Jesuit Worldwide Learning
Higher Education at the Margins

The Use of Artificial Intelligence Policy and Guidelines for Jesuit Worldwide Learning

Effective April 2025

Table of Contents

JWL Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Academic Settings

Preamble

In light of the rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools into educational environments, JWL recognizes the need to guide and regulate the use of these technologies within our academic community. This policy, developed in collaboration with our partner universities, aims to establish a framework for the ethical and responsible use of AI in academia. It addresses both the opportunities these tools present and the challenges they pose, ensuring that our educational standards remain high and our practices align with our ethical commitments.

At JWL, our approach to artificial intelligence (AI) is grounded in Ignatian pedagogy, which emphasizes critical reflection, ethical engagement, and the pursuit of justice. AI is a powerful tool, but its use must always uphold human dignity, freedom, and integrity. As an educational institution dedicated to marginalized learners, we recognize both the opportunities and challenges AI presents, particularly in ensuring that the voices of underrepresented communities are no longer silenced in the digital age.

AI systems draw primarily from existing knowledge, much of which is produced in the Global North and reflects its dominant perspectives. This creates a great problem: marginalized communities—whether indigenous, refugee, or communities excluded because of structural inequalities—are largely absent from the datasets that shape AI-generated content. When students from these marginalized communities rely solely on AI to generate knowledge without first contributing their own perspectives, questions, sources, critiques and experiences, the result is the continued reproduction of an incomplete and biased representation of human wisdom.

Therefore, at JWL, we encourage students not only to engage with AI critically and ethically but also to be active creators of knowledge. Before using AI, marginalized learners must document, share, and articulate their own insights, experiences, and cultural understandings. This practice is not just an academic exercise; it is an act of epistemic justice. By recording and integrating their perspectives into global conversations, these students contribute to a more representative and accurate knowledge base—one that AI can eventually learn from and reflect more equitably.

The ethical use of AI in education must prioritize human agency. AI should never replace critical thinking, creativity, or the personal narratives that shape diverse ways of knowing. At JWL, we embrace AI as a tool that can support learning, but we also challenge our students and faculty to be active participants in shaping knowledge, ensuring that no voice remains unheard.

Understanding AI in Academic Contexts

AI-driven tools, which utilize machine learning models to generate text based on vast databases of existing content, have become increasingly common in academic settings. These tools can assist in the formulation of ideas and provide quick access to information, yet they require critical oversight to ensure that their use enhances, rather than compromises, academic integrity. It is essential for both students and faculty to understand that while these tools can support educational activities, they do not replace the need for critical independent thinking and original analysis, nor does it replace the need to develop basic academic skills.

Academic Standards and AI Integration

The integration of AI technologies in academic practice must be approached with a focus on enhancing educational quality and maintaining rigorous academic standards. To this end, JWL and its academic partners will:

- Encourage the development of basic skills such as writing, reading comprehension and mathematical skills, as well as critical thinking and original analysis skills alongside the use of AI tools.
- Regularly update our teaching methodologies to include critical reflections on the uses, challenges, limitations and implications of AI in academic work.
- Course designs will prioritize engagements that require personal judgment and unique contributions from students, minimizing reliance on AI tools.
- Adjust assessment methods to ensure they accurately measure student understanding and original thought, considering the accessibility of AI tools.
- Include more in-person assessment whenever possible given the situation of students at the margins.

Legal and Ethical Considerations

In recognition of the complex legal landscape surrounding AI technologies JWL asserts that:

- AI-generated content does not qualify as an original work of authorship.
- The use of AI to support learning and research can be helpful; it must not, however, replace original work and submissions created with the assistance of AI must always be critically reviewed to ensure that they remain the student's own work.
- The use of AI tools must be transparent and clearly disclosed in academic work to avoid plagiarism and to uphold academic integrity.

Practical Guidelines for AI Usage

To operationalize this policy, JWL and its partner institutions will adopt the following practices:

- All students upon enrolling for the first time in a JWL program will be required to take part in a crash course which teaches about how generative AI technologies work, and aids in the comprehension of the ethical implications of AI use.
- At the onset of each course, clear guidelines on the permissible uses of AI will be provided. Students will be required to acknowledge and agree to these guidelines before proceeding with the course. In the creation of courses, SMEs and/or university representatives may determine which assignments may use AI and how AI may be used. **If the SME and/or university representatives decide to prohibit the use of AI**, this must be communicated to the students at the beginning of the course in Unit 0 and/or by means of an announcement at the beginning of the relevant course.

- Examples of academic integrity breaches involving AI use will be clearly defined and communicated, along with associated sanctions.

