

Teaching Case

Student AI Implementation Framework for Business Education: From Principles to Local Practice

G. David Shows
showsgd@appstate.edu

Ed Hassler
hasslereee@appstate.edu

Shishir Shakya
shakyas@appstate.edu

Santosh Nandi
nandis1@appstate.edu

Jeff Kaleta
kaletajp@appstate.edu

Annie Love Johnson
loveam2@appstate.edu

Lucian Zelazny
zelaznylm@appstate.edu

Josh Silvey
silveyjl@appstate.edu

Brandy Hadley
hadleybe@appstate.edu

Appalachian State University
Boone, NC, 28607, USA

Hook

The Walker College of Business (WCOB) administration has asked student business groups to help the business student population adopt and implement the new AI framework and acceptable use policies.

Abstract

Business colleges face a practical implementation problem as generative AI becomes part of teaching, learning, assessment, and professional work. The Walker College of Business proposes a Responsible AI Implementation Framework for Business Education that links seven layers: governance, AI literacy, assessment design, faculty development, student readiness, privacy and accountability, and implementation metrics. The implementation phase includes student involvement in testing assignment categories, reviewing policy language, interpreting readiness measures, and identifying privacy or access problems. Guided by ethical adoption of ChatGPT and large language models in the classroom, students within business organizations can help guide the adoption, diffusion, and acceptance of ethical standards for acceptable AI use.

Keywords: Generative AI, AI Diffusion, AI governance, Diffusion of Innovation, Business Education and Student Involvement

Student AI Implementation Framework for Business Education: From Principles to Local Practice

G. David Shows, Shishir Shakya, Jeff Kaleta, Lucian Zelazny,
Brandy Hadley, Ed Hassler, Santosh Nandi, Annie Love Johnson and Josh Silvey

1. THE ASSIGNMENT

Armed with research and the desire to achieve the benefits of AI, both in and out of the classroom, Zac Taylor and his peers have the assignment to help execute the implementation of AI in the college of business. He and his peers have the semester to create practical assignments to successfully conduct the student part in the adoption of AI standards and to finalize the AI Framework based upon student concerns in the adoption.

Assignment:

1.1 Define your mission.

Zack and his colleagues should state the purpose of their work that defines not the implementation of their job but the core reason for the assignment. The idea behind activity will shape all decisions from this moment forward. The mission is the guiding principle which all strategies are built upon.

1.2 Consider your subjects.

The case states that students' concerns are different from teachers. How different? What is the current state of student understanding? Using the discussion from the focus group below, consider the concerns of the students balanced against the implementation schedule and determine the best way to complete the task.

1.3 Develop Goals.

Goals are the long-term outcomes this group hopes to achieve. This is the expectation of results that your activities hope to achieve.

1.4 Develop Strategic Targets.

Strategic Targets are empirically measured time-based objectives. Group your tasks by short-term goals and long-term goals. Which will take considerable time to implement? Which are accomplished soon, and which require time? Determine a measurement for success in time and student acceptance or order to codify success or failure.

1.5 Develop and Implementation Strategy.

Develop and implement actions that support the strategic targets. Define the implementation of short-term goals and long-term goals with an

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Zac Taylor, student president of the CIS Working Group in the Walker College of Business (WCOB) at Appalachian State, was surprised to find their monthly group meeting changed to the big classroom on the first floor by their faculty sponsor. He was even more surprised to find the hall rapidly filled up with the student councils for all the other student associations in the Walker College of Business and the podium staffed by members of the WCOB Dean's office.

His questions are answered by Dr. Tracy Reed, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs. The student organizations of the WCOB are given a special assignment this year; to help the College of Business adopt and spread the newly minted WCOB acceptable use framework for Artificial Intelligence

(AI) implemented for the new year. Dr. Reed explained that part of the implementation process adopted by the WCOB was that; “student participation should move beyond one-time consultation. The next step is to involve students in testing assignment categories, reviewing policy language, interpreting readiness measures, and identifying privacy or access problems.” Given this mandate, Zac and his peers in the other business organizations have been asked to further the successful implementation of ethical standards for scholarly work both inside and outside the classroom through their help in completing student readiness outlined in the AI framework.

