Daffodil International University

AI Ethics and Implementation Guideline

for Teaching, Research, and Administration

Version 2.0

April 2026

Supervised By

Professor Dr. Md. Fokhray Hossain

Convener, DIU "AI Ethics and Implementation Guideline
Dean, Faculty of Science and Information Technology, DIU

Prepared By

Committee of DIU "AI Ethics and Implementation Guideline"

ENDORSEMENT

This document, titled “AI Ethics and Implementation Guideline for Teaching, Research, and Administration at Daffodil International University” (Version 2.0), has been reviewed and approved for university-wide implementation. It supersedes the DIU GenAI Guideline (Version 1.0) dated 19 September 2024.

Upon endorsement by the Committee of DIU “AI Ethics and Implementation Guideline (Version 2.0)," this Guideline takes immediate effect. It applies to every student, faculty member, researcher, and administrative employee at Daffodil International University.

SL	Name and Designation	Role in the Committee
1	Professor Dr. Md. Fokhray Hossain, Dean, FSIT	Convener
2	Professor Dr. Sheak Rashed Haider Noori, Head, CSE, FSIT	Co-convener
3	Dr. Imran Mahmud, Head, SWE, FSIT	Co-convener
4	Md. Sarwar Hossain Mollah, Head, CIS, FSIT	Co-convener
5	Dr. Nusrat Jahan, Head, ITM, FSIT	Co-convener
6	Dr. Md. Akhtaruzzaman, Head, RME, FSIT	Co-convener
7	Md. Salah Uddin, Head, MCT, FSIT	Co-convener
8	Ms. Tahsina Yasmin, Director-in-Charge, HRDI, and Associate Professor, Dept. of English, FHSS	Member
9	Mr. Juwel Rana, Assistant Professor, NFE, FHLS	Member
10	Mr. Dipto Biswas, Lecturer (Senior Scale), ICE, FE	Member
11	Mr. Md. Mahbobor Rahaman, Lecturer (Senior Scale), BA, FBE	Member
12	Mr. Kazi Jahid Hasan, Assistant Professor, MCT, FSIT	Member Secretary

©Daffodil International University

Table of Contents

1.0 Preamble

In May 2024, Daffodil International University (DIU) took a decisive step. Recognizing that AI was rapidly reshaping higher education worldwide, DIU established its AI Policy Framing Committee and by September of that year, produced the DIU GenAI Guideline (Version 1.0) [1]. Built on Focus Group Discussions with students, teachers, and administrative staff at the Daffodil Smart City campus, that first document laid down six foundational principles for responsible Generative AI use.

Much has changed since then. AI in education no longer means just ChatGPT and a few image generators. By early 2026, universities around the world are grappling with reasoning engines, autonomous coding agents, multimodal systems that combine text, image, and video, and discipline-specific tools that can draft legal briefs or analyze medical imaging. Oxford, Harvard, Stanford, Cornell, and Cambridge have each overhauled their AI policies at least once since 2024 [3, 22, 25, 30]. UNESCO released updated frameworks. The European Union's AI Act moves toward full enforcement in August 2026.

DIU conducted a comprehensive stakeholder survey between November and December 2025, collecting 743 responses across all university constituencies [2]. The results were revealing. Nearly all respondents (97.6%) now use text-based AI tools; two out of three use them every single day. But more than half (57.6%) had little or no awareness that DIU even had AI guidelines in place. Only one in four consistently disclosed when they used AI in their work. And one in five believed it was perfectly acceptable to use AI-generated ideas without any attribution at all.

These gaps between near-universal adoption and minimal institutional guidance demanded action. The present document replaces Version 1.0 entirely. Its scope extends beyond generative AI to cover all AI technologies relevant to DIU's academic and administrative life. It introduces a tiered classification system for AI use in assessments, mandatory attribution standards, a graduated framework for addressing non-compliance, and clear positions on contentious issues like AI detection tools. Throughout, it draws on international best practices while staying rooted in Bangladesh's national context and DIU's own institutional data [31].

2.0 Purpose and Scope

2.1 Purpose

Why does DIU need this guideline? Because AI is no longer optional. It is embedded in the daily workflow of almost every member of this university, yet the institutional infrastructure to govern its use has not kept pace. This guideline exists to close that gap. It provides a framework for using AI ethically and effectively across teaching, research, and administration at DIU. Its goals: promote AI literacy among all stakeholders; safeguard academic integrity; protect data privacy and intellectual property; ensure no student is disadvantaged by unequal access to AI tools; and prepare graduates for workplaces where AI competency is expected, not exceptional [3, 25, 26].

2.2 Scope

Every DIU student undergraduate and postgraduate alike falls under this Guideline, as does every faculty member, researcher, and administrative employee. The Guideline covers AI use in teaching and learning, research and publication, assessment and evaluation, and daily administrative operations. It applies to all categories of AI: large language models like ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini; image and video generation tools such as Veo and Midjourney; code assistants like GitHub Copilot; research tools including Elicit and Research Rabbit; presentation platforms like Gamma; and any discipline-specific AI application that may emerge.

2.3 Relationship to Other Policies

This Guideline does not exist in isolation. It works alongside DIU's Academic Integrity Policy, Examination Regulations, Research Ethics Policy, Data Protection Policy, and Code of Conduct. When a conflict arises between this Guideline and an existing policy, the AI Governance Committee described in Section 14.0 will resolve it. Externally, this Guideline aligns with the Bangladesh National Artificial Intelligence Guideline 2024 (Draft) [31], UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence [27], and key principles from the EU Artificial Intelligence Act [30].

3.0 Definitions

Clarity matters. The terms below carry specific meanings throughout this document.

