

APPROVED BY:

ISM University of Management and Economics
Rector's Order of 2025 09 25
No. 2025/01-07-92

ISM UNIVERSITY OF MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE POLICY

1. Policy Statement and Purpose

ISM University of Management and Economics recognizes Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a powerful tool that can enhance education, research, and administrative decision-making. In line with ISM's mission to "*challenge present and empower change*," the university is committed to leveraging AI to improve learning outcomes and operational efficiency, while upholding the highest standards of academic integrity, ethics, and compliance with all applicable laws. This policy establishes a framework for the responsible and ethical use of AI within the ISM community (students, faculty, and staff). It aims to ensure that AI technologies are used in ways that augment human capabilities and enrich our academic environment, without compromising our core values of honesty, transparency, fairness, and excellence. The policy will be reviewed annually (or as needed) by the AI Policy Governance Committee to remain current with technological advancements and regulatory developments.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all members of the ISM community – including faculty, students, administrative staff, and any other affiliates – whenever they utilize AI tools or systems in the context of university-related activities. This includes:

- **Teaching and Learning:** Use of AI in classroom instruction, course content development, assignments, and evaluations.
- **Research:** Use of AI in academic research activities, publications, and creative work conducted by or on behalf of ISM.
- **Administration and Services:** Use of AI in managerial, operational, or support functions of the university (e.g. admissions, student services, marketing, IT services, HR, facilities management).

For the purposes of this policy, "Artificial Intelligence tools" include software, applications, or systems that perform tasks which typically require human intelligence – such as natural language generation (e.g. chatbots, text completion tools), data analysis and pattern recognition (machine learning algorithms), image or video generation, decision support systems, and other emerging AI technologies. "Generative AI" refers to AI that produces novel content (text, images, audio, code, etc.) in response to prompts.

3. Guiding Principles

All use of AI at ISM University must adhere to the following guiding principles:

- **3.1 Human-Centered & Educational Value:** AI should be used to *augment* and support human learning, decision-making, and creativity – not to replace the human role outright. In the context of education, AI deployments should align with pedagogical objectives and improve the quality of teaching or learning. We adopt a “human-in-the-loop” approach: AI may provide input or automation, but human judgment has the final say in academic and administrative matters.
- **3.2 Fairness & Non-Discrimination:** AI systems used at ISM must be vetted for bias and if a risk of bias is identified, it must be clearly disclosed by the AI policy Governance Committee. They should not produce or reinforce unfair discrimination against any individual or group based on characteristics such as gender, race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, or any other protected attribute. ISM will favor AI tools that have been tested for fairness and will monitor outcomes to ensure equitable treatment of all students and staff. If an AI system is found to yield biased results, it must be corrected or its use discontinued.
- **3.3 Transparency & Accountability:** The ISM community should be transparent about when and how AI is being used. Whenever AI contributes to content (in an assignment, publication, or official document), that contribution should be disclosed and appropriately referenced (see Academic Use section for citation requirements). Likewise, if an administrative decision was informed significantly by an AI analysis, those affected should be informed of the AI’s role upon request. Humans remain accountable for decisions made and work done with assistance from AI. Simply put, using “the AI did it” as an excuse is not acceptable – users must take responsibility for AI-assisted outputs.
- **3.4 Academic Integrity:** ISM’s existing academic integrity and honesty policies fully extend to the use of AI. Any attempt to use AI tools to cheat, plagiarize, fabricate answers, or otherwise gain an unfair academic advantage is a violation of our Code of Ethics. Community members are expected to use AI in an honest manner, which includes crediting AI for its contributions and ensuring that one’s own understanding and effort are central to any submitted work. The presence of AI does not change our fundamental expectations: submitted academic work must reflect the knowledge and skills of the student or researcher involved.
- **3.5 Privacy & Data Protection:** All usage of AI at ISM must comply with data protection laws (GDPR) and respect individual privacy and confidentiality. No personally identifiable or sensitive university data (e.g., student records, personal details, confidential research data, proprietary business information) should be input into any third-party AI service unless that service has been approved by ISM IT and legal offices for such use. Users should assume content given to a public AI tool (especially many free online generative AI tools) may be stored or seen by others and must refrain from entering confidential information. ISM will prioritize AI solutions that offer data privacy guarantees (for instance, self-hosted models or contracts that ensure data is not retained or used for training by the provider). Additionally, users must be aware that if an AI tool retains user-generated data, generated texts may later be detected by plagiarism detection tools as matches. Such instances will be considered plagiarism because ISM cannot verify the uniqueness or originality of the text as solely generated by the individual student.
- **3.6 Safety & Reliability:** AI tools used should be reliable and safe. This means they should be sufficiently accurate for the intended purpose and have measures to prevent highly erroneous or harmful outputs. Users should exercise critical thinking and double-check important AI-generated information, especially in high-stakes situations (e.g. an AI tutor’s explanation of a concept should be verified against trusted sources). If an AI system is interactive (like a chatbot), users should not rely on it for legal, medical, or other professional advice without