Sanctions for Breaches of AI Usage Policy

To ensure the ethical and responsible use of AI tools in academic work, JWL enforces the following sanctions:

1. **Assessment of AI Disclosures**:
    - Faculty will assess each case to determine whether the work predominantly showcases the student's own critical insights and intellectual contributions, despite the use of AI. AI detection sites may be utilized critically by faculty to ascertain misuse of AI. Disclosure of AI tool use is mandatory and must be comprehensive. However, disclosure alone does not exempt a submission from penalties.
2. **Sanctions for Non-Compliance in each course**:
    - **First Level Offense**: Students receive a formal warning and are required to revise and resubmit the assignment, emphasizing the need for a significant personal contribution.
    - **Second Level Offense**: A failing grade on the assignment if there is a continued lack of substantial student engagement or reliance on AI without adequate disclosure.
    - **Third Level Offense**: Failing the course due to persistent misuse of AI tools and failure to meet academic standards of originality and personal intellectual effort.
3. **Continued Violations**:
    - Further offenses may lead to more severe disciplinary actions, such as suspension or expulsion from the program. This step is considered when a student consistently substitutes AI-generated content for personal academic effort, undermining the educational process. Students may use the appeals process in order to contest their suspension or expulsion. *Hyperlink to appeals process text – yet to be developed.*

Enhancing AI Literacy

JWL encourages its academic partners to offer workshops and resources to both students and faculty on the ethical use of AI in academic work and contributes to the development of online modules that address the capabilities, limitations, and ethical considerations of AI tools, ensuring that our community remains informed and conscientious users of technology.

Collaboration with Accrediting Universities

JWL will work closely with accrediting universities to:

- Ensure that the AI policies of partner institutions align with JWL's ethical standards and educational goals.

Review and Adaptation

This policy will be reviewed biennially to adapt to technological advancements and changes in the legal and educational landscapes. This ensures that our practices remain current and effective in fostering an environment of integrity and innovation.

Conclusion

Adopting this policy allows JWL to reaffirm its commitment to maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity and excellence as technological landscapes evolve. We recognize the transformative potential of AI in education and commit to its responsible use to benefit our global academic community.

Guidelines for Online Faculty at JWL

Self-Education and Continuous Learning

Faculty members are encouraged to independently advance their understanding of the latest AI technologies, exploring their capabilities and ethical implications. This includes seeking out resources, courses, and seminars that deepen their comprehension of AI.

Ethical Integration and Oversight

It is the responsibility of faculty members to oversee the ethical use of AI, to watch for the possible misuse of AI in student assignments, and to implement sanctions according to JWL policy.

Review Process

- Faculty should rely upon their own academic competence and common sense in assessing the use or misuse of AI. Faculty may make critical use of AI detection software in order to identify potentially unacknowledged AI-generated content. Please note: AI detection software itself makes use of AI, and therefore is far from reliable.
- Unless AI has been explicitly forbidden in a particular course or assignment, faculty should review AI disclosure statements in student submissions to verify all AI assistance is properly acknowledged.
- Upon verifying AI disclosure, faculty should critically evaluate the depth of student engagement in the submission, focusing on how well students have integrated, synthesized, and built upon AI-generated content with their own analysis and insights.
- Faculty should measure submissions against the specific learning objectives of the course, ensuring that the student's contribution demonstrates an understanding that surpasses the foundational level provided by AI tools.

Grading Criteria

- Prioritize transparency in grading, ensuring fully disclosed AI assistance is assessed for its appropriateness relative to the assignment's requirements.
- Evaluate the level of intellectual engagement in submissions, determining whether AI tools were used merely to complete assignments with minimal effort or to genuinely enhance learning and understanding.
- Confirm that submissions meet all assignment criteria, including original thought, critical analysis, and relevance to the assigned topics or questions.

Feedback and Grading

- When a student has made transparent use of AI, faculty should provide specific, constructive feedback on AI usage in academic work, identifying where AI integration was successful and where it could be improved, with a focus on enhancing learning outcomes. This involves offering actionable suggestions for improving the use of AI tools in future assignments, such as advocating for more thorough analysis or deeper engagement with the material. Points may be deducted from the grade at the discretion of the faculty, based upon the extent and manner of AI use.

- When it is evident that the student has used AI without identifying it, faculty must voice and explain their suspicion and either require resubmission or give a grade of 0 (see penalties for undisclosed AI submissions).

Penalties for undisclosed AI Submissions

First Level Offense: Faculty must issue a warning to the student, who must then revise and resubmit the assignment. The revised submission must demonstrate a significant increase in personal intellectual contribution and the use of AI will be clearly stated. This revised submission will be graded.