Term	Definition
Artificial Intelligence (AI)	Computer systems that perform tasks ordinarily requiring human intelligence, learning from data, recognizing patterns, making decisions, understanding language, and generating content.
Generative AI (GenAI)	A category of AI that creates new content, text, images, code, audio, or video by learning patterns from vast training datasets. ChatGPT, Nano Banana, and Midjourney are common examples.
AI-Assisted Work	Any academic or professional output where AI tools played a role at any stage: ideation, drafting, editing, data analysis, visualization, or review.
AI-Generated Content	Content produced largely or entirely by an AI system, with only minimal human editing or modification.
Attribution	Disclosing and documenting AI tool usage in submitted work specifying the tool, the prompts given, and how outputs were incorporated into the final product.

Proof of Process	Evidence showing how work was actually created: saved drafts, prompt logs, revision history, and reflective notes. Increasingly standard at leading universities worldwide [23, 24].
AI Literacy	The competence to understand, critically evaluate, and productively use AI including awareness of what AI can and cannot do, its biases, and the ethical considerations it raises [3, 26].
Hallucination	A confident-sounding but false output from an AI system. This includes fabricated citations, invented statistics, and factual claims that have no basis in reality [6].

4.0 Guiding Principles

Version 1.0 articulated six principles [1]. The following eight principles retain the original core while adding two dimensions, academic integrity and continuous adaptation, that emerged as critical needs from both international benchmarking [3, 25, 27, 30] and DIU's own 2025 survey data [2].

4.1 Human-Centricity and Dignity

AI at DIU exists to serve people, not the other way around. Every AI deployment must respect the fundamental rights guaranteed by Bangladesh's Constitution and by international human rights instruments. The goal is augmentation: AI should sharpen a student's critical thinking, expand a researcher's analytical capacity, or free an administrator from repetitive tasks [1, 25, 27]. It should never replace the intellectual effort that makes education meaningful. UNESCO's 2025 report put it plainly: the future of education belongs to educators, not to algorithms [28, 29].

4.2 Academic Integrity

Academic work submitted at DIU must be authentic. The person whose name appears on an assignment, thesis, or publication bears full responsibility for its content including any AI-assisted portions. Using AI without disclosure in assessed work is academic misconduct, full stop [8, 9, 13, 14]. This principle does not prohibit AI use. It requires honesty about it.

4.3 Transparency and Attribution

If AI contributed to a piece of work, that contribution must be visible. Transparency here has three layers: accountability (who bears responsibility for the AI-assisted decision), interpretability (how AI outputs shaped the final product), and explainability (why AI was used for this particular task) [1, 3, 19]. The specific attribution requirements appear in Section 10.0.

4.4 Fairness and Equity

AI must not widen existing inequalities at DIU. On one side, this means being alert to bias selection bias in training data, algorithmic bias in outputs [1]. On the other, it means confronting the access question head-on. When 97.6% of DIU's community already uses AI daily [2], equitable access to quality AI tools is not a philosophical concern. It is a practical one. DIU will work to ensure that subscription-based AI tools do not create a two-tier student experience [3].

4.5 Data Privacy and Security

The 2025 survey flagged privacy and security as the number-one concern among DIU stakeholders, cited by 64.1% of respondents [2]. The rule is straightforward: do not feed sensitive, confidential, or personally identifiable information into public AI tools unless proper safeguards and authorization are in place [6, 15, 16]. All data handling must comply with Bangladeshi law and DIU's Data Protection Policy [1, 31].

4.6 Accountability

If you submit it, you own it. Every individual who uses AI at DIU whether student, faculty member, or administrator is responsible for the quality, accuracy, and integrity of the final product. AI hallucinations, factual errors, and biased outputs cannot be blamed on the machine. They are the user's responsibility [6, 8, 9].

4.7 Sustainability

Training and running large AI models consumes enormous computational resources and generates significant carbon emissions. DIU acknowledges this environmental cost. Where practical, users should prefer energy-efficient models and avoid unnecessary large-scale AI processing [1].

4.8 Continuous Adaptation

AI moves fast. Policy must keep pace. This guideline will be reviewed at least every six months, a cycle supported by 73.3% of survey respondents who wanted semi-annual or continuous updates [2]. The Harvard metaLAB recommended the same cadence: semester-by-semester review [5]. The AI Governance Committee (Section 14.0) owns this review cycle.

5.0 AI Use Classification System

One-size-fits-all rules do not work for a university with departments ranging from computer science to English to Law. What makes sense for a coding assignment may be entirely inappropriate for a literary analysis essay. DIU therefore adopts a three-tier classification, GREEN, AMBER, and RED, adapted from the University of Oxford's summative assessment framework [12, 13] and similar traffic-light systems now used across Russell Group institutions in the UK [3, 20, 21].

Faculty members designate the applicable tier for each course and, where needed, for individual assignments. This classification must appear in the course outline or syllabus.

Tier	What Is Permitted	Practical Examples
GREEN	AI use is allowed with acknowledgment. Students may use AI freely for the task, so long as they disclose and document that use following the requirements in Section 10.0.	Brainstorming ideas; getting grammar and style feedback; generating search terms for a literature review; creating flashcards or mind maps; exploring a concept through AI conversation; scaffolding code for a non-assessed prototype [6, 13].
AMBER	AI use is allowed only after the course instructor gives explicit, written approval. The instructor specifies exactly which parts of the work may involve AI. Full disclosure is required.	Drafting paragraphs in a literature review; polishing language in near-final drafts; writing data-cleaning scripts; creating AI-assisted visualizations; translating material between languages; summarizing source readings [13, 33].
RED	AI use is prohibited. The student must produce the work entirely on their own. This tier applies when the learning objective requires demonstrating independent thinking, analysis, or creative ability.	Writing the core analysis or discussion of a paper; drafting abstracts or conclusions; in-class exams and viva voce defenses; submitting AI-generated text as original work; entering confidential or research data into any public AI tool [6, 8, 13, 16].

