LANDMARK UNIVERSITY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE POLICY

Executive Summary

The incursion of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has impacted every aspect of humans' life including the educational sector. The use of AI tools, especially the large language models may either pose a threat or transform positively many aspects of higher education systems depending on what is done to checkmate the current rapid transformation being experienced. In Landmark University, the integration of AI tools or AI-assisted technologies into the teaching, research, and community development initiatives may bring forth a myriad of concerns regarding acceptable level of AI use and this necessitate the need to take proactive measures to mitigate potential risks and ensure responsible AI deployment.

Consequently, this report presents a policy on the responsible use of AI in Landmark University. The policy delineates clear guidelines for responsible use of AI across its teaching, research, community service, and quality assurance initiatives accompanied by provisions for accountability and sanctions for ethical transgressions. The roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders are also clearly highlighted. Overall, the policy underscores Landmark University's commitment to responsible AI stewardship, promoting a future where technology is leveraged ethically and inclusively to foster positive change.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 1

Table of Contents 1

1.0 Definitions of Terms 2

2.0 Preamble 3

3.0 Acceptable Level of AI use 4

3.1 Acceptable use of AI for Teaching 4

3.2 Acceptable use of AI for Research, Academic papers, students' Project Reports and Theses/Dissertations 5

3.3 Acceptable Level of AI Use for Community Development Initiatives 6

3.4 Acceptable Level of AI Use for Quality Assurance 6

Approved by the Senate of Landmark University, during her 111th Senate Meeting held on May 30, 2024

4.0 Ethical Considerations 7
4.1 Ethical Considerations of AI Integration in Teaching 7
4.2 Ethical Considerations of AI Integration in Research 7
4.3 Ethical Considerations of AI Integration in Community Service 7
4.4 Ethical Considerations of AI Integration in Quality Assurance Processes 8
5.0 Sanctions for Contravention of the Policy 8
5.1 For Faculty and Staff 8
5.2.1 Minor Offences 8
5.2.2 Severe or Repeated Violation 9
6.0 Full Disclosure Policy 9
7.0 Roles and Responsibilities 10
7.1 The University Management 10
7.2 Thesis Supervisor 10
7.3 Student 11
8.0 AI-text-generated-detection system 12
9.0 Monitoring and Evaluation 12
9.1 AI Use in Teaching 12
9.2 AI Use in Research 13
9.3 AI Use in Community Service 14
9.4 AI Use in Quality Assurance Processes 15
10.0 Conclusion 17

1.0 Definitions of Terms

1. Artificial Intelligence

The process of simulating human intelligence by machines which enables them to perform human-like tasks.

2. AI Tool

AI tools are software applications that utilize artificial intelligence techniques to perform specific tasks or solve particular problems.

3. AI-generated content

AI-generated content refers to text, images, videos, or other forms of data or media that are created with the assistance of AI technologies.

4. AI Writing Assistant

AI writing assistants are tools that utilize artificial intelligence techniques to assist users in various writing tasks such as proofreading, grammar checking, sentence structure improvement, style suggestions, and even generate new content.

5. Thesis/Dissertation

A thesis or dissertation is a substantial piece of academic writing (typical written by student) that presents an original research question or argument and provides evidence, analysis, and interpretation to support that argument. A thesis or dissertation is typically required for the award of a master's or doctoral degree.

6. Research Paper

A written document, which follows a structured format and aims to communicate the findings of a study or investigation conducted by the author(s) on a particular topic or question.

7. Ethics in AI

Ethics in AI refers to a set of moral principles and guidelines that govern the development and use of artificial intelligence technologies to ensure responsible use.

8. Ethical Consideration in AI integration

Ethical considerations in integrating AI in higher education refer to the careful examination and adherence to moral principles and values when implementing artificial intelligence technologies in educational settings.

9. Data Privacy

Data privacy refers to the ability of a person to determine for themselves when, how, and to what extent personal information about them is shared with or communicated to others. It involves safeguarding sensitive information from unauthorized access, misuse, or exploitation.