Second Level Offense: If after two cases of AI misuse (for which the student has received two warnings) a student submits a further assignment which fails to demonstrate sufficient personal engagement or improperly relies on AI, a failing grade may be assigned to the assignment. There is no possibility of resubmission.

Third Level Offense: Two cases of second level offence may result in failure of the course. Continued misuse of AI, characterized by a lack of original thought and excessive reliance on external assistance, may result in failing the program. Students may use the appeals process in order to contest their suspension or expulsion. *Hyperlink to appeals process text – yet to be developed.*

Conclusion

These guidelines are designed to equip faculty with a structured approach to integrating, monitoring, and evaluating the use of AI in student submissions, ensuring that these tools are used ethically and effectively to enhance educational outcomes at JWL.

JWL Student Guidelines for the Use of AI Tools

Introduction

These guidelines aim to inform students in JWL programs about responsible and ethical integration of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools into their studies **(except in cases when AI has been explicitly prohibited)**. While the emergence of AI technologies can serve as significant aids in academic environments, it is crucial to employ these tools ethically in ways that uphold academic integrity and enhance educational outcomes.

Foundational Principles

1. **Supportive Role of AI Tools:** AI technologies are acceptable as aids in the educational process but are not permitted as substitutes for basic skills, such as writing, reading comprehension, mathematical skills, or for advanced skills, such as independent critical thinking and learning. They can facilitate entry into the writing process, assist in exploring ideas, and offer a means to review draft texts. Their use is intended to enrich academic discourse and promote critical engagement with content.

2. **Transparency in Using AI Tools:** The use of AI in academic settings requires open and transparent communication. Students are required to disclose the use of AI-based tools in their academic works, critically reflecting on their role in research and text composition.

Guidelines for Use

1. **Understanding and Awareness:**
    - Gain a basic understanding of how generative AI technologies work and their potential limitations and impacts.
    - Understand the ethical implications and the importance of data integrity and copyright in the context of AI use.
2. **Critical Use in Academia:**
    - AI tools may be used to support the learning process, such as for research, exploring ideas or requesting feedback on one's ideas.
    - Always remain critical of the outputs and verify their accuracy and relevance.
3. **Data Protection and Security:**
    - Be aware of the data privacy risks associated with using AI tools and act in compliance with data protection laws (see safeguarding policy *Hyperlink*).
    - Protect personal data and respect the privacy of others, in compliance with the safeguarding policy of JWL.
4. **Innovation and Creativity:**
    - Explore new ways in which AI can support creativity in research and in projects or assignments.

- Use AI as a tool to aid in the development of innovative solutions to complex problems.

Permitted Applications – if not otherwise stated at the beginning of a given course or assignment

- **Writing Assistance:** The use of AI is allowed to overcome writer's block and gather ideas.
- **Research Assistance:** AI may be used to aid in finding academic sources and compiling bibliographies. It cannot replace the study of the course material (input and assigned reading).
- **Linguistic Improvements:** The use of AI to enhance grammar, spelling, and writing style is permitted.

Prohibited Applications

- **Substitution of Human Academic Competence:** Completely replacing one's own academic work with AI-generated content is prohibited. Independent thinking, critical analysis, and reflection are essential.
- **Failure to disclose AI support:** Unacknowledged use of AI to aid in the production of answers for assignments is forbidden.
- **Copyright Infringement through Rephrasing:** Utilizing AI technologies to rephrase and subsequently integrate copyrighted works into one's academic papers without proper citation is a violation of AI usage guidelines and principles of academic integrity.

Utilization and Disclosure of AI

In all academic submissions, students should be aware that the use of any AI tool requires transparent documentation, and that this expectation holds true regardless of how large or small the tool's contribution might be.

- If you use any AI tool for tasks that go beyond basic proofreading—such as refining arguments, suggesting sources, reorganizing paragraphs, or generating new content—you must **clearly indicate where and how the AI assisted you**. You can do this in the body of your text or with a footnote, for example by stating: "This section was developed using ChatGPT to strengthen the argument."[1]
- **Always keep evidence of the AI's involvement**, such as links to the AI thread, exported conversation transcripts, or screenshots. Be prepared to provide these if an online faculty member asks for proof of where your text originated. Even when the AI's role is minor, **keep a record of any drafts or suggestions** the tool provided. This helps clarify how your ideas developed and upholds honesty and clarity in all academic work.
- If you **only** use AI to correct **grammar, spelling, or punctuation**, instruct it to do "**Proofread only.**" In that strictly limited scenario, you **do not need to cite the AI's help**, as long as it did

[1] For concrete and detailed examples of how to do this, see the appendix to this document.

not suggest alternative structures, add new arguments, or otherwise contribute beyond basic proofreading.