What happens when a faculty member does not specify a tier? The default is **AMBER**. In other words, students may use AI only with prior instructor approval and full disclosure. This mirrors Stanford's approach: when no explicit guidance exists, treat AI assistance the same way you would treat help from another person [9].

DIU's survey data support this model. When asked how students should be guided on AI for assignments, 71.1% of respondents chose "explain ethical guidelines first," far outpacing both outright bans (14.1%) and unrestricted permission (10.6%) [2]. The three-tier system delivers exactly that: structured guidance, not prohibition.

6.0 Guidelines for Students

6.1 General Obligations

Students sit at the center of DIU's educational mission, and AI, when used well, can genuinely strengthen learning. But there is a crucial distinction between using AI to learn and using AI to avoid learning. The Harvard Graduate School of Education states it directly: shortcutting the

process of thinking and writing through AI "would rob you of the learning you came here to experience" [6]. That principle applies equally at DIU. Whatever AI tools a student uses, the final submitted work must reflect that student's own understanding. The name on the assignment means the thinking behind it is yours [6, 8, 9, 25].

6.2 Permitted Uses

What can students actually do with AI at DIU? Quite a lot provided the course instructor's classification allows it (Section 5.0). The range of legitimate uses starts with the basics: asking AI to generate review questions on a topic, or to help build flashcards and mind maps for exam preparation. Students can also use AI to compile preliminary reading lists, though every source on that list must be independently verified. Exploring an unfamiliar subject through back-and-forth conversation with an AI tool is permitted and can be genuinely useful for building conceptual understanding. So is brainstorming, outlining, requesting feedback on early drafts, and running their own writing through AI for grammar or language improvement [1, 6, 14]. One word matters throughout: *assist.* AI assists the student. The student does the thinking.

6.3 Prohibited Uses

Certain uses of AI are off-limits at DIU regardless of the classification tier. No student may submit AI-generated content as their own original work without proper attribution. Creating deepfakes or intentionally misleading content is forbidden. Using AI during RED-tier examinations or assessments is a serious violation. Students must not enter personal data, institutional records, or the work of other students into public AI platforms. Attempting to use AI to defeat plagiarism detection constitutes misconduct. And any AI use that violates DIU's Code of Conduct or Bangladeshi law is prohibited [1, 6, 8, 16].

6.4 Verification Responsibility

Here is something every DIU student needs to understand about AI: it lies with confidence. Large language models routinely generate plausible-sounding but entirely fabricated information fake citations to papers that do not exist, invented statistics, and factual claims with no basis in reality [6]. If a student incorporates such a hallucination into their work without checking, the student is responsible for the error. Not the AI. The 2025 survey showed that 70.9% of DIU respondents already grasp this they selected "check multiple reliable sources" as the right response when AI provides conflicting information [2]. That instinct is correct, and this Guideline makes it a requirement, not a suggestion.

6.5 Disclosure and Attribution

Every use of AI in assessed work must be disclosed, following the attribution requirements in Section 10.0 of this Guideline. The 2025 survey painted a clear picture of the current gap: only 25.2% of respondents consistently disclose AI use, while 20.9% believed using AI ideas without mentioning it was perfectly fine [2]. It is not. Undisclosed AI assistance in assessed work is academic misconduct at DIU (see Section 11.0).

7.0 Guidelines for Faculty

7.1 Course-Level AI Policy

Teaching a course at DIU now comes with an additional responsibility: setting clear ground rules for AI. This is not optional. Every course syllabus must specify four things. First, the AI Use Classification tier GREEN, AMBER, or RED that applies to the course overall and, where relevant, to specific assignments. Second, a plain-language explanation of what counts as acceptable versus unacceptable AI use in that course's context. Third, how students must document and attribute any AI assistance they receive. Fourth, what happens if those requirements are not followed [4, 7, 8, 11, 17]. Departments should coordinate so that students moving through a program encounter reasonably consistent expectations while leaving room for the genuine differences between, say, a coding course and a creative writing seminar [3, 10].

7.2 Assessment Design

The arrival of AI changes what exams and assignments can meaningfully test. A take-home essay question that could be answered in thirty seconds by ChatGPT is no longer measuring what it once measured. Faculty need to adapt. Some proven strategies: build assignments around personal experience, unique individual perspectives, or hands-on lab work that no AI can fake. Ask for process evidence drafts, prompt logs, reflective journals not just polished final products. Add oral components where students explain and defend what they submitted. Break larger projects into stages, permitting AI at some steps but restricting it at others [4, 8, 23, 24]. The goal is not to make assessments AI-proof. It is to make them learning-proof designed so that genuine engagement with the material remains the path of least resistance.

7.3 Faculty Use of AI in Teaching

Faculty themselves may and in many cases should use AI to strengthen their teaching. AI can help develop course materials, create assessment rubrics, personalize feedback for individual students, and handle routine instructional tasks more efficiently. When faculty use AI in preparing materials, they should tell their students. Modeling transparency is far more effective than merely demanding it [1, 4, 8].

One critical restriction applies here. Faculty must not rely on AI detection software (Turnitin's AI indicator, GPTZero, or similar tools) as the sole or primary basis for accusing a student of misconduct. These tools are advisory aids, not evidence. Their false-positive rates are well documented [5, 8, 23].