verification. ISM will provide guidance on the limits of specific AI tools. Any AI system that is found to generate misleading or inappropriate content in our context should be reported to the relevant department (e.g. IT or the course instructor) for review.

- **3.7 Compliance with Law and Policy:** All AI use must comply with Lithuanian law, European Union regulations (including the forthcoming EU AI Act provisions), and the policies of ISM University. Where regulations impose stricter requirements (for example, if the EU classifies certain educational AI applications as high-risk, requiring transparency or human oversight), ISM will integrate those requirements into practice.

These principles provide a lens through which all specific policies below should be interpreted. They ensure that, as AI technologies evolve, ISM's community maintains a consistent ethical stance.

4. Academic Use of AI (Teaching, Learning and Assessment)

4.1 For Faculty (Teaching & Assessment Design):

- *Faculty Discretion and Responsibility:* Instructors have the discretion to determine if and how AI tools are used in their courses, both by themselves and by students. They should articulate their course-specific AI policy in the syllabus and discuss it with students at the start of the course.

For each major assignment or exam, instructors should clarify (in writing) whether use of AI tools is permitted, limited in specific ways, or prohibited. Faculty are encouraged to integrate AI in ways that enhance learning – e.g., using AI to demonstrate concepts, or permitting students to use AI for preliminary research or idea generation – while ensuring that the student's own effort is still meeting learning objectives (like critical thinking or writing skills). In all cases, instructors must ensure that AI use (or non-use) expectations are fair, clearly explained, and consistently enforced. Faculty who allows AI assistance in student work must require proper attribution from students (see 4.2 below) and should design assessments in a way that still accurately evaluates student learning (for example, focusing grading on how students analyze or interpret AI outputs, rather than the AI-generated text itself). Instructors continue to hold the same responsibility as before the use of AI — to ensure the accuracy of any facts or information they rely on, including content generated by AI tools.

- *Use of AI by Faculty in Teaching:* Faculty may use AI tools to aid in preparing teaching materials (for instance, generating quiz questions, illustrating examples, creating first drafts of lecture notes or case studies). However, they should review and edit AI-generated material for accuracy and appropriateness before using it in class, just as they would review any content sourced from the internet or textbooks. If AI is used to produce content that is shared directly with students (e.g. an AI-generated summary or an image), faculty should disclose this to students in an appropriate way, especially if it's not obvious. (Example: "This case scenario was partly generated with the assistance of an AI tool and then refined by the instructor.") This transparency helps model the ethical use of AI to students. Faculty should not rely on AI for any evaluative tasks that require human judgment about a student's performance; for example, grading should not be delegated to AI unless it's a straightforward objective quiz, and even then, oversight is needed. All grading remains the responsibility of the instructor to ensure fairness. Additionally, users must be aware that if an AI tool retains user-generated data, generated texts may later be detected by plagiarism detection tools as matches. Such instances will be considered plagiarism because ISM cannot verify the uniqueness or originality of the text as solely generated by the individual student.

- **Preventing Misuse:** Faculty are advised to design assessments that minimize opportunities for academic dishonesty via AI. This might include in-class assessments, personalized oral defenses of written work, progressive assignments that require drafts (thus making purely AI-generated final submissions easier to detect), or assignments focusing on personal reflection or recent class discussions that generic AI would not easily reproduce. The goal is not to “ban” AI, but to ensure that assessments truly gauge student learning. Faculty should also be attentive to factual inaccuracies and inappropriate or incorrect terminology generated by AI, especially in disciplines with highly specialized terminology (e.g., finance, etc.), where AI may introduce terms unfamiliar to students. If faculty suspect a student has used AI in a prohibited manner, it should be handled as an academic misconduct case, with evidence gathered (such as unusual fluency, factual errors, inappropriate terminology, or known AI quirks in the submission) and due process per ISM’s academic ethics procedures. Faculty should refrain from using unreliable AI-detection tools as sole evidence of cheating, given their high error rates; instead, suspicions should be vetted with a combination of tools and academic judgment. The university will support faculty with training on how to detect and address AI-related dishonesty appropriately.