1.2 Introduction of AI in the classroom

Generative artificial intelligence has created a practical governance problem for business schools. Colleges now need to prepare students for AI-mediated professional work while also protecting learning integrity, student agency, data privacy, equity, faculty autonomy, and institutional accountability. The difficulty is not only that AI tools are changing quickly. It is that institutional responses remain broad: they endorse responsible use, integrity, transparency, or human-centered practice without specifying who owns implementation, how instructors should signal allowed use, how students should demonstrate learning, or how the college should measure progress.

The WCOB developed a responsible AI implementation framework for business education. The framework links seven implementation layers: governance, AI literacy, assessment design, faculty development, student readiness, privacy and accountability, and implementation metrics. Responsible AI cannot be operationalized by a policy statement alone. It must become a coordinated set of decision artifacts: governance roles, assignment-use categories, assessment templates, faculty capability pathways, student readiness measures, privacy rules, and review routines. The WCOB moved from broad AI principles toward local decisions about syllabus expectations, curriculum integration, student focus groups, faculty concerns, privacy language, sustainability, assessment redesign, and measurable goals.

The WCOB AI framework brings together AI literacy re-search (Allen and Kendeou, 2023; Chiu et al., 2024; Ng et al., 2021), higher education AI policy and governance literature (Chan, 2023; Wu et al., 2024), human-centered and ethical AI principles (Fu and Weng, 2024; Holmes et al., 2021; Nguyen et al., 2022), assessment frameworks (Furze et al., 2024; Ilieva et al., 2025), faculty capability literature (Burneo-Arteaga et al., 2025), and participatory AI design (Delgado et al., 2023; Deckker and Sumanasekara, 2025). It translates those sources into a business-school implementation architecture that the WCOB and similar colleges can use.

The framework differs from prior models in its unit of action. Chan’s AI policy framework helps organize university-level policy domains; AIAS clarifies assignment-level AI use; AI literacy models define learner competencies; governance studies identify institutional responsibility structures. The work in the WCOB integrates those strands into a single business-school implementation model in which every layer must produce a local artifact, owner, and measure. Its distinctive contribution is not a new ethical principle, literacy taxonomy, or assessment scale. It is a bridge between these existing frameworks to accountable college-level practice.

2. LITERATURE FOUNDATION

2.1 Governance and Policy Architecture

The higher education AI policy literature suggests responsible AI implementation must operate across pedagogical, governance, and operational dimensions. Chan (2023) treats AI policy as a framework problem rather than a classroom-only issue. It supports a structure in which teaching guidance, institutional governance, academic integrity, privacy, and operational support are coordinated rather than managed as disconnected policies.

Wu et al. (2024) strengthens this point through evidence from Big Ten AI governance. The relevant lesson for a business college is that governance should be multi-unit and role specific. A college-level framework needs decision owners for curriculum, assessment, privacy, student communication, faculty development, and review, not only a general AI committee. Li et al. (2025) adds an important boundary: strategic symbolic decisions should remain under human leadership, while AI may support localized, lower-level decision work. For WCOB, this distinction helps separate policy authority from tool-assisted implementation support.

Institutionalization literature warns against ethics language without accountability. Schultz and Seele

(2022) emphasize that AI ethics become symbolic unless connected to governance, reporting, and institutional routines. Javed et al. (2022) similarly argues against siloed AI ethics curricula. These sources justify a framework that links values to owners, artifacts, and measures.

2.1 Human-Centered and Ethical AI

Ethical AI in education requires more than compliance. Nguyen et al. (2022) supports a principled foundation around transparency, accountability, fairness, privacy, autonomy, and inclusion. Holmes et al. (2021) extends this by treating AI ethics in education as a community-wide issue involving multiple stakeholders, not only technologists or individual instructors. Fu and Weng (2024) adds a human-centered lens that highlights agency, autonomy, equity, privacy, and collaboration. For business schools, these principles must be converted into professional judgment. Students need to learn how AI affects decisions, work processes, data practices, communication, markets, customers, employees, and communities. The WCOB case study showed the same pressure locally: AI is framed as a tool for learning and work, but stakeholders also raised concerns about learning loss, fairness, privacy, disclosure, sustainability, and human-centered decision-making.

2.2 AI Literacy and Student Readiness

AI literacy research gives the framework its learning architecture. Ng et al. (2021) defines AI literacy through capacities such as knowing, understanding, using, evaluating, creating, and ethical judgment. Chiu et al. (2024) expands the construct to include confidence, self-reflection, collaboration, impact, and ethics. Allen and Kendeou (2023) adds educational AI literacy dimensions such as knowledge, evaluation, collaboration, contextualization, autonomy, and ethics. Figaredo and Stoyanovich (2023) argue that responsible AI literacy should start with stakeholder needs and the impacts of automated decision-making.