7.4 Handling Suspected AI Misuse

When something about a student's submission raises concern, faculty should respond with investigation, not accusation. Cornell University's evidence-based approach [8] provides a strong model. Start by examining whether the submission contains citations or references that do not actually exist a telltale sign of AI hallucination. Consider whether the work's sophistication or methodology exceeds what the course has covered. Ask the student to explain,

expand on, or defend the work verbally. Compare the submission against the student's earlier work for stylistic consistency. Before any formal proceeding begins, the evidence must meet a "clear and convincing" threshold [8]. And a direct conversation with the student should always come first.

8.0 Guidelines for Researchers

8.1 Research Integrity

Research is the backbone of any university's academic credibility. AI can support that work through literature searches, data analysis, hypothesis generation, or polishing manuscript language but it must never compromise the validity or reproducibility of research findings [12, 15]. One non-negotiable rule: AI tools cannot be listed as co-authors on publications. This aligns with the policies of Springer Nature, Elsevier, IEEE, and virtually every major academic publisher [32]. The human researcher bears complete responsibility for published content.

8.2 Disclosure in Publications

Any use of AI in research must be disclosed in the manuscript's methodology or acknowledgment section. The disclosure should name the specific tool (and its version), describe what the AI did (literature searching, language editing, data visualization, etc.), and indicate the extent of its contribution. Oxford [12], MIT [15], and Imperial College London [18] all require similar transparency, and major journal publishers increasingly demand it as a condition of submission.

8.3 Data Security in Research

Researchers at DIU must not input unpublished data, personally identifiable information, proprietary datasets, or confidential findings into any public AI tool. When AI-assisted analysis of sensitive research data is needed, it should happen within institutional or otherwise secured environments [6, 15, 16]. This restriction applies at every stage from data collection through manuscript preparation.

8.4 Thesis and Dissertation Supervision

Faculty who supervise undergraduate or postgraduate theses should set clear expectations about AI use from the very start of the supervision relationship. Which tasks are GREEN? Which are AMBER? Which are definitively RED? These agreements should be documented. Supervisors should require students to maintain prompt logs and iterative drafts as proof of process, and should review AI disclosure statements as part of the regular supervision workflow [32, 33]. For a practical benchmark, Princeton now requires a generative AI disclosure statement on the thesis cover page, with prompt-and-output records available in appendices [22].

9.0 Guidelines for Administrative Employees

9.1 Operational Efficiency

AI offers real gains for university administration, faster document drafting, streamlined clearance processes, better-organized data, and smarter reporting. DIU encourages administrative employees to explore these efficiencies [1]. The 2025 survey confirmed broad enthusiasm: 71.1% of administrative respondents saw AI as having a significant impact on student services and administrative operations [2]. The principle is simple. Use AI to work smarter, but always keep a human in the loop for final decisions.

9.2 Prohibited Administrative Uses

Administrative employees at DIU must not access, modify, or process another person's data without proper authorization. They must not use AI to produce content that enables harassment, threats, defamation, or any form of discrimination. No sensitive, restricted, or protected institutional data may be entered into public AI tools without formal internal review. And AI outputs must never serve as the sole basis for HR decisions; competent human judgment remains essential [1, 30].

9.3 Official Communications

When AI helps draft an official communication, report, or institutional document, the responsible officer must review every word before it goes out. AI-generated text in official contexts needs to be checked for factual accuracy, appropriateness of tone, and compliance with DIU's institutional standards. The officer's name on the document means the officer owns its content.

10.0 Attribution and Citation Requirements

Version 1.0 told users to "disclose the usage" of AI but never specified what that disclosure should look like [1]. The result was predictable: only 25.2% of respondents in the 2025 survey consistently disclosed AI use, and 16.8% said they simply did not know when disclosure was expected [2]. This section closes that gap with concrete, enforceable standards.

10.1 Mandatory Disclosure Statement

Whenever a student, faculty member, or administrator submits work that involves AI tools, an "AI Use Disclosure Statement" must accompany the submission. Think of it as a brief appendix. This approach draws from the Harvard metaLAB [5] and Cornell [8]. Five elements are required. Name the tool be specific: not just "ChatGPT" but "ChatGPT-4o" or "Claude 3.5 Sonnet." Describe the task: brainstorming? drafting? data analysis? code generation? Include the prompts you entered, at least the significant ones. Explain how you evaluated what the AI gave back what you kept, what you changed, what you threw out. And finally, confirm that the submitted work reflects your own understanding and intellectual contribution, not a copy-paste job.

10.2 In-Text Citation Format

When AI-generated content is directly quoted or substantially incorporated into academic work, it must be cited in the text using APA 7th edition format [34]. Here is the recommended approach:

Example: When prompted with "Explain the significance of HCI in product design," ChatGPT indicated that [paraphrased content] (OpenAI, 2026).

Reference entry: OpenAI. (2026). ChatGPT (Mar 15 version) [Large language model]. https://chat.openai.com

This format follows APA Style guidance [34] and is consistent with the citation practices in place at Cornell [8], Imperial College London [18], and across Russell Group universities [3].

10.3 Faculty Disclosure

Faculty who use AI to prepare course materials, design assessments, or generate student feedback should acknowledge that use to their students. This is not about policing it is about modeling. If instructors are transparent about their own AI use, students are far more likely to be transparent about theirs [4, 8].

11.0 Academic Integrity and AI

11.1 What Constitutes Academic Misconduct

What crosses the line at DIU? Several things. Handing in AI-generated text as though you wrote it yourself, without any attribution. Running a RED-tier exam through an AI tool. Staying silent about AI help when your course classification says you must disclose it. Making up a fake AI Use Disclosure Statement that is a fabrication, treated the same as data falsification. Deploying AI specifically to get around plagiarism safeguards. And here is one that catches students off guard: submitting a paper full of AI hallucinations, fabricated citations, and invented statistics as though those were findings from your own research [8, 9, 13, 14]. If the AI made it up and you did not bother to check, the responsibility is still yours.