10. Full Disclosure Policy

A full disclosure policy typically refers to a practice or principle where all relevant information, whether positive or negative, is openly communicated and made available to relevant parties.

2.0 Preamble

Landmark University is a faith-based private university in Omu-Aran, Nigeria, established in March 2011 by the Living Faith Church. It focuses on agriculture and aims to develop competent, entrepreneurial graduates through its academic programmes while promoting research, innovation, and community development. The university also emphasizes spiritual growth and offers modern ICT infrastructure to support its educational endeavours. For the university to achieve its mandate of revolutionizing agriculture through teaching, research and community engagement, the university recognizes the transformative potential of artificial intelligence (AI). As an esteemed institution committed to innovation and societal progress, integrating AI into teaching, research, and community

development initiatives is not just a choice, but a strategy. By leveraging AI-driven tools, the university aims to cater to diverse learning style, enhance educational outcomes, address complex challenges, drive innovation and create tangible and sustainable impact beyond the confines of academia.

However, the integration of AI into the tripartite mandates of the university also brings forth a myriad of ethical, legal, and social implications. Concerns regarding acceptable level of AI use for teaching, research, community service, legal implications, digital divide, data privacy, ethical considerations etc necessitate proactive measures to mitigate potential risks and ensure responsible AI deployment. The university therefore recognizes the need to develop a comprehensive policy that prioritizes transparency, fairness, and accountability in AI usage. Consequently, a policy on responsible AI usage in Landmark University across its teaching, research, and community development endeavours is presented. The report covers definitions of terms used in the policy, provide information about the acceptable use of AI in the university's tripartite mandate as well as in its quality assurance processes. The need for accountability, sanctions for ethical transgressions, and the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders are also covered.

3.0 Acceptable Level of AI use

3.1 Acceptable use of AI for Teaching

The following guidelines are acceptable use of AI for teaching in Landmark University.

i. AI-driven learning management systems (LMS) to enhance the individual learning experience of students.
ii. AI algorithms to analyze student performance data, identify individual learning needs to enhance comprehension and engagement.
iii. AI-based adaptive learning platforms to provide real-time feedback, track student progress, and facilitate targeted interventions to support struggling learners.
iv. AI-powered educational technologies, such as virtual reality (VR) simulations, augmented reality (AR) applications, and intelligent tutoring systems, to enrich instructional delivery and promote active learning.
v. AI-driven chatbots or virtual assistants to teaching methodologies to address common student inquiries, provide instant clarification on course content, and facilitate interactive discussions both inside and outside the classroom.
vi. AI analytics tools to analyze large datasets and extract actionable insights into student learning behaviors, preferences, and performance trends.
vii. AI predictive analytics models to anticipate student needs, identify at-risk individuals, and tailor instructional strategies to optimize learning outcomes.
viii. AI-based assessment tools, such as automated grading systems and similarity detection software, to streamline the evaluation process.

3.2 Acceptable use of AI for Research, Academic papers, students' Project Reports and Theses/Dissertations

The following guidelines are the acceptable use of AI for research, writing academic papers, students' project reports and theses/dissertations in Landmark University.

i. AI tools to collect, analyze and draw insights from large volume of data during research process*. Note that the use of AI tools to generate data for research purpose is completely unacceptable*.
ii. AI tools in sifting through large volume of literature to identify and extract relevant information, and summarize findings.
iii. AI-driven visualization tools to create interactive and informative visualizations of research data.
iv. AI algorithms to optimize experimental designs through simulation of different scenarios, leading to more efficient and effective experiments.
v. AI tools such as spelling or grammar checkers. In addition, the use of reference managers that enable researchers/students to collect, organize, annotate, and use references to scholarly articles or theses – such as Mendeley, EndNote, Zotero and others is acceptable.
vi. AI tools to locate and understand scholarly materials in order to draft text more efficiently.
vii. AI writing assistants can be used to improve the language structure and style of research papers/theses in order to enhance its readability. However, Ballery (2024) reported that the amount of AI-generated content acceptable in academic writings varies across disciplines, subjects, and assessment tasks. In addition to meeting this condition, the student/researcher is expected to provide full disclosure on the level of AI utilization in his/her thesis. Therefore, the following table provides the acceptable amount of AI-generated content for different fields, based on reviewing academic integrity standards and expert perspectives:

