitted. In some contexts, AI may be a legitimate learning aid; in others, it may undermine the purpose of the assessment by replacing the student's own thinking, practice, or demonstration of skill. The institution should therefore provide clearer guidance on permitted, restricted, and prohibited uses of AI across different learning contexts.

- **Common failure modes: hallucinations, fabricated sources, and confident misinformation**

Academic integrity also involves the accuracy and reliability of submitted work. Generative AI systems may produce false information, invented citations, inaccurate quotations, misleading summaries, biased interpretations, or claims presented with unwarranted confidence. Students may mistakenly assume that fluent AI-generated text is reliable or that references produced by an AI tool are real. For this reason, responsible academic practice must include verification and accountability.

- **Integrity as a learning culture: skills, expectations, and fairness**

The institution should treat academic integrity as part of students' academic development. This includes teaching students how to use AI critically, how to document assistance, how to distinguish support from substitution, and how to preserve their own intellectual contribution. A learning culture also requires fairness. Students should not be expected to infer AI rules from vague or inconsistent instructions. Faculty should state expectations clearly at course and assignment level, while students should seek clarification when unsure. Consistency is especially important because acceptable AI use may differ across disciplines, courses, and assessment types.

- **Alignment with institutional values and academic standards**

The institution's approach to AI and academic integrity should protect the credibility of its degrees, the validity of its assessments, and the trust placed in its academic standards. It should also reflect institutional commitments to ethical conduct, responsible innovation, equity, and student learning. AI-related academic integrity guidance should therefore be integrated with existing academic integrity policies, assessment practices, faculty development, student support, and quality assurance processes. This alignment ensures that AI adoption strengthens, rather than weakens, the institution's educational mission.

## 4.2 Responsible Use, Disclosure, and Academic Practice

Responsible AI use should be treated as part of academic skill-building. Students need to understand how AI can support learning without replacing their own thinking, practice, and demonstrated achievement. Faculty, in turn, should provide clear guidance on when AI use is permitted, restricted, or prohibited, and how students should acknowledge its use when allowed. This section establishes responsible AI use as a matter of transparency, verification, accountability, and respect for the purpose of assessment. This includes the following issues:

- **Understanding AI policies**

AI use may vary across courses, disciplines, levels, and assessment types. Students should be expected to follow the specific guidance provided by each instructor and assignment as appropriate to the course subject matter. Faculty should explain whether AI use is prohibited, permitted with limits, or encouraged for particular learning purposes.

- **Disclosure norms**

When AI use is allowed or required to be disclosed, students should clearly state how they used it. Disclosure may include the tool used, the purpose of use, the stage of work affected, and how the output was checked or revised. Disclosure expectations should be stated in course or assignment instructions.

- **Verification habits**

Students remain responsible for the accuracy of all submitted work, which requires cultivating well-developed verification habits. AI-generated content should be checked against course materials, scholarly sources, data, or other approved evidence. Students must verify citations, quotations, references, facts, and data before including them in academic work. Faculty should follow similar verification procedures in preparing teaching or assessment materials.

- **Overreliance and dependency**

AI should assist learning rather than substitute for it. Students should not use AI in ways that prevent them from developing the skills being assessed, such as writing, analysis, problem-solving, coding, translation, research, or reflection. Overreliance on AI tools can negatively affect students' cognitive skills and prevent them from achieving the full potential of their learning experience.

- **Using AI ethically with peers**

In collaborative work, students should be transparent about any AI assistance used and clear about each group member's contribution. AI should not be used to conceal unequal participation, replace group engagement, or misrepresent individual or collective effort.

- **Data privacy**

Students and faculty should not upload sensitive, confidential, personal, unpublished, or

assessment-related material into AI tools unless this is explicitly approved. This includes student work, grades, feedback, exam questions, institutional records, research data, and any material protected by privacy, copyright, or institutional policy.