11.2 Position on AI Detection Tools

DIU does not endorse AI detection software, whether Turnitin's AI writing indicator, GPTZero, or any similar product, as the sole or primary basis for determining academic misconduct. The false-positive problem is well documented: students who wrote every word themselves have been wrongly flagged [5, 8]. Detection tools offer one data point among many, not a verdict [23]. Faculty should rely instead on the evidence-based approach in Section 7.4, emphasizing proof of process over algorithmic suspicion [23, 24].

11.3 Proof of Process

Rather than trying to catch AI use after the fact, DIU adopts a prevention-first model. Students may be asked to maintain and submit documentation showing how their work developed over time: sequential drafts, AI prompt logs, reflective notes on how they evaluated and modified AI

outputs, and records showing genuine intellectual progression. This "proof of process" approach is now standard practice at universities around the world [23, 24]. It protects honest students from false accusations and makes deliberate dishonesty much harder to sustain [5, 24].

12.0 Data Privacy and Security

Privacy topped the list of stakeholder concerns in the 2025 survey, cited by 64.1% of respondents [2].

12.1 Data Classification for AI Use

DIU classifies data into three tiers for the purpose of AI interaction, drawing on MIT's framework [15]: **Public data** (freely available information may be used with any AI tool); **Internal data** (institutional information not meant for public release, such as internal reports or unpublished curricula may be used only with approved institutional AI tools); and **restricted data** (personal records, student data, financial information, unpublished research, and proprietary content must never be entered into any public AI tool) [6, 15, 16].

12.2 Intellectual Property

Users should be aware that content entered into public AI platforms may be absorbed into the tool's training data and could lose confidentiality [6]. Uploading original creative or research work to AI tools may jeopardize intellectual property rights. For work involving original ideas, DIU recommends using institution-approved or sandboxed AI environments wherever possible.

13.0 AI Literacy and Training

The training gap at DIU is stark. Nearly half (49%) of survey respondents have received no AI training at all, though they want it. Only 14% have had anything formal [2]. At the same time, 66.2% identified ethical AI principles as their top training priority, followed by practical tool tutorials (52.4%) and preparation for future technology shifts (48.5%) [2]. The Russell Group's foundational principle that universities must support students and staff in becoming AI-literate applies directly [3, 26].

13.1 Training Program

DIU will develop and deliver a structured AI literacy program. Content will include: this Guideline's requirements and the reasoning behind them; hands-on tutorials with AI tools relevant to each discipline; skills for spotting bias and detecting hallucinations; techniques for verifying AI-generated outputs; data privacy and security practices; and discipline-specific applications. Delivery formats will reflect stakeholder preferences: in-person workshops (34.9%), online self-paced modules (24.1%), video tutorials (16.3%), and interactive case studies (15.2%) [2].

13.2 Orientation and Onboarding

Every incoming student will receive an introduction to this Guideline and basic AI literacy training during orientation week. Faculty will receive training on the classification system, AI-aware assessment design, and the evidence-based approach to suspected misuse. Administrative employees will receive role-specific training focused on operational AI applications and data security [3, 26].

13.3 Continuous Learning Resources

DIU will maintain an online repository of AI literacy materials accessible through GoEdu and IoU, including tutorials, best practices, frequently asked questions, and updated guidance as AI technologies evolve [1].

14.0 Governance and Oversight

14.1 AI Governance Committee

An AI Governance Committee will be established to oversee this Guideline's implementation, conduct periodic reviews, and recommend updates. Its membership will include faculty from multiple disciplines, administrative representatives, IT and technical staff, student representatives, and external experts as needed. Its responsibilities are monitoring compliance, commissioning reviews, proposing amendments, resolving policy conflicts, advising on AI procurement, and maintaining records of AI-related incidents. The 2025 survey showed broad agreement that multiple stakeholder groups should participate: IT specialists (58.1%), students (54.5%), and faculty (54%) were the top three choices [2].

14.2 Departmental Responsibility

Each academic department will designate an AI liaison, a faculty member who serves as the department's point of contact for AI policy questions, helps colleagues implement the classification system, gathers feedback, and ensures discipline-specific guidance is developed where needed. This follows Stanford's model of embedding AI policy at the departmental level [10] and the Russell Group's recognition that "appropriate uses of generative AI tools are likely to differ between academic disciplines" [3].

15.0 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Review

15.1 Review Cycle

This guideline will be reviewed every six months. That timeline reflects what 73.3% of survey respondents asked for [2]. Each review will examine compliance rates and awareness levels, emerging AI technologies that may affect existing provisions, stakeholder feedback, shifts in international regulatory or best-practice frameworks, and academic integrity data related to AI use.

15.2 Monitoring Mechanisms

How will DIU know whether this guideline is working? Through multiple channels, not just one. Bi-annual surveys will track awareness, usage patterns, and satisfaction across all stakeholder groups. Where institutional AI tools are deployed, usage analytics will provide quantitative data. Each department's AI liaison will file compliance reports. Both digital feedback forms and old-fashioned suggestion boxes will remain available. And periodic focus group discussions, the same method that grounded Version 1.0, will give qualitative depth to the numbers [1, 2].

15.3 Reporting

The AI Governance Committee will publish an annual report covering implementation progress, key findings, challenges, stakeholder input, and forward-looking recommendations. Quarterly progress updates will be prepared for internal use [1].

16.0 Non-Compliance Framework

Version 1.0 addressed non-compliance in just two sentences [1]. That was insufficient. The graduated framework below balances accountability with fairness, drawing on the evidence-based models at Cornell [8] and Stanford [9].