Table 1: Acceptable percentage for the amount of AI-generated content for different fields (Source: Michelle Ballery, 2024)

S/N	Field	%of AI Usage	S/N	Field	%of AI Usage
1	**Natural Sciences** (Physics, Chemistry, Biology)	20-30%	6	**Education** (Education Policy, Curriculum Studies, Educational Psychology)	10-15%
2	**Social Sciences** (Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology)	10-20%	7	**Business** (Marketing, Finance, Management)	20-25%
3	**Medical Sciences** (Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy)	25-35%	8	**Law** (Legal Studies, Criminology, Criminal Justice)	15-20%

4	**Engineering** (Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering)	30-40%	9	**Arts and Design** (Fine Arts, Music, Architecture)	5-10%
5	**Humanities** (English, History, Philosophy)	5-10%			

viii. The percentage shown in the AI writing detection indicator and in the AI writing report is the amount of qualifying text within the submission that Turnitin's AI writing detection model determines was generated by AI. However, certain percentages other than the stated benchmark might be acceptable under certain conditions as may be analysed and deemed fit by the reviewer. The final decision on whether any misconduct has occurred rests with the reviewer.

ix. Unethical use of generative AI is completely unacceptable regardless of the percentage. This means that even when the percentage is very low, but unethical use is found in the document it will still be unacceptable.

3.3 Acceptable Level of AI Use for Community Development Initiatives

The following are the acceptable use of AI for community engagement initiative in Landmark University.

i. AI-powered data analytic algorithms to process large datasets from various community engagements for data-driven decision making.
ii. AI-powered chatbots used to provide personalized assistance and information to community members.
iii. The use of AI technologies, such as speech recognition and text-to-speech synthesis, to enhance accessibility for community members with disabilities.
iv. The use of AI predictive analytic models to analyze past community engagement data to predict future trends and preferences.
v. The use of AI tools to facilitate virtual engagement interaction between university stakeholders and the community.

3.4 Acceptable Level of AI Use for Quality Assurance

The following are the acceptable use of AI for Quality Assurance in Landmark University.

i. The use of AI in data analysis from various sources to identify patterns and trends that can help the university to predict future outcomes.
ii. The use of AI-powered algorithms to create personalized learning experiences for students.
iii. The use of AI tools to streamline the assessment process and to provide feedback on assignments and exams.
iv. The use of AI-powered Virtual assistants to provide supports for students, faculty members, and staff and to offer guidance on various aspects of academic life.
v. The use of AI tools to monitor the quality of educational programmes and services.

vi. The use of AI tools to identify academic fraud, such as plagiarism or cheating.
vii. The use of AI technologies to optimize the enrollment process.
viii. The use of AI tools in effective allocation of the university resources.

4.0 Ethical Considerations

4.1 Ethical Considerations of AI Integration in Teaching

i. Ensure that AI tools used in teaching do not worsen existing educational inequalities.
ii. Lecturers should be transparent about the use of AI in teaching materials and assessments. *They are to note that AI tools may generate content that are inconsistent, biased, or factually incorrect. Therefore, they should see AI technologies as tools to augment and assist their creativity. Hence, the need to always fact-check and verify the accuracy of AI-generated contents.*
iii. Safeguard student privacy and sensitive data when using AI tools.
iv. Preserve the human-centric aspects of teaching and learning.