The framework therefore treats student readiness as more than coincidence or tool familiarity. Student readiness includes the ability to select appropriate AI uses, verify outputs, recognize bias and hallucination, protect sensitive data, explain decisions, cite or disclose AI assistance, and apply AI within business contexts. WCOB's local materials support this shift because students asked for practical AI skills and job preparation, while faculty emphasized critical thinking, verification, and authentic learning.

2.3 Assessment and Academic Integrity

Assessment is where AI ethics become classroom practice. Furze et al. (2024) provides a direct model for assignment-level AI-use signaling. It supports a move away from vague course policies toward explicit categories that tell students whether AI is prohibited, limited, guided, expected, or open. Ilieva et al. (2025) adds a governance frame for assessment by distinguishing instructors, students, and institutional control responsibilities.

Students worry about fairness when AI rules are unclear. Faculty worry that final products might hide weak understanding and that detection alone is unreliable. The working group is already moving toward syllabus statements, assignment categories, disclosure, and process-visible assessment. The framework therefore treats assessment design as the operational bridge between policy and learning.

2.4 Faculty Capability and Participatory Governance

Faculty development is necessary because AI policy cannot implement itself. Burneo-Arteaga et al. (2025) supports a capability-based model of educator GenAI training. For a business college, this means faculty support should include model assignments, discipline examples, assessment redesign help, privacy guidance, policy language, and peer learning. One-time awareness sessions are insufficient when faculty must redesign assignments and evaluate AI-assisted work.

Participatory AI design strengthens legitimacy and trust. Delgado et al. (2023) supports a participation-depth dimension in AI design, while Deckker and Sumanasekara (2025) emphasizes student rights, consent, data ownership, and student-centered ethical governance. The WCOB case study showed that student focus groups surfaced practical concerns that faculty and administrators might otherwise miss. The framework therefore treats student participation as an implementation layer, not only a consultation activity.

2.5 Strategic Transformation and Continuous Evaluation

Responsible AI implementation should also be treated as institutional transformation. George and Wooden (2023) frames AI as part of smart-university strategy, where institutions must balance opportunity with educational quality, privacy, safety, bias, and stakeholder acceptance. Allam et al. (2025) adds a living-intelligence perspective that links human-AI partnership to adaptation, sustainability, accessibility, training, and policy. These sources justify continuous evaluation: business schools should not only adopt AI guidance; they should monitor whether guidance changes teaching, learning, readiness, integrity, and trust.

3. RESPONSIBLE AI IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

3.1 Layer 1: Governance and Ownership

Governance is the framework's coordinating layer. A responsible AI plan identifies who owns curriculum mapping, assignment guidance, faculty support, privacy language, student communication, and annual review. Governance should be multi-unit and role-specific, drawing from Chan (2023) and Wu et al. (2024). It should also preserve human authority over strategic decisions, consistent with Li et al. (2025).

The decision artifact is an AI governance map. The map should name owners, cadence, authority, reporting duties, escalation paths, and student/faculty participation mechanisms.

3.2 Layer 2: AI Literacy

AI literacy is the foundation of learning. It should include technical use, critical evaluation, ethical reasoning, contextual judgment, collaboration, autonomy, and creation. Allen and Kendeou (2023), Chiu et al. (2024), Ng et al. (2021), and Allen and Kendeou (2023) support a broad literacy model rather than a narrow prompt-engineering model. Figaredo and Stoyanovich (2023) adds that literacy should begin with stakeholder needs and the effects of automated decision-making.

The decision artifact is an AI literacy outcome map. It should specify what students and faculty are expected to know, do, evaluate, disclose, and protect at diverse levels of the curriculum.

3.3 Layer 3: Assessment Design

Assessment design translates policy into student behavior. A responsible AI framework should define assignment-level categories, disclosure expectations, evidence-of-process requirements, verification practices, and consequences for misuse. Furze et al. (2024) supports assignment-level use signaling, while Ilieva et al. (2025) supports shared responsibilities among instructors, students, and institutional authorities.

The decision artifact is a process-visible assessment template. It should help faculty design assignments that require drafts, prompts, source checks, reflection, oral defense, or verification when AI use is permitted.