Compliance

Adherence to these guidelines is mandatory for all students and serves to promote an ethical and responsible approach to using AI technologies in academic writing. These guidelines will be regularly reviewed and adjusted as necessary to ensure they remain aligned with current technological and societal conditions.

Consequences of Violation

1. **Assessment and Disclosure**:
    - When AI tools are used, full disclosure is required in the student's submission. However, disclosing the use of AI does not automatically guarantee exemption from penalties. Faculty will evaluate each submission to ensure that it reflects the student's own ideas, insights, and understanding, adequately fulfilling academic requirements.
2. **Sanctions for Violations**:
    - **First Level Offense**: A formal warning is issued to the student, who must then revise and resubmit the assignment. The revised submission must demonstrate a significant increase in personal intellectual contribution. This revised submission will be graded.
    - **Second Level Offense**: If after two cases of AI misuse (two formal warnings) a student submits a further assignment which fails to demonstrate sufficient personal engagement or improperly relies on AI, a failing grade may be assigned to the assignment. There is no possibility of resubmission.
    - **Third Level Offense**: Two cases of second level offence may result in failure of the course.
3. **Severe or Repeated Violations**:
    - Students who persistently disregard the guidelines for AI use may face more severe disciplinary measures, including suspension or expulsion from the program. These measures are necessary to uphold the educational values of independence, originality, and integrity within our academic community. Students may appeal their suspension or expulsion.

Appendix:

Example 1: Disclosure within the body of a text

Task: Create two formative assessments that you would like to try in your current or future course. Explain how you will use them in your course and what kind of learning you will assess using these assessment strategies.

Student submission:

In designing formative assessments for my class of 80 students in Kakuma, Kenya, I used ChatGPT to generate initial ideas. Given the challenges of structuring effective assessments in a resource-limited environment, AI helped me explore possibilities, but the final choices were based on pedagogical considerations and classroom realities.

ChatGPT provided ten assessment ideas, ranging from reflective journals to scenario-based discussions. While useful, not all were practical given the constraints of my classroom. After careful review, I selected two:

1. Structured Peer Review Assignments – Since providing individual feedback to 80 students is challenging, peer review fosters critical engagement, collaboration, and reflection while reducing my workload.

2. Scenario-Based Group Discussions – Given the students' diverse backgrounds, real-world ecological discussions encourage interactive learning and critical thinking, ensuring broad participation without requiring one-on-one evaluation.

AI did not create the instructions—these were developed based on my understanding of the students' needs and course objectives.

Assessment 1:

1. Students write a 400-word analysis of a local ecological problem.

2. They explain the issue, its causes and consequences, and propose a realistic, community-based solution.

3. Each student reviews two peer submissions, providing constructive feedback based on a rubric.

4. After incorporating feedback, they submit a final revised response.

This process assesses students' analytical skills, and their ability to engage with peer feedback critically, fostering a deeper understanding of ecological dynamics and resilience.

Assessment 2:

1. In groups of 4-6, students analyze real-world ecological scenarios affecting Kakuma, such as:

- Water scarcity and conservation solutions
- Waste management in refugee camps
- Climate change and food security adaptation strategies

2. Groups discuss solutions and propose an action plan relevant to their context.
3. Findings are presented as a role-play to enhance engagement and practical understanding.

This assessment evaluates students' collaborative problem-solving skills, their ability to apply theoretical knowledge to real-world situations, and their capacity for innovative thinking in addressing environmental challenges.

Example 2: Disclosure using a footnote

Task: Reflection on Leadership Experience

Think of a moment in your life where you were called on to lead.

- What were the positive traits that helped you in the situation?
- Which traits did not help you?
- If you were in the same situation today, what would you do differently?

Please write a post of around **200 words and submit your text by the end of the week.**

Student submission:

I had to step into a leadership role when I planned my mother's 60th birthday. I took care of everything, from booking the venue to coordinating the music, and my strong organizational skills, attention to detail, and motivation helped me create a truly special celebration. At the same time, I see now that I took on too many tasks by myself, mostly because I worried others might not meet my standards. This made the whole process more stressful than it had to be, and I also missed out on other people's creative ideas and help.

If I could do it again, I would let family and friends share more responsibilities. I would assign them smaller tasks and give them clear instructions, then trust them to manage on their own. That way, everyone would feel more involved, and I would have less pressure on my shoulders. I'd also make sure to keep communication open, so we could discuss any problems or improvements and solve them together. I believe this would reduce my stress and allow others to show their skills, too.

I should mention that I used an AI tool (ChatGPT) to help me structure my ideas and express them clearly, but all the insights and personal experiences here are completely my own.

https://chatgpt.com/share/6799da62-6bdc-800e-a844-30b64a63d4b9