### 4.3 AI-Related Misuse and Misconduct in Teaching and Learning

This section defines unacceptable uses of AI in academic work, clarifies grey areas, and distinguishes them from acceptable, supported uses. The aim is to ensure a shared understanding among students and staff, while promoting ethical and transparent engagement with AI tools. AI-related misuse should be assessed in relation to course expectations, assignment instructions, the extent of AI use, the student's transparency, and whether the use of AI undermines the learning outcomes being assessed.

AI-related misuse and misconduct includes:

- **Undisclosed AI-Generated Work**  
Submitting work generated wholly or substantially by AI as one's own, without required disclosure or when AI use is not permitted.
- **Fabrication of Information (Made-Up Evidence)** Presenting AI-generated or otherwise invented citations, references, quotations, data, or sources as genuine or verified evidence.
- **Unauthorized AI Use in Restricted Assessments**  
Using AI tools in assessments where their use is explicitly prohibited, such as exams, in-class tests, quizzes, practical assessments or specified take-home assignments.
- **Misrepresentation of the Learning Process**  
Falsifying drafts, version histories, research logs, prompts or other evidence of the work process to conceal AI involvement or exaggerate independent effort.

Clarifying grey areas is also important in this process. Some uses of AI may fall into ambiguous territory and should be evaluated based on intent, transparency, proportionality and alignment with course expectations. Examples include:

- Using AI for brainstorming or outlining without disclosure (where disclosure is expected)
- Excessive reliance on AI for rewriting or paraphrasing that obscures the student's original contribution
- Partial AI assistance in assignments with unclear guidelines

In such cases, students are expected to seek clarification before submission, and instructors should provide explicit guidance at course or assignment level.

Similarly, it is necessary to outline which uses of AI tools do not constitute misconduct when such use is permitted. This includes:

- Using AI tools for idea generation, language support, or structuring, where explicitly allowed
- Properly disclosing and citing AI assistance in accordance with course or institutional guidelines
- Engaging with AI as a learning aid, rather than a substitute for original work

## 4.4 Faculty Guidance for Assessment Design

Assessment design is addressed in detail in Pillar 3. For the purposes of this pillar, faculty are encouraged to consult Pillar 3 when designing assessments that preserve academic integrity, clarify acceptable AI use, and ensure that submitted work provides meaningful evidence of student learning.

## 4.5 Resources

1. **AUS Student Academic Integrity Code / Student Handbook (p.42)**  
Link: [AUS Student Handbook 2025-2026](#)
2. **AUS AI Hub - AUS AI Policy**  
Link: [AUS AI Policy](#)
3. **Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL)**  
Link: [AUS Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning](#)
4. **Academic Support Center (ASC)**  
Link: [AUS Academic Support Center](#)
5. **AUS Academic Information / Catalog Resources**  
Link: [AUS Academic Information](#)
6. **CAS Writing Center**  
Link: [AUS Writing Center](#)

## Pillar 5: Technology, Infrastructure, and Data Security

---

This pillar establishes the secure, scalable, and governed technology foundation needed to support AI adoption in teaching and learning at AUS. It aligns with AUS enterprise architecture, cybersecurity standards, and UAE regulatory requirements while ensuring compliance with institutional policies and the AUS AI Guidelines and Best Practices for Using AI Platforms.

## 5.1 Institutional AI Ecosystem and Approved Tools

The institution will maintain a controlled and approved AI ecosystem to support secure, responsible, and sustainable use across teaching and learning contexts.

### 5.1.1 Institutionally Approved and Recommended Tools

This section applies specifically to AI tools used in teaching and learning contexts at AUS, including tools used in classrooms, incorporated into course activities, or required by faculty for assignments, homework, projects, or assessments.