4.2 Ethical Considerations of AI Integration in Research

i. Students/researchers must ensure robust data anonymization and protection protocols to safeguard individuals' privacy.
ii. The use of AI tools to generate data for research purpose is completely unacceptable and is therefore considered to be unethical.
iii. Students/researchers must proactively identify and mitigate biases to ensure fair and unbiased results.
iv. AI tools or models used in research should be transparent and explainable.
v. When AI is used in research that involves human subjects, students/ researchers must obtain informed consent.
vi. Students/researchers should implement mechanisms for algorithmic accountability, enabling stakeholders to understand how AI-driven decisions are made and challenging outcomes that may raise ethical concern.

4.3 Ethical Considerations of AI Integration in Community Service

i. Use diverse datasets, include human oversight in decision-making, and actively monitor for bias.
ii. Community services often handle sensitive data. Ensure AI systems are secure and user data is protected.
iii. Allow human review of AI decisions.
iv. Use AI to augment human capabilities, not replace them. Ensure there are qualified professionals available for support and complex situations.
v. Not everyone has equal access to technology or the internet. Ensure that AI does not become a barrier to accessing essential services.

4.4 Ethical Considerations of AI Integration in Quality Assurance Processes

i. When AI tools are used in quality assurance process, ensure that the AI algorithms are regularly audited to eliminate biases.
ii. Ensure transparency on how decisions are made and accountability for outcomes when AI tools are used in evaluation process.
iii. Ensure data security to protect the confidentiality of researchers or students and uphold trust in quality assurance procedures.
iv. The primary goal of quality assurance is to maintain and improve the quality of education. Therefore, we must ensure that with AI integration, the quality assurance should enhance, rather than diminish, the overall quality of education provided.

5.0 Sanctions for Contravention of the Policy

5.1 For Faculty and Staff

The following sanction may be applied to Faculty members who violate the acceptable levels of AI use in Landmark University.

i. For minor transgressions or first-time offenses, a formal warning can be issued to the individual or group of persons involved serving as a notification. However, further violations may result in more severe consequences. *The university may offer mandatory training programmes or workshops on ethical AI use and responsible conduct in teaching, research, and other activities for such individual.*
ii. In cases where the transgression is more serious but not severe enough to warrant immediate termination or expulsion, individuals may be placed on suspension.
iii. In cases of severe or repeated transgressions, individuals in leadership positions may be removed from their positions.
iv. In the most horrific cases, termination of employment or expulsion from the university may be necessary.
v. In instances where the transgression has significant implications for the university community or the broader public, disclosing the details of the incident and the resulting sanctions may be considered.
vi. In cases involving serious breaches of law or ethics, the university may need to pursue legal action against individuals or entities responsible for the transgression.

5.2 For Student

The following sanction may be applied to students who violate the acceptable levels of AI use in Landmark University.

5.2.1 Minor Offences

For minor offences, the university management may:

i. direct the student to revise the sections of their thesis or dissertation that contravene AI policy, ensuring compliance with ethical guidelines and standards.

ii. direct the student's academic supervisor to introduce additional oversight to monitor and guide revisions to ensure adherence to AI policy.
iii. mandate the student for compulsory training programme that focuses on AI ethics and responsible research practices to enhance the student's understanding and awareness of ethical considerations in AI research.
iv. temporarily restrict the processing of the student's thesis/dissertation until revisions are made to address the AI policy violations.
v. suspend or restrict the student's access to AI-related research resources of the university (if available) as a consequence of the violation, with a pathway for reinstatement contingent on demonstrated compliance with AI policy.

5.2.2 Severe or Repeated Violation

In cases of severe or repeated violations, the university management may:

i. impose academic penalties such as a reduction in the grade or credit awarded for the thesis/dissertation if AI policy contraventions are identified.
ii. revoke funding or scholarships (if any) associated with the student's research or academic programme as a deterrent and consequence for non-compliance with AI policy.
iii. delay the student's graduation or completion of degree until satisfactory revisions are made to ensure compliance with AI policy.