16.1 Graduated Response for Students

Level	Nature of Violation	Response	Determined By
Level 1	First-time, minor infraction: missing AI disclosure statement; incomplete attribution in GREEN-tier work.	Educational response: one-on-one counseling on AI ethics and attribution; chance to resubmit with proper disclosure. No permanent record.	Course Instructor
Level 2	Repeat minor or moderate violation: undisclosed AI use in AMBER-tier work; submitting lightly edited AI output as original.	Mandatory resubmission; grade reduction on the assignment; formal written warning from department; required AI ethics training module.	Course Instructor + Department Head
Level 3	Serious: AI used in RED-tier assessment; fabricated disclosure statement; entirely	Failing grade on assignment or course; formal misconduct proceedings; notation on	Departmental Academic Integrity Committee

	AI-generated work submitted as original.	academic record; possible suspension.	
Level 4	Severe or repeated Level 3: pattern of deliberate violations; AI used to compromise exam integrity; commercial exploitation of AI-generated academic work.	Expulsion proceedings; degree revocation if discovered post-graduation; referral to law enforcement if criminal conduct is involved.	University Disciplinary Committee

16.2 Due Process

Fairness requires due process at every level. The accused individual has the right to know the specific allegation, to present their account and any supporting evidence (including proof of process records), to have the case reviewed by someone other than the accuser, and to appeal. Determinations must rest on evidence meeting the "clear and convincing" standard [8]. To be absolutely explicit: an AI detection tool score, standing alone, is never sufficient evidence for disciplinary action at any level [5, 8, 23].

16.3 Faculty and Staff Non-Compliance

Faculty and administrative employees who violate this Guideline will be addressed through existing university HR and professional conduct procedures. Relevant violations include: failing to include an AI policy in a course syllabus; using AI in research publications without disclosure; inputting sensitive data into public AI tools; or using detection tool scores as the sole basis for accusing a student of cheating.

17.0 Communication and Dissemination

More than half of DIU's community did not know the Version 1.0 guidelines existed [2]. That failure cannot be repeated. Version 2.0 requires a deliberate, multi-channel dissemination effort.

17.1 Dissemination Channels

Where will people find this Guideline? Everywhere they look. On the DIU website front and center, not buried three clicks deep in a policy archive. In orientation sessions for every new student and employee. During departmental meetings and faculty development workshops. Through email, sent directly to every stakeholder when the Guideline is adopted and again whenever it changes. In the student handbook and the faculty handbook. On notice boards physical and digital across campus. On learning management systems. On DIU's social media channels. The point is redundancy. If someone at DIU does not know this Guideline exists, the dissemination strategy has failed.

17.2 Ongoing Awareness

The AI Governance Committee will keep awareness alive through at least one university-wide AI event per semester, timely updates whenever the Guideline is revised, integration of AI ethics into departmental discussions and program activities, and a dedicated DIU webpage serving as the single authoritative source for all AI-related institutional guidance.

18.0 Amendments and Version Control

Version	Date	Description	Approved By
1.0	19 September 2024	Initial release as DIU GenAI Guideline. Six principles, three stakeholder categories, and an FGD-based development process.	DIU AI Policy Framing Committee
2.0	June 2026	Comprehensive revision. Broadened scope to all AI; GREEN/AMBER/RED classification system; mandatory attribution framework; graduated non-compliance; proof of process; AI detection tool position; research guidelines; international alignment.	Vice Chancellor, DIU

Future amendments follow the six-month review cycle in Section 15.1. The AI Governance Committee may issue minor clarifications without full VC re-approval. Substantive changes to principles, classification tiers, or non-compliance procedures require VC endorsement. All versions will be archived in the institutional repository.

19.0 AI Disclosure Declaration

In keeping with the transparency and attribution principles outlined in Sections 4.3 and 10.0 of this Guideline, the authors disclose that AI-assisted tools were employed during the preparation of this document. Specifically, large language model technology was used to support the following tasks: drafting preliminary text based on structured outlines and data inputs provided by the authors; synthesizing and cross-referencing international university AI policies identified through systematic review; formatting survey data (N = 743) into tabular summaries; and generating the initial APA 7th edition reference list from source materials collected by the lead author.

All substantive decisions, including the document's scope, structure, classification framework, guiding principles, non-compliance tiers, and policy positions, were determined by the human authors and reviewers named on the cover page. Every section underwent manual review, contextual editing, and institutional adaptation by the lead author (Kazi Jahid Hasan), with supervisory oversight from the Dean, Faculty of Science and Information Technology (Professor Dr. Md. Fokhray Hossain), peer review by the Head of the Department of Multimedia and Creative Technology (Md. Salah Uddin), and was acknowledged with endorsement by the committee of DIU AI Ethics and Implementation Guideline (Version 2.0).

The empirical data cited throughout this guideline, including all survey percentages, respondent counts, and cross-tabulated findings, were derived from primary data collected and analyzed independently by the lead author [2]. The identification, reading, and critical assessment of the 34 international reference sources were conducted by the lead author, with AI serving as a research support tool rather than an independent analytical agent.

This disclosure is made in accordance with the attribution standards this Guideline itself establishes (Section 10.1) and models the transparency that DIU expects from all members of its academic community. The practice aligns with the emerging norm across leading international institutions, where the responsible use of AI in institutional document preparation is acknowledged rather than concealed [4, 5, 8].

Appendix A: 2025 Stakeholder Survey Detailed Findings

Survey Title: AI Ethics and Implementation Guideline for Teaching, Research, and Administration Survey for DIU [2].

Survey Period: November 10 – December 17, 2025.

Total Respondents: N = 743.

Instrument: 24-question survey covering demographics, AI usage patterns, ethical awareness, policy preferences, training needs, and future expectations.