4.2 For Students (Learning & Assignments):

- **Permissible Use:** Students may use AI tools to assist their learning and research process except where explicitly disallowed by the instructor or by this policy. Permissible uses include: practicing problems with an AI tutor, asking a generative AI for explanations of course concepts (as a supplement to textbooks and lectures), brainstorming ideas for essays or projects, getting suggestions for coding assignments, improving writing mechanics (grammar or style) in drafts, and other formative or preparatory activities. When in doubt about whether a certain use of AI is allowed, students should seek clarification from their instructor before using it. Students are encouraged to discuss with instructors how AI might be used beneficially in a course—this open dialogue can help set healthy norms (e.g., a student might ask “Can I have ChatGPT check my grammar on this report?” and the instructor can then advise). Additionally, students must retain records or transcripts of their interactions with AI tools (such as ChatGPT or other generative platforms) until the end of the semester or another specified duration determined by the instructor. This documentation must be available to provide evidence if concerns or suspicions arise about improper AI usage. In group projects, all group members are responsible for ensuring AI tools (if used) are utilized according to the rules; the group should openly communicate about any AI-derived content among members.
- **Prohibited Use (Cheating/Plagiarism):** Students are strictly prohibited from using AI tools to generate content for any assignment, project, paper, presentation, or exam that they then submit as if it were their own work. Unless an instructor has explicitly allowed AI-generated material in a submission (and it is properly credited), assuming authorship of AI content is considered plagiarism. For example, inputting an essay prompt into an AI, receiving a full essay, and turning in that essay - even with minor edits—is an act of academic dishonesty at ISM. Similarly, using AI to solve a problem or complete a take-home exam and presenting the answer as solely one’s own understanding violates this policy. If AI is used in a manner contrary to an instructor’s stated rules (for instance, using it on homework intended to be completed independently), that is an infraction. Students must also refrain from using AI to fabricate sources or data, such as asking an AI to generate references or false interview content. Any invented or AI-fabricated information presented as real constitutes serious academic misconduct (falsification of data). ISM will treat such incidents under its academic misconduct procedures, which may result in sanctions including a failing grade, academic probation, or termination of the student’s study contract. The policy aligns with ISM’s academic standards:

work submitted must reflect a student's own analysis and effort, and any external assistance (human or AI) must be explicitly authorized and appropriately credited.

- **Required Attribution:** When students do make use of AI as an authorized aid in their work, they must **acknowledge it clearly**. This means:
 - **In-text citation or notation** indicating the use of the AI, and
 - A **reference entry** for the AI tool, in an appropriate format (e.g. APA citation for the tool and version/date, as provided in ISM's citation guidelines).

For instance, if a student used ChatGPT to help draft a section of a report, the final report might include a footnote or parenthetical note like, "*Drafted with assistance from ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2024 version), which provided an initial summary of Apple's 2023 financial report.*" And in the references or bibliography: "OpenAI. (2024). ChatGPT [Large Language Model, Jan 2024 version]. <https://chat.openai.com/>". Additionally, the student should in their methodology or an appendix describe what was done (e.g. "We prompted the AI with XYZ and used it to generate a list of factors, which we then verified and expanded upon."). The aim is full transparency – an instructor or reader should never be misled about which parts of the work were human-generated and which parts had AI involvement.

- **Quality Control and Verification:** Students who use AI tools should critically review and, if necessary, correct or improve the AI-generated content they incorporate. AI outputs can contain inaccuracies ("hallucinations"), outdated information, or biases. It is the student's duty to verify facts (via reliable sources) and ensure that any analysis or conclusions drawn from AI assistance are valid. For example, if an AI provides a statistical figure or quote, the student should cross-check it and they should cite the actual source, not AI in that case. If an AI translates a text or summarizes an article, the student should read the original to confirm its fidelity. Work that appears unvetted (for instance, an essay that includes obviously false statements from an AI) will be marked down, and repeating such uncritical use despite feedback may be considered academic negligence. Students should think of AI as a knowledgeable but fallible assistant – helpful for speeding up tasks, but not a substitute for their own critical thought. Embracing AI in learning at ISM comes with the expectation that students will *learn to use it responsibly*.