3.4 Layer 4: Faculty Development

Faculty capability determines whether the framework becomes classroom practice. Faculty needs support for policy language, assignment redesign, discipline-specific AI use, assessment of AI-assisted work, student disclosure norms, and privacy-sensitive teaching. Burneo-Arteaga et al. (2025) supports a capability-based training approach.

The decision artifact is a faculty AI capability pathway. It should combine workshops, peer examples, communities of practice, model assignments, and evidence of redesigned teaching artifacts.

3.5 Layer 5: Student Readiness

Student readiness should be measured as performance and judgment. Students should be able to use AI for business tasks while also evaluating accuracy, recognizing bias, protecting data, explaining decisions, and documenting AI assistance. This layer draws from the AI literacy literature and from WCOB's student/faculty gap analysis, where students wanted practical career preparation and faculty wanted evidence of authentic learning.

The decision artifact is a student AI readiness measure. It should combine self-report, performance tasks, ethical scenarios, verification tasks, and business-context application.

3.6 Layer 6: Privacy and Accountability

Privacy and accountability connect AI to institutional trust. Fu and Weng (2024), Holmes et al. (2021), support privacy, transparency, accountability, inclusion, and human agency as core ethical commitments. Deckker and Sumanasekara (2025) adds student rights, consent, and data ownership. To secure these ethical commitments requires the active participation of students in the process.

The decision artifact is a privacy and accountability guide. It should explain approved tools, prohibited data, disclosure norms, student data protections, instructor responsibilities, and reporting procedures.

3.7 Layer 7: Implementation Metrics

Implementation metrics prevent the framework from remaining aspirational. Schultz and Seele (2022) caution against symbolic ethics without accountability. Allam et al. (2025) and George and Wooden (2023) support continuous institutional adaptation. Metrics should track whether the framework changes actual practice.

The decision artifact is an annual AI implementation dashboard. It should track syllabus coverage, assignment category adoption, redesigned assessments, faculty capability participation, student readiness results, privacy communication, student/faculty feedback, and governance review completion.

Layer	Decision artifact	Core question	Evidence base
Governance	AI governance map	Who owns decisions, review, and reporting?	(Chan, 2023; Wu et al., 2024; Li et al., 2025)
AI literacy	AI literacy outcome map	What should students and faculty know, do, evaluate, and disclose?	(Ng et al., 2021; Chiu et al., 2024; Allen and Kendeou, 2023; Figaredo and Stoyanovich, 2023)
Assessment design	Process-visible assessment template	How should assignments make AI use transparent and learning visible?	(Furze et al., 2024; Ilieva et al., 2025)
Faculty development	Faculty AI capability pathway	What support lets faculty implement policy and redesign assignments?	(Burneo-Arteaga et al., 2025)
Student readiness	AI readiness measure	Can students use AI critically, ethically, and professionally?	(Ng et al., 2021; Chiu et al., 2024; Allen and Kendeou, 2023)
Privacy and accountability	Privacy and accountability guide	What data, disclosure, consent, and responsibility rules apply?	(Nguyen et al., 2022; Holmes et al., 2021; Fu and Weng, 2024; Deckker and Sumanasekara, 2025)
Implementation metrics	Annual AI implementation dashboard	How will the college know whether the framework is working?	(Schultz and Seele, 2022; George and Wooden, 2023; Allam et al., 2025)

Table 1: Responsible AI Implementation Framework for Business Education

4. APPLICATION TO THE WCOB

WCOB's planning process already contains many of the framework's layers: guiding principles, student and faculty focus groups, syllabus-policy discussion, curriculum benchmarking, AI literacy goals, faculty workshops, privacy language, sustainability language, and governance review. The remaining challenge is coordination. The framework helps convert WCOB's case evidence into a decision architecture.

Students, faculty, and the working group are not fundamentally misaligned. Students emphasize practical use, fairness, career preparation, translation, productivity, and un-certainty about disclosure. Faculty emphasize rigor, authentic learning, assessment evidence, policy clarity, and academic integrity. The working group emphasizes institutional wording, measurable goals, syllabus expectations, privacy, access, faculty support, and governance. This pattern supports the framework's central claim: responsible AI implementation must connect practical student needs, pedagogical faculty needs, and institutional governance needs.