A.1 Respondent Demographics

A.1.1 Role Distribution

Respondent Category	Count	Percentage
Undergraduate Students	512	68.9%
Administrative Officials	108	14.5%
Faculty Members	106	14.3%
Graduate/Postgraduate Students	16	2.2%
Research Officials	1	0.1%

A.1.2 Top Responding Departments

Department	**Responses**	**Percentage**
CSE	157	21.1%
SWE	117	15.7%
Other	114	15.3%
EEE	51	6.9%
NFE	47	6.3%
English	43	5.8%
TE	29	3.9%

DBA	26	3.5%
Pharmacy / CIS	24 each	3.2% each
MCT	11	1.5%

A.1.3 Experience and Technical Comfort

Experience at DIU	Technical Comfort Level
Less than 1 year: 350 (47.1%)	Intermediate: 311 (41.9%)
1–2 years: 166 (22.3%)	Beginner: 226 (30.4%)
3–4 years: 132 (17.8%)	Advanced: 174 (23.4%)
5+ years: 95 (12.8%)	Expert: 32 (4.3%)

A.2 AI Adoption and Usage Patterns

A.2.1 AI Tools in Use

Tool Category	Users	Percentage
Text AI (ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude)	725	97.6%
Presentation AI (Gamma, Beautiful.AI)	275	37.0%
Code AI (GitHub Copilot, CodeT5)	183	24.6%
Image AI (DALL-E, Midjourney)	153	20.6%
Research AI (Elicit, Research Rabbit)	118	15.9%
Video AI (editing, generation)	111	14.9%
Voice AI (transcription, synthesis)	66	8.9%
None	7	0.9%

A.2.2 Frequency of AI Use

Frequency	Count	Percentage
Daily	498	67.0%
Several times per week	193	26.0%
Weekly	27	3.6%
Rarely	17	2.3%
Monthly	6	0.8%
Never	2	0.3%

A.2.3 Primary Purposes for AI Use

Purpose	Respondents	Percentage
Writing and editing	589	79.3%
Problem-solving	490	65.9%
Learning new concepts	469	63.1%
Research and analysis	463	62.3%
Teaching support	319	42.9%
Creative content	253	34.1%
Data processing	246	33.1%
Administrative tasks	176	23.7%

A.3 Ethical Awareness and Behavior

A.3.1 AI Training Status

Training Status	Count	Percentage
No, but interested	364	49.0%
Yes, self-taught	265	35.7%
Yes, formal training	104	14.0%
No, not interested	10	1.3%

A.3.2 Guideline Familiarity

Familiarity Level	Count	Percentage
Not familiar at all	240	32.3%
Heard about it	188	25.3%
Yes, very familiar	181	24.4%
Somewhat familiar	134	18.0%

A.3.3 AI Disclosure Behavior

Disclosure Practice	Count	Percentage
Sometimes disclose	310	41.7%
Always disclose	187	25.2%
Not sure when to disclose	125	16.8%
Rarely disclose	92	12.4%
Never disclose	29	3.9%

A.3.4 Self-Assessed AI Competence (Likert Scale, 1–5)

Statement	Mean	Median
I know my responsibilities when using AI	3.90	4.0
I understand potential risks of AI misuse	3.81	4.0
I always verify AI-generated information	3.58	4.0
I can identify biased AI outputs	3.44	4.0

A.4 Scenario-Based Ethical Judgments

A.4.1 Research Paper AI Use (Q12)

Response	Count	Percentage
Mention AI helped with brainstorming	364	49.0%
Only use AI for grammar checking	182	24.5%
Use ideas without mentioning AI	155	20.9%
Avoid using AI-suggested ideas	42	5.7%

A.4.2 Conflicting AI Information (Q13)

Response	Count	Percentage
Check multiple reliable sources	527	70.9%
Use the answer that seems better	96	12.9%
Ask AI to clarify the conflict	74	10.0%
Choose the most recent information	46	6.2%

A.5 Policy Preferences and Future Outlook

A.5.1 AI Policy Direction (Q21)

Preferred Approach	Count	Percentage
Balanced approach with clear guidelines	389	52.4%
Prioritize innovation, minimal restrictions	167	22.5%
Not sure	85	11.4%
Case-by-case evaluation	62	8.3%
Conservative approach, limit high-risk uses	40	5.4%

A.5.2 Guideline Review Frequency (Q23)

Preferred Frequency	Count	Percentage
Every 6 months	287	38.6%
Continuously updated	258	34.7%
Annually	101	13.6%
When major changes occur	86	11.6%
Every 2 years	11	1.5%

A.5.3 Top Concerns About AI (Q17)

Concern	Mentions	% of N
Privacy and security	476	64.1%
Over-dependence on AI	435	58.5%
Job displacement	348	46.8%
Loss of human skills	347	46.7%
Academic integrity	279	37.6%
Mental health impact	203	27.3%
Bias and fairness	161	21.7%
Cost and access	87	11.7%

A.5.4 Training Priorities (Q18)

Training Need	Mentions	% of N
Ethical AI use principles	492	66.2%
Practical tool tutorials	389	52.4%
Future technology preparation	360	48.5%
Risk identification	325	43.7%
Quality verification methods	303	40.8%
Discipline-specific applications	177	23.8%
Policy compliance	148	19.9%

A.5.5 Expected AI Impact in Next 3 Years (Q15)

Expected Change	Count	Percentage
Significant workflow changes	403	54.2%
Some helpful tools	178	24.0%
Complete transformation	92	12.4%
Minimal change	39	5.2%
Uncertain	31	4.2%

References

[1] DIU AI Policy Framing Committee. (2024, September 19). *DIU GenAI guideline (Version 1.0).* Daffodil International University.