6.0 Full Disclosure Policy

Students/researchers shall be transparent about the use of generative AI in their research work, and supervisors should have access to tools and strategies for ensuring students' transparency. Transparently acknowledging the use of AI-generated content in dissertation is a way of maintaining academic integrity.

There are many ways students may employ generative AI in research write-up: to summarize literature, formulate ideas, organize outlines, produce drafts of text, or revise and refine text. Students who employ generative AI in preparing their dissertations shall transparently disclose the level of usage under a special sub-section titled "**Full Disclosure Statement**" in their dissertation. The disclosure shall describe how the AI was used and identify AI-generated content. Some ways of disclosing the use of generative AI could include describing the use in a paper's introduction, methods section, appendix, or supplementary materials or citing the generative AI tool in the references.

Although the supervisors (or university authority) may rely on students to honestly and transparently disclose their use of generative AI, the university shall put in place technologies that can detect whether generative AI was used (and potentially how it was used) in submitted dissertations.

7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

7.1 The University Management

The following are the roles and responsibilities of the university management. The university management is to:

i. oversee the implementation of the policy across various departments, research centres, and academic programmes within the university.
ii. communicate and create awareness of the policy among stakeholders.
iii. organize training sessions, workshops, and educational programme to ensure that individuals involved in AI-related activities understand the principles of responsible AI usage, ethical considerations, and compliance requirements outlined in the policy.
iv. allocate resources, including funding, technology infrastructure, and personnel, to support the implementation of the policy.
v. assess and manage risks associated with AI usage within the university.
vi. establish processes for monitoring compliance with the policy and conducts periodic reviews to assess adherence to policy guidelines.
vii. ensure that mechanisms are in place to enforce the policy and hold individuals accountable for non-compliance.
viii. facilitate a culture of continuous improvement by soliciting feedback from stakeholders, conducting evaluations of the policy and practices, and making necessary updates or revisions to enhance effectiveness and relevance over time.

7.2 Thesis Supervisor

The following are the roles and responsibilities of thesis supervisor. The thesis supervisor:

i. shall be knowledgeable about the guidelines in the AI policy of the university. He/she shall ensure that their students are aware of this policy and understand their implications for their dissertations.
ii. must be able to integrate the policy into the research process by incorporating discussions about ethical considerations, data privacy, and responsible AI practices into thesis planning and development.
iii. is to provide guidance and oversight to ensure that thesis adheres to acceptable AI usage policies.
iv. must be ready to assist students in conducting ethical reviews or obtaining institutional approval for their research, particularly when it involves sensitive data or human subjects. Supervisor is to ensure that the research design and methodology align with ethical standards and policy requirements.
v. is to oversee the handling, storage, and use of data in thesis research to ensure compliance with data privacy policy. He or She must educate their students about best practices for data management and help them implement appropriate measures to protect research data.
vi. provides additional training and educational resources to students on AI ethics, responsible research practices, and compliance with AI usage policy.

vii. monitor the progress of thesis research to ensure continuous compliance with the policy. They are to provide feedback to students on their research practices, identify any potential policy violations, and work with students to address them proactively.
viii. must ensure that necessary documentation, such as ethics approvals, consent forms, and data management plans, are completed and maintained throughout the study.
ix. In cases where ethical or policy-related conflicts arise during the study, supervisors serve as mediators to help students navigate these challenges effectively.
x. is to engage in ongoing professional development to stay informed about emerging trends and best practices in AI ethics and policy compliance.