4.3 Assessments and Examinations:

- In supervised, closed-book exam settings (onsite or proctored online exams), the use of AI or any external tool is by default prohibited unless explicitly allowed as part of the exam tools. ISM will treat any attempt to consult AI during a closed exam as cheating (analogous to using a hidden smartphone or notes).
- For take-home exams or open-ended projects, instructors will specify the extent of AI use allowed. Some assessments may be labeled as "AI-assisted work allowed with citation," whereas others may be "AI-free: your own analysis only." Students must adhere to these specifications. If not stated, students should assume the same rules as for assignments (AI assistance allowed only if cited and only for non-prohibited portions of the task).
- The evaluation criteria will be aligned with the policy: instructors will grade the student's understanding, reasoning, originality, and proper attribution. Using AI won't inherently result in a better or worse grade; what matters is how appropriately the student uses it (or abstains from it) to demonstrate their learning and how transparently its use is specified.
- ISM is exploring the use of viva voce (oral defense) or follow-up interviews for major projects and theses, where students may be asked to discuss and explain their work in person. This practice serves as an additional integrity check in an era where AI can generate polished text—

the student's ability to articulate and answer questions about their submission is critical. If a student is unable to clearly explain or articulate the content and arguments presented in their written submission during the oral defense, the project or thesis may be evaluated negatively, regardless of the quality of the written work submitted.

4.4 Faculty & Student Support:

- Training sessions (workshops, webinars) will be held periodically for both faculty and students on topics such as "Academic Integrity in the Age of AI," "How to Use AI Tools for Studying Effectively," and "Designing Assignments in Light of AI."
- The AI Policy Governance Committee will maintain a list of recommended AI tools that students and faculty can use (which have been vetted for security and usefulness) as well as a list of banned tools if any (e.g. AI services known to facilitate plagiarism).

5. Research Use of AI

The use of AI in faculty or student research projects in any level of studies must also conform to the principles of integrity, transparency, and rigor:

- **5.1 AI-Assisted Research and Writing:** Researchers (faculty or students) who use AI tools to gather information, analyze data, or draft text for publications, reports, or theses should acknowledge this assistance in their methodology or acknowledgments, as appropriate. For instance, if a literature review section was generated in part by an AI summarizer, the author should state that and double-check the summaries against actual sources. Under no circumstances should AI be listed as an author of a publication; per international scholarly ethics (e.g. COPE guidelines), authorship implies responsibility and contribution that an AI cannot shoulder. Instead, any significant AI contribution can be noted in the acknowledgments (e.g. "Research assistant and tools: We utilized [AI Tool] to help with data coding and initial trend detection.").
- **5.2 Data Management:** When using AI for data analysis, researchers must ensure that the data input (especially personal data) is handled in compliance with research ethics and privacy laws. If the research data is confidential or sensitive (such as interview transcripts, proprietary datasets, or personal data), researchers should use AI tools offline or on secure ISM-provided platforms where the data will not be uploaded to external servers. Alternatively, data should be anonymized before using external AI services. Any cloud-based AI service used for research data must be reviewed by ISM's IT/data protection officer for compliance. Researchers are encouraged to use ISM's secure computing infrastructure for AI (if available) or reputable platforms that guarantee data confidentiality. If unsure, it could be consulted with Institutional Review Board (IBR).
- **5.3 Verification of AI Outputs:** In scientific research, results generated by AI (for example, an AI algorithm finds a pattern in data or suggests a hypothesis) should be verified through traditional means or domain expertise. AI can introduce spurious correlations or artifacts; thus, conclusions cannot rest solely on an AI's say-so. Researchers must apply the same skepticism to AI-generated insights as they would to any software output – debug, cross-validate, or peer review where possible. If AI was used to translate texts or transcribe interviews in research, a human fluent in the language should review a sample for accuracy.
- **5.4 Ethical Considerations:** If the research project itself involves developing or evaluating AI (common in information systems, economics forecasting, etc.), the research team should incorporate ethical analysis into the project – considering impacts, biases, and societal

implications of the AI. Any experimental use of AI that involves human subjects (even if just using student data or behavior) must go through the proper ethical approval (e.g. ISM's Institutional Review Board (IBR)) as would any human-subject research. Researchers should also be mindful of intellectual property: AI tools may generate content based on copyrighted training data, so using AI-generated text or images in published work could have legal implications unless properly attributed or checked for originality.

- **5.5 Collaboration and Funding:** ISM will support researchers in accessing AI resources. When applying for grants or funding, researchers should mention how AI will be used in the methodology if applicable, to demonstrate methodological rigor to reviewers. The university encourages interdisciplinary collaboration on AI topics (e.g. business researchers teaming with data scientists) to strengthen research proposals and outcomes.