- **Controlled Adoption:** Adoption is limited to institutional AI platforms approved by the AUS Information Technology Department. These platforms meet institutional requirements for privacy, access control, support, and oversight.
- **Centralized Access:** Access is supported through institutional accounts in dedicated enterprise environments with limited data processing and access, including Google Gemini and NotebookLM, Microsoft Copilot, and Zoom AI Companion.
- **Repository:** The active list of approved AI tools used for teaching and learning is published by CITL at <https://aihub.aus.edu/> and [go.aus.edu/AI-Guidelines](https://go.aus.edu/AI-Guidelines).
- **Pre-Implementation Validation:** All AI tools, applications, and related technologies must undergo formal ICT and information security review before procurement, implementation, or installation to ensure alignment with IT architecture, cybersecurity, and support requirements.

### 5.1.2 Requesting New Tools for Academic Use

- **Evaluation Request:** Faculty or staff who want to use a new AI tool for academic purposes must submit an evaluation request through the ServiceNow intake form. IT and CITL will jointly review the request.
- **Ecosystem Updates:** Once a new tool is formally approved, it will be added to the central repository of institutionally approved tools.

### 5.1.3 Use of Non-Approved Tools

This applies to AI tools not included in the institutionally approved and recommended list.

- **Personal and optional use:** Faculty and students may use non-approved AI tools for personal productivity, experimentation, or optional individual work only when that use follows institutional guidance on privacy, confidentiality, and data security. They must complete the [AI User Risk Acknowledgment and Acceptance Form](#) before using a non-approved tool.

- **Prohibition in Coursework:** Non-approved tools should not be required or mandated for student use in courses, assignments, or assessments. They must not be built into required teaching and learning activities where this would introduce risks related to privacy, cost, unequal access, or institutional liability.

## 5.2 Infrastructure Readiness and Operational Resilience

The institution will ensure that its infrastructure supports internally developed AI use cases at scale, while maintaining performance, reliability, and alignment with enterprise architecture and cybersecurity standards, leveraging a hybrid hosting strategy (Cloud and AUS data center) where appropriate.

- **Capacity Management:** Ensuring network and system readiness for peak academic usage periods, such as online exams and evaluation periods.
- **Continuity and Resilience:** Maintaining strict alignment with institutional business continuity and disaster recovery plans.
- **Environment support:** Delivering continuous infrastructure support for remote and hybrid learning environments.
- **System Integration:** Supporting integration with AUS systems and applications where applicable.

## 5.3 Identity, Access, and Secure Usage Controls

Secure and seamless access is critical for adoption and compliance across institutionally approved tools.

- **Single Sign-On (SSO):** Enforcing SSO access across AI tools when applicable.
- **Role-Based Access Control (RBAC):** Access permissions are assigned according to institutional roles, including students, faculty, and staff.
- **Identity Lifecycle Management:** Standardizing user provisioning and deprovisioning along with proper account lifecycle management.
- **Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA):** Requiring multi-factor authentication (MFA) where supported by the platform.
- **Oversight and Auditing:** Maintaining strict auditability of access and usage alongside robust privileged access management.

## 5.4 Data Privacy, Protection, and UAE Compliance

Data protection is a core requirement for AI adoption in teaching and learning at AUS, governing both approved and non-approved tools.

- **Data Upload Prohibitions:** Users must not upload the following data to AI tools unless IT has explicitly approved the tool for the relevant data classification and use:
  - Student records
  - Confidential institutional data
  - Sensitive academic data
- **Operational Standards:** AI use must follow ICT and IT Security Department policies and guidance, including requirements for consent management, data retention, and deletion.
- **Vendor and Legal Alignment:** External vendors must meet institutional requirements for data privacy and residency and align with:
  - UAE data protection laws, regulations, and standards
  - AUS IT and InfoSec policies

## 5.5 Cybersecurity Risk Management for AI

AI introduces new cybersecurity risks that must be actively managed by the institution and its users.

- Users of AI platforms must remain vigilant and aware of key risks associated with these environments, including:
  - Data leakage and exposure
  - AI hallucinations and misinformation
  - Bias and fairness issues
  - Deepfake and social engineering risks
- IT and CITL manage these risks through:
  - Alignment with AUS InfoSec monitoring and governance frameworks
  - Conducting risk and security assessments for all AI tools
  - Implementing strict incident reporting and response protocols

## 5.6 Responsible and Ethical AI Use

Technology implementation should reinforce ethical AI use in accordance with institutional standards and policies. See Section 5.7 for the relevant policies, guidelines, and frameworks.