Framework layer	WCOB translation	First decision
Governance	Multi-unit AI governance with named owners for curriculum, assessment, faculty development, privacy, and review	Decide whether ownership sits in a new AI governance committee, an existing committee, or a role-specific hybrid
AI literacy	Shared student and faculty literacy around use, verification, bias, privacy, disclosure, and business application	Adopt a local AI literacy outcome map for core and major courses
Assessment design	Assignment-level AI-use categories and process-visible assessment templates	Approve baseline assignment categories that instructors can adapt
Faculty development	Capability-based development with model assignments and peer examples	Build a faculty pathway beyond one-time workshops
Student readiness	Measure readiness through confidence, verification, ethics scenarios, and business tasks	Pilot a readiness measure in selected core or senior courses
Privacy and accountability	Clear guidance on approved tools, unsafe data, student disclosure, and instructor responsibilities	Publish a WCOB privacy/accountability guide aligned with university rules
Implementation metrics	Annual dashboard for course integration, syllabus coverage, re-designed assessments, faculty participation, student readiness, and re-view completion	Define Year 1 thresholds and reporting cadence

Table 2: WCOB translation of the framework

5. FRAMEWORK FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The WCOB produced the following conclusions to successfully create and implement an AI framework into their business school.

First, business schools should treat responsible AI as implementation architecture. A principal statement is useful, but it does not tell an instructor how to design an assignment, a student how to disclose AI help, or a curriculum committee how to measure readiness. The framework turns broad values into artifacts that can be assigned and reviewed.

Second, business schools should integrate workforce readiness with ethical judgment. AI is becoming part of accounting, finance, analytics, marketing, management, supply chains, human resources, entrepreneurship, and communication. But workforce readiness without ethics risks reducing education to tool use. The framework therefore links business application to verification, data protection, fairness, accountability, and human judgment.

Third, assessment design should be the early implementation priority. Policy clarity and academic integrity concerns become actionable when assignments specify permitted AI use and require visible evidence of learning. This is the fastest way to align students' fairness concerns with faculty concerns about rigor.

Fourth, student participation should move beyond one-time consultation. WCOB's focus groups produced usable implementation suggestions. The next step is to involve students in testing assignment categories, reviewing policy language, interpreting readiness measures, and identifying privacy or access problems.

Fifth, implementation metrics should be narrow enough to manage. Colleges do not need a large dashboard at first. They need a small set of measures: syllabus coverage, assignment-category use, redesigned assessments, faculty development artifacts, student readiness results, privacy communication, and governance review completion.

6. STUDENT FEEDBACK ON AI USE

As mentioned, in the fall of 2025, the WCOB held an informal focus group meeting with three teachers and ten students to discuss their uses and understanding of AI and its place inside and outside the classroom. The discussion involved areas relevant to AI in business education, including student use and their perceptions of AI use. The faculty represented expertise in finance, statistics, economics, management, and CIS and cybersecurity.

The transcript of the focus group was analyzed by Speak AI, an AI program specializing in the analysis

of focus groups. Speak AI found that 38.6% of the discussion represented positive sentiment, 53.6% of the content was perceived as neutral, and 7.8% expressed a negative sentiment. The overwhelming theme across the interviews was AI as an efficiency and study tool. AI is noted for being a valuable study aid and a great facilitator for automating tasks, including automated emailing and article searching through libraries. Its time savings is noted by the students as being valuable to completing tasks on the required periods.

The downsides of students are critical. One student noted the lack of personal reward when you complete a particularly challenging task when you perform without AI. One student was concerned that with AI, you could complete a semester class on critical thinking and leave without becoming a better critical thinker. An underlying concern by the students was its impact on the job market and societal issues. Students noted when AI starts to have a more pronounced impact on society, what will happen to the human ability of creation and creativity. Finally, the issue of misuse and cheating was another sub-theme. All were concerned about its abuse and had concerns for the student who must compete with cheaters while being honest. The preponderance of online classes leads students to feel many of them are using AI to complete their tests. Overall, they believe this will fail the student who must compete in the open marketplace without the necessary skills obtained through honest effort.

The students express an ardent desire for clearer guidance along with a greater integration of AI education within the university and are consistent across all departments. This includes education in acceptable use and greater literacy in the use of AI. Departments across the university have differing opinions and are rejecting its use. The students note that professors have different opinions about its use and are willing to let the professors decide within their classrooms.