6. Administrative and Operational Use of AI

ISM University's administration may employ AI systems to improve services and efficiency. Such uses are governed by this policy to ensure they reflect ISM's values and legal obligations:

- **6.1 Transparent Deployment:** Before any AI system is adopted in an administrative process, the responsible department must document its purpose, scope, and any impact it may have on students, faculty, or staff. A simple registry of AI systems will be maintained by the ISM AI Policy Governance Committee (or IT department), noting for each: what it's used for (e.g. "AI chatbot answering student FAQs on admissions"), which vendor or technology it uses, and who is overseeing it internally. This registry ensures awareness and oversight of AI across the institution.
- **6.2 Human Oversight in Decisions:** AI may be used to assist in decision-making (such as screening applicants, flagging financial anomalies, scheduling resources, or monitoring building security), but it will not have sole authority on any decisions that significantly affect individuals' rights or status. For example, while an AI might help sort admission applications by predictive score, admissions officers will review candidates holistically and no applicant will be rejected or accepted by an algorithm alone. Similarly, if an AI flags a student as "at risk" academically (based on performance data), academic advisors will intervene with support – no punitive action would occur solely on an AI's flag. ISM ensures that for high-impact decisions (admissions, grading, disciplinary actions, hiring, promotions, etc.), AI is at most a recommendation tool and humans make the final determination, with the rationale that humans can consider context and nuances beyond an algorithm's reach.
- **6.3 Quality and Bias Monitoring:** Every administrative AI tool will have an assigned "owner" (a staff member or committee) responsible for periodically reviewing its output for quality and fairness. For instance, if an AI chatbot is deployed, the owner should review logs to see if it's giving correct answers or if it ever provides misleading information and retrain or update it as needed. If an AI system is used in HR (say to screen CVs), the HR department must audit outcomes to ensure it's not inadvertently favoring or excluding certain groups without justification. ISM commits to adjusting or withdrawing AI tools that are found to produce unacceptable error rates or biases. Feedback channels will be available – if any user believes an AI-driven process has made a mistake or treated them unfairly, they can raise a concern to the relevant office and receive a human review of the matter.
- **6.4 Privacy and Security in Administrative AI:** Many administrative AI uses involve processing of personal data (student records, employee data, etc.). ISM will implement such AI in accordance with privacy laws: typically, this means using data that individuals have provided for those purposes and informing them (at least in policy terms) that we may use automated systems to assist. If any AI process could be considered solely automated individual

decision-making with legal or similarly significant effects (as defined by GDPR Article 22), ISM will either avoid such use or ensure explicit consent and an option for human reconsideration. Security-wise, any AI system integrated with ISM's databases will meet our IT security standards – secure authentication, access controls (only appropriate personnel or systems can access it), and encryption of data in transit and storage. Contracts with AI vendors will include clauses on data protection, data ownership (university retains ownership of its data and outputs), and confidentiality. For in-house developed AI, ISM's IT will follow secure coding and deployment practices. Regular backups and fail-safes will be in place so that if an AI system fails, the service does not collapse (e.g. if an AI scheduling assistant goes down, staff can manually intervene).

- **6.5 Use in Communications and Marketing:** If AI is used to generate content for official ISM publications, social media, or communications (for example, an AI tool writing a first draft of a press release or creating an image for marketing), staff must review and edit such content carefully. All official communications remain the responsibility of ISM staff – AI is seen as a creative aid. Staff should also be transparent in internal contexts about AI usage (e.g. if a newsletter article was AI-assisted, it can be noted in internal records, though outward-facing it will just be polished as needed). AI-generated imagery or video should be used ethically, avoiding any misleading depictions. If AI is used to personalize outreach (like AI analyzing prospective student data to tailor email content), ensure that the practice complies with anti-discrimination policies and that personal data is handled lawfully (e.g. included in our privacy notice to prospective students).
- **6.6 Student and Staff Services:** Some services, like advising, counseling, or library help, might integrate AI (for instance, a library search AI that helps find resources, or a career services AI resume reviewer). These tools should be presented as optional enhancements. ISM will inform users that they are interacting with an AI when it's not obvious, especially in sensitive areas (for example, if a mental health support chatbot is offered, students should know it's an AI and not a human counselor, and it's a supplement to, not a replacement for, professional counseling). All AI in student services should align with the principle of *beneficence* – it should be there to help, never to secretly surveil or judge students. Data from these tools should be used in aggregate to improve services, not to profile individuals (unless as part of a supportive intervention with appropriate consent).