- Keeping human accountability central and positioning AI as an assistive tool rather than an authoritative decision-maker
- Enforcing transparency and disclosure capabilities where applicable
- Prohibiting the automation of high-risk academic decisions related to teaching and learning without governance and human oversight
- Promoting the consistent verification of AI outputs before formal use
- Ensuring all technical deployments align with the Academic Integrity pillar and applicable teaching and learning AI policies

## 5.7 Resources

1. **AUS AI Guidelines (Students, Faculty & Staff)**  
Link: [AUS AI Guidelines](#)
2. **IT Acceptable Use Policy and Procedure (incl. InfoSec Standards and Sharjah Cyber Security Center Directives)**  
Link: [IT Acceptable Use Policy and Procedure](#)
3. **AI Hub (CITL)**  
Link: [AI Hub](#)
4. **Academic Integrity Policy**  
Link: [AUS Undergraduate Catalogs](#)
5. **Generative AI in Teaching & Learning Policy**  
Link: [AUS AI Policy](#)

## 6. Outcomes

---

These outcomes are tracked through the framework's regular review cycle, using indicators such as those noted below.

- **AI-Ready Graduates.** Students who graduate able to use AI critically, ethically, and effectively for learning and future professional practice. *Observed through*

*graduate competency assessments, capstone and portfolio work, and employer and alumni feedback.*

- **Enhanced Teaching and Learning.** Faculty integrate AI in ways that deepen engagement, personalize support, and strengthen learning outcomes. *Observed through course evaluations, learning-outcome attainment, and uptake of AI-integrated course designs.*
- **Ethical and Responsible Use.** AI is used across the institution with transparency, accountability, and respect for privacy and academic integrity. *Observed through disclosure compliance, academic-integrity case trends, and responsible-use reviews.*
- **Faculty Empowerment.** Faculty are supported with training, resources, and flexibility to adopt AI with confidence. *Observed through participation in AI professional development and faculty confidence and adoption surveys.*
- **Institutional Excellence.** The institution sustains its academic standards and reputation while adapting continuously to AI developments. *Observed through framework review cycles, accreditation outcomes, and institutional AI-readiness benchmarks.*

## 7. Index of Links

---

The links below provide quick access to the external sources referenced throughout this framework.

AI Hub - <https://aihub.aus.edu/>

AI Literacy @ AUS LibGuide - <https://aus.libguides.com/aiataus>

AI User Risk Acknowledgment & Acceptance Form - <https://forms.aus.edu/261331578124050>

AUS Academic Information - <https://www.aus.edu/academics/services-and-resources/academic-information>

AUS Academic Support Center - <https://www.aus.edu/academics/asc>

AUS AI Guidelines and Best Practices - <https://go.aus.edu/AI-Guidelines>

AUS AI Policy - <https://aihub.aus.edu/aus-ai-policy/>

**AUS Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning / CITL Certification Programs -**

<https://www.aus.edu/academics/services-and-resources/center-for-innovation-in-teaching-and-learning>

**AUS Student Handbook 2025-2026 -** [https://www.aus.edu/sites/default/files/ose\\_handbook\\_2025-2026\\_final.pdf](https://www.aus.edu/sites/default/files/ose_handbook_2025-2026_final.pdf)

**AUS Undergraduate Catalogs -** <https://www.aus.edu/academics/services-and-resources/aus-catalogs>

**AUS Writing Center -** <https://www.aus.edu/cas/writing-center>

**Coursera AI in education courses -** <https://www.coursera.org/search?query=AI%20in%20education>

**IT Acceptable Use Policy and Procedure / IT Policies -** <https://www.aus.edu/life-at-aus/on-campus-services/it-services/it-policies>

**Reflect Learn Connect LibGuide -** <https://aus.libguides.com/rlc>