7.3 Student

The following are the roles and responsibilities of students. They are:

i. to familiarize themselves with the policy, including acceptable usage level, ethical guidelines, data privacy regulations, and any specific requirements in the policy.
ii. to consider the ethical implications of their research and ensure that it aligns with ethical principles outlined in the AI policy.
iii. responsible for adhering to the policy throughout the research process. They shall follow approved research protocols, adhere to data management guidelines, and obtain necessary approvals or permits for their research activities.
iv. to manage research data responsibly and in accordance with data privacy policy. This includes collecting, storing, and analyzing data in a manner that protects participants' privacy and ensures data integrity.
v. to maintain transparency in their research practices and document all aspects of their research process, including data collection methods, analysis techniques, and any deviations from approved protocols.
vi. to engage in ongoing learning and professional development related to AI ethics and policy compliance. They should stay informed about relevant regulations, guidelines, and best practices in AI research ethics and integrate this knowledge into their research practices.
vii. communicate regularly with their thesis supervisor regarding any policy-related concerns or challenges they encounter during the research process. They should seek guidance and feedback from their supervisor on how to address these issues effectively while maintaining compliance with AI policy.
viii. to conduct thorough risk assessments to identify potential ethical, legal, or social risks associated with their research and develop strategies to mitigate these risks. They should proactively address any concerns raised by their supervisor regarding policy compliance.
ix. If the student become aware of the policy violations or ethical breaches during their research, they shall report these incidents to their supervisor or appropriate authorities within the university.

8.0 AI-text-generated-detection system

AI-text-generated-detection software (Turnitin) shall be used as well as any other legitimate means to determine the extent to which the research work contains AI-generated text.

9.0 Monitoring and Evaluation

9.1 AI Use in Teaching

S/N	Performance Indicator	Target	Monitoring and Evaluation	Action by
1.	Enhancement of individual learning experience	Use of AI-driven learning management systems (LMS) to enhance the individual learning experience of students	Review of student feedback and engagement metrics to assess the impact of AI-driven LMS on individual learning experience	Course Lecturer; Heads of Departments; E-Learning Administrator; Deans Director, Academic Planning
2.	Analysis of student performance data	AI algorithms to analyze student performance data, identify individual learning needs to enhance comprehension and engagement	Analysis of student performance data and comparison with identified learning needs to assess effectiveness of AI algorithms	Course Lecturer; Heads of Departments; E-Learning Administrator; Deans Director, Academic Planning
3.	Real-time feedback and targeted interventions	AI-based adaptive learning platforms to provide real-time feedback, track student progress, and facilitate targeted interventions to support struggling learners	Evaluation of student progress and interventions provided through AI-based platforms	Course Lecturer; Heads of Departments; E-Learning Administrator; Deans
4.	Enrichment of instructional delivery	AI-powered educational technologies (e.g., VR simulations, AR applications, intelligent tutoring systems) to enrich instructional delivery and promote active learning	Observation of instructional delivery and student engagement with AI-powered educational technologies	Director, Academic Planning
5.	AI-driven chatbots or virtual assistants	AI-driven chatbots or virtual assistants to address common student inquiries, provide instant clarification on course content, and facilitate interactive discussions	Review of student interactions with chatbots/virtual assistants and assessment of their effectiveness in addressing inquiries and facilitating discussions	Course Lecturer; Heads of Departments; E-Learning Administrator; Deans

		both inside and outside the classroom		
6.	AI-based assessment tools	AI-based assessment tools (e.g., automated grading systems, similarity detection software) to streamline the evaluation process	Review of assessment results and comparison with traditional evaluation methods to assess the efficiency and accuracy of AI-based assessment tools	Course Lecturer; Heads of Departments; Director, Academic Planning
7.	Mitigation of educational inequalities	Ensure that AI tools used in teaching do not worsen existing educational inequalities	Review of educational outcomes across diverse student groups to assess any disparities resulting from the use of AI tools	Course Lecturer; Heads of Departments; E-Learning Administrator; Deans
8.	Transparency and accuracy in AI use	Lecturers to be transparent about the use of AI in teaching materials and assessments, ensuring accuracy by fact-checking and verification	Evaluation of teaching materials and assessments to ensure transparency about AI use and accuracy of AI-generated content	Course Lecturer; Heads of Departments; Director, Academic Planning
9.	Student privacy and data protection	Safeguard student privacy and sensitive data when using AI tools	Assessment of data handling practices to ensure compliance with privacy regulations and safeguarding of student data	Course Lecturer; Heads of Departments; E-Learning Administrator; Deans
10.	Human-centric teaching and learning	Preserve the human-centric aspects of teaching and learning	Observation of teaching practices and student interactions to ensure AI tools complement rather than replace human involvement	Director, Academic Planning

9.2 AI Use in Research

S/N	Performance Indicator	Target	Monitoring and Evaluation	Action by (Reviewer)
1.	AI-generated content in papers/theses	Not more than 20% of AI-generated content in research papers/theses	Review of papers/theses to check for compliance with the 20% limit and full disclosure requirement	Supervisor; Heads of Departments; Director, LUCRID Director, Centre for Learning Resources
2.	AI writing detection indicator	Percentage of qualifying text within the submission generated by AI	Turnitin's AI writing detection model will provide the percentage, final decision on any misconduct rests with the reviewer	Supervisors; Ethical Review Committee; Director, Centre for Learning Resources
3.	Ethical use of generative AI	No unethical use of generative AI, regardless of the percentage	Review of content for ethical/unethical use, even if percentage of AI-generated content is low. Unethical use will result in paper/theses rejection	Supervisors; Ethical Review Committee; Director, LUCRID; Director, Centre for Learning Resources;

			and/ other relevant sanctions applied.	SPS Board; Vice-Chancellor
4.	Data anonymization and protection	Robust data anonymization and protection protocols to safeguard individuals' privacy	Review of research protocols and data handling procedures to ensure compliance with anonymization and protection protocols	Supervisors; Ethical Review Committee; Director, LUCRID
5.	Use of AI tools for data generation	Complete prohibition of using AI tools to generate data for research purposes	Scrutiny of research methods and data sources to ensure no AI tools are used for data generation	Supervisors; Ethical Review Committee; Director, LUCRID; Higher Degree Committee/SPS Board
6.	Transparency and full disclosure	AI tools or models used in research should be transparent and fully stated	Evaluation of research methodologies to ensure transparency of AI tools or models used	Supervisors; Ethical Review Committee; Director, LUCRID; Higher Degree Committee/SPS Board
7.	Informed consent	Obtain informed consent when AI is used in research involving human subjects	Review of research protocols and documentation to confirm informed consent procedures are followed.	Supervisors; Ethical Review Committee; Director, LUCRID; Higher Degree Committee/SPS Board

9.3 AI Use in Community Service

S/N	Performance Indicator	Target	Monitoring and Evaluation	Action by
1.	Data-driven decision making	Use of AI-powered data analytic algorithms to process large datasets from various community engagements	Review of decision-making processes and outcomes to assess the extent to which AI algorithms are used for data-driven decision making	Team Leads, SDGs Groups; Director, LUCRID; Ranking Committee; Director, CSIS
2.	Accessibility enhancement for community members	Use of AI technologies (e.g., speech recognition, text-to-speech synthesis) to enhance accessibility for community members with disabilities	Assessment of accessibility features implemented and feedback from community members with disabilities to ensure effectiveness	Team Leads, SDGs Groups; Director, LUCRID; Ranking Committee; Director, CSIS
3.	Predictive analytics for future trends and preferences	Use of AI predictive analytic models to analyze past community engagement data to predict future trends and preferences	Analysis of the accuracy of predictions made by AI models compared to actual future trends and preferences	Team Leads, SDGs Groups; Director, LUCRID; Ranking Committee; Director, CSIS

4.	Facilitation of virtual engagement interaction	Use of AI tools to facilitate virtual engagement interaction between university stakeholders and the community	Evaluation of virtual engagement events and feedback from stakeholders and community members to assess the effectiveness of AI tools in facilitating interaction	Team Leads, SDGs Groups; Director, LUCRID; Ranking Committee; Director, CSIS
5.	Use of diverse datasets and human oversight	Ensure diverse datasets are used, include human oversight in decision-making, and actively monitor for bias	Review of datasets used and decision-making processes to ensure diversity, human oversight, and bias monitoring are incorporated	Team Leads, SDGs Groups; Director, LUCRID; Ranking Committee; Director, CSIS
6.	Security and protection of user data	Ensure AI systems are secure and user data is protected	Assessment of data security measures implemented in AI systems and compliance with data protection regulations	Team Leads, SDGs Groups; Director, LUCRID; Ranking Committee; Director, CSIS
7.	Human review of AI decisions	Allow human review of AI decisions	Implementation of mechanisms for human review of AI decisions and periodic audits to ensure compliance	Team Leads, SDGs Groups; Director, LUCRID; Ranking Committee; Director, CSIS
8.	Augmentation of human capabilities	Use AI to augment human capabilities, not replace them	Observation of AI integration into workflows and availability of qualified professionals for support in complex situations	Team Leads, SDGs Groups; Director, LUCRID; Ranking Committee; Director, CSIS
9.	Ensuring AI does not create barriers to access	Ensure AI does not become a barrier to accessing essential services	Evaluation of accessibility of AI tools and provision of alternative access methods for community members without equal access to technology or the internet	Team Leads, SDGs Groups; Director, LUCRID; Ranking Committee; Director, CSIS

9.4 AI Use in Quality Assurance Processes

S/N	Performance Indicator	Target	Monitoring and Evaluation	Action by
1.	Prediction of future outcomes	Use of AI in data analysis to identify patterns and trends for predicting future outcomes	Review of predictive models and comparison of predicted outcomes with actual results	Quality Assurance Committee; Director, CSIS; Director, Academic Planning; Director, LUCRID; Director, CLR; Vice-Chancellor
	Personalized learning experiences	Use of AI-powered algorithms to create personalized learning experiences for students	Assessment of student feedback and learning outcomes to evaluate the effectiveness of personalized learning experiences	Quality Assurance Committee; Heads of Departments; Deans; Director, Academic, Planning; Director, CLR;

				Director, CSIS; Vice-Chancellor
	Streamlining assessment process	Use of AI tools to streamline the assessment process and provide feedback on assignments and examinations	Evaluation of assessment efficiency and quality of feedback provided by AI tools	Quality Assurance Committee; Heads of Departments; Deans; Director, Academic, Planning; Director, CLR; Director, CSIS; Vice-Chancellor
	Virtual assistants for support and guidance	Use of AI-powered Virtual assistants to support students, faculty, and staff and offer guidance	Feedback from users on the effectiveness of virtual assistants in providing support and guidance	Quality Assurance Committee; Heads of Departments; Deans; Director, Academic, Planning; Director, CLR; Director, CSIS; Vice-Chancellor
	Monitoring quality of educational programmes	Use of AI tools to monitor the quality of educational programmes and services	Analysis of educational programme data and feedback mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of AI tools in monitoring quality	Quality Assurance Committee; Heads of Departments; Deans; Director, Academic, Planning; Director, CLR; Director, CSIS; Vice-Chancellor
	Identifying academic fraud	Use of AI tools to identify academic fraud such as plagiarism or cheating	Evaluation of plagiarism detection accuracy and effectiveness in identifying academic fraud	Quality Assurance Committee; Heads of Departments; Deans; Director, Academic, Planning; Director, CLR; Director, CSIS; Vice-Chancellor
	Optimizing the enrolment process	Use of AI technologies to optimize the enrolment process	Assessment of the efficiency of enrolment process and effectiveness of AI tools in optimizing enrolment	Admission Office; Admission Committee; Director, CSIS
	Effective allocation of university resources	Use of AI tools in effective allocation of university resources	Review of resource allocation strategies and assessment of AI tools in optimizing resource allocation	Director, Financial Services