6. THE ASSIGNMENT

Armed with this research and the desire to achieve the benefits of AI, both in and out of the classroom, Zac and his peers have the assignment to execute the fourth conclusion in the implementation of AI. He and his peers have the semester to produce an expression of student desires and concerns in the implementation of AI policies within the university. Included is an action plan that satisfies the students' concerns and is consistent with the implementation metrics discussed above. Especially important in this will be Student Readiness pertaining to student confidence in understanding AI and its ethical use in the classroom, and Privacy and Accountability, which includes clear guidance in approved tools, the responsibilities expected by the instructor, and a student's expected disclosure on the use of approved AI tools.

7. CONCLUSIONS

Armed with history, purpose and a strategic plan, Zac and his group will start to shape the future acceptance and support of Artificial Intelligence among his peers. Zac has a semester to consider all the options, but the time for the plan of action is NOW.

8. REFERENCES

- Allam, H., Gyamfi, B., and AlOmar, B. (2025). Sustainable innovation: Harnessing ai and living intelligence to transform higher education. *Education Sciences*.
- Allen, L. K. and Kendeou, P. (2023). Ed-ai lit: An interdisciplinary framework for ai literacy in education. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*.
- Bouteraa, M., Bin-Nashwan, S. A., Al-Daihani, M., Dirie, K. A., Benlahcene, A., Sadal-lah, M., Zaki, H. O., Lada, S., Ansar, R., Fook, L. M., and Chekima, B. (2024). Understanding the diffusion of ai-generative (ChatGPT) in higher education: Does students' integrity matter? *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 14:100402.
- Burneo-Arteaga, P., Lira, Y., Murzi, H., Balula, A., and Costa, A. P. (2025). Capability-based training framework for generative ai in higher education. *Frontiers in Education*.
- Chan, C. (2023). A comprehensive ai policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*.
- Chiu, T., Ahmad, Z., Ismailov, M., and Sanusi, I. (2024). What are artificial intelligence literacy and competency? a comprehensive framework to support them. *Computers and Education Open*.

- Deckker, D. and Sumanasekara, S. (2025). Student-centric ethical frameworks for ai-driven education: Participatory consent and data ownership in a global perspective. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*.
- Delgado, F., Yang, S., Madaio, M., and Yang, Q. (2023). The participatory turn in ai design: Theoretical foundations and the current state of practice. *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM Conference on Equity and Access in Algorithms, Mechanisms, and Optimization*.
- Figaredo, D. D. and Stoyanovich, J. (2023). Responsible ai literacy: A stakeholder-first approach. *Big Data & Society*.
- Fu, Y. and Weng, Z. (2024). Navigating the ethical terrain of ai in education: A systematic review on framing responsible human-centered ai practices. *Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell.*
- Furze, L., Perkins, M., Roe, J., and MacVaugh, J. (2024). The AI assessment scale (AIAS) in action: A pilot implementation of genial supported assessment. *ArXiv*.
- George, B. and Wooden, O. (2023). Managing the strategic transformation of higher education through artificial intelligence. *Administrative Sciences*.
- Holmes, W., Porayska-Pomsta, K., Holstein, K., Sutherland, E., Baker, T., Shum, S. B., Santos, O., Rodrigo, M. T., Cukurova, M., Bittencourt, I., and Koedinger, K. (2021). Ethics of ai in education: Towards a community-wide framework. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*.
- Holmström, J. (2021). From ai to digital transformation: The AI readiness framework. *Business Horizons*.
- Ilieva, G., Yankova, T., Ruseva, M., and Kabaivanov, S. (2025). A framework for generative AI-driven assessment in higher education. *Inf.*
- Javed, R. T., Nasir, O., Borit, M., Vanhée, L., Zea, E., Gupta, S., Vinuesa, R., and Qadir, J. (2022). Get out of the bag! silos in ai ethics education: Unsupervised topic modeling analysis of global ai curricula. *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*
- Li, X., Turner, D. A., and Liu, B. (2025). Ai as sub-symbolic systems: Understanding the role of ai in higher education governance. *Education Sciences*.
- Ng, D., Leung, J., Chu, S. K., and Qiao, M. S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. *Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell.*
- Nguyen, A., Ngo, H., Hong, Y., Dang, B., and Nguyen, B.-P. T. (2022). Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education. *Education and Information Technologies*.
- Schultz, M. D., and Seele, P. (2022). Towards AI ethics institutionalization: knowledge bridges from business ethics to advance organizational ai ethics. *AI and Ethics*.
- Wu, C., Zhang, H., and Carroll, J. M. (2024). Ai governance in higher education: Case studies of guidance at big ten universities. *Future Internet*