[2] Hasan, K. J. (2025, November–December). *AI ethics and implementation guideline for teaching, research, and administration: Survey for DIU* [Survey dataset, N = 743]. Daffodil International University.

[3] Russell Group. (2023). *Russell Group principles on the use of generative AI tools in education.* https://www.russellgroup.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2025-01/Russell%20Group%20principles%20on%20generative%20AI%20in%20education.pdf

[4] Office of Academic Integrity and Student Conduct, Harvard University. (n.d.). *Academic integrity and teaching with(out) AI.* https://oaisc.fas.harvard.edu/academic-integrity-and-teaching-without-ai/

[5] Newman, S., Esfahany, K., & Atherton, D. (2023). *Proposed Harvard AI code of conduct.* metaLAB (at) Harvard. https://aicodeofconduct.mlml.io/

[6] Harvard Graduate School of Education. (2025). *HGSE policy on student use of generative artificial intelligence in academic work: Academic year 2025–2026.* https://registrar.gse.harvard.edu/learning/policies-forms/ai-policy

[7] Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning. (n.d.). *AI syllabus policies.* Harvard University. https://bokcenter.harvard.edu/ai-syllabus-policies

[8] Center for Teaching Innovation, Cornell University. (n.d.). *AI & academic integrity.* https://teaching.cornell.edu/generative-artificial-intelligence/ai-academic-integrity

[9] Board on Conduct Affairs, Stanford University. (2023, February 16). *Generative AI policy guidance.* https://communitystandards.stanford.edu/generative-ai-policy-guidance

[10] Stanford University. (2025, October). Academic integrity working group addresses generative AI and exam policies. *Stanford Report.* https://news.stanford.edu/stories/2025/10/academic-integrity-working-group-generative-ai-exam-policies

[11] Center for Teaching and Learning, Duke University. (2025, August 26). *Artificial intelligence policies: Guidelines and considerations.* https://ctl.duke.edu/ai-and-teaching-at-duke-2/artificial-intelligence-policies-in-syllabi-guidelines-and-considerations/

[12] University of Oxford. (n.d.). *Policy for using generative AI in research.* https://www.ox.ac.uk/research/support-researchers/research-practice/policy-generative-ai-research

[13] University of Oxford. (n.d.). *AI use in summative assessment.* Education Committee. https://governance.admin.ox.ac.uk/education-committee/policies/ai-use-in-summative-assessment

[14] University of Cambridge. (n.d.). *Using generative AI: Guidance for students.* https://blendedlearning.cam.ac.uk/artificial-intelligence-and-education/using-generative-ai

[15] Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (n.d.). *AI guidance: Information Systems & Technology.* https://ist.mit.edu/ai-guidance

[16] Office of the Senior Vice Provost, Columbia University. (n.d.). *AI policy.* https://provost.columbia.edu/content/office-senior-vice-provost/ai-policy

[17] UCLA Center for Education Innovation and Learning in the Sciences. (2025, April). *Creating a generative AI policy for your course.* https://teaching.ucla.edu/news/creating-a-generative-ai-policy-for-your-course/

[18] Imperial College London. (2025, March). *Generative AI principles.* https://www.imperial.ac.uk/students/academic-support/ai-and-study-guidance-hub/generative-ai-principles/

[19] ETH Zurich. (n.d.). *Generative AI in teaching and learning: Guidelines.* https://ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/main/eth-zurich/education/ai_in_education/Generative%20AI%20in%20Teaching%20and%20Learning%20-%20Guidelines%20ETH.pdf

[20] Queen Mary University of London. (n.d.). *University AI principles, guidance and policies.* Queen Mary Academy. https://www.qmul.ac.uk/queenmaryacademy/

[21] University of Bristol. (n.d.). *Our commitment to the Russell Group principles.* https://www.bristol.ac.uk/bilt/

[22] Giugliano, A. (2025, October 16). Generative AI policies at the world's top universities: October 2025 update. *Thesify.* https://www.thesify.ai/blog/gen-ai-policies-update-2025

[23] WriteBros.ai. (2026, February 21). AI is not banned It's regulated: 25 AI university policies you should know (2026). *WriteBros.ai Blog.* https://writebros.ai/blog/ai-university-policies-you-should-know

[24] Paper Checker. (2026, February). University AI policies 2026: Global tracker for students. *Paper Checker Hub.* https://hub.paper-checker.com/blog/university-ai-policies-2026-tracker/

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

[26] UNESCO. (2024, August). *AI competency framework for teachers.* https://www.unesco.org/en/digital-education/artificial-intelligence

[27] UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence.* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

[28] UNESCO. (2025). *AI and the future of education: Disruptions, dilemmas and directions.* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

[29] Kim, T. (2026, January 5). Summary of UNESCO AI and the future of education. *CIDDL.* https://ciddl.org/summary-of-unesco-ai-and-the-future-of-education/

[30] European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2024). *Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (Artificial Intelligence Act).* Official Journal of the European Union.

[31] Government of Bangladesh. (2024). *National artificial intelligence guideline 2024 (Draft).* Ministry of Science and Technology.

[32] Thesify. (2025). Navigating AI policies for PhD students in 2025: A doctoral researcher's guide. *Thesify.* https://www.thesify.ai/blog/phd-ai-policies-2025

[33] Thesify. (2025). Supervising with AI in 2025: Policies, templates, and assessment practice. *Thesify.* https://www.thesify.ai/blog/ai-policies-for-professors-and-phd-supervisors-2025

[34] McAdoo, T. (2023, April 7). How to cite ChatGPT. *APA Style Blog.* https://apastyle.apa.org/blog/how-to-cite-chatgpt