7. Governance and Implementation

To put this policy into practice, ISM University establishes the following governance and support structure:

- **7.1 Governance Oversight:** The ISM AI Policy Governance Committee is charged with overseeing the implementation of this AI policy. Its duties include: keeping the inventory of AI systems (as noted in 6.1), reviewing and approving significant new AI deployments or initiatives, monitoring compliance with the policy, and recommending updates to the policy on a regular basis. The AI Policy Governance Committee is appointed by Rector's order and should include members from academic leadership, IT, legal, representative from faculty, Committee of Ethics and a student representative. quarterly) to discuss AI-related opportunities or concerns. An annual report on AI at ISM will be produced to summarize how AI has been used, benefits achieved, issues encountered, and policy revisions needed – providing transparency and accountability to the university community.
- **7.2 Training and Awareness:** Faculty onboarding will also cover this policy and how to design courses in light of AI. Ongoing workshops will be offered (as mentioned in 4.4) to keep everyone updated on policy changes and emerging best practices. The University will maintain

an online *AI Policy and Resources Hub* – a website where this policy, FAQs, examples, citation formats, and links to recommended tools are available in an accessible format.]

- **7.3 Compliance and Enforcement:** Compliance with this policy is expected under ISM's Code of Conduct for employees and Code of Academic Ethics for students. Violations will be handled according to the respective disciplinary processes. For example, a student's breach (plagiarizing via AI) will go through the Academic Ethics Committee, and a staff breach (say an unauthorized disclosure of data to an AI service, or an unfair automated process they implemented) will be handled by the relevant supervisor or HR process. The goal of enforcement is not to punish experimentation or good-faith mistakes, but to correct behavior and protect the community's interests. Generally, if someone self-discloses a potential breach (e.g. a student admits they used an AI when they shouldn't have), ISM will treat it with educational sanctions, whereas deliberate misconduct or concealment will be met with stricter consequences.
- **7.4 Updates and Revisions:** AI technology and norms are evolving. This policy is intended as a living document. The AI Policy Governance Committee will update the policy as needed – for instance, if new types of AI tools (like deepfake generators, or advanced AR/VR learning AI) become prevalent, or if laws like the EU AI Act impose new rules that we need to incorporate. Any major changes to the policy will be communicated to all ISM members via official channels (email announcement, website update, and info sessions).
- **7.5 Alignment with External Standards:** ISM's policy will remain aligned with Lithuanian national education guidelines and European standards regarding digital education and AI ethics. Where useful, ISM will reference international frameworks (like the Russell Group principles for AI in education, UNESCO guidance on AI in education, etc.) to benchmark its practices. Participation in consortia like EUonAIR will also inform our governance model, as we share and adopt best practices with partner universities. By aligning externally, we also ensure our students' and faculty's use of AI is recognized and respected globally (for instance, our citation practices and integrity policies will match those of other top institutions, so our graduates and researchers are well-prepared to operate anywhere in the world).

8. Conclusion

ISM University is committed to **responsible AI integration** – embracing the opportunities AI offers for enhancing teaching, learning, research, and administration, while proactively managing the risks. This policy provides a comprehensive approach to guide the ISM community in using AI ethically and effectively. All members of the community are expected to familiarize themselves with these guidelines and uphold them. By doing so, we ensure that ISM remains a trusted institution that not only keeps pace with technological change but does so in a way that reinforces our core academic values and our reputation for excellence and integrity. The University leadership fully supports this policy and the ongoing education and resources needed to implement it. Together, we will leverage AI to further ISM's mission and enrich the educational experience, preparing our students to be competent and conscientious leaders in an AI-augmented world.

References

1. Stanford University AI Policy and Governance Framework. Retrieved from <https://provost.stanford.edu>
2. Harvard University Generative AI Guidelines. Retrieved from <https://thecrimson.com>
3. Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) AI in Education Policies.

4. University of Oxford AI Education Principles.
5. University of Cambridge Guidelines on Generative AI.
6. Resolution on Generative AI Use in Studies, Lithuanian University Rectors' Conference (LURK), March 28, 2025.
7. General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), European Union.
8. ISM University Code of Academic Ethics.
9. Russell Group Principles for AI in Education.
10. UNESCO Guidance on AI in Education.

"This policy was partially drafted using ChatGPT, [version or date, e.g., GPT-4.5, May 2025]. The AI tool was used specifically to generate initial drafts, suggest phrasing, structure content. All AI-generated content was thoroughly reviewed, edited, and validated by the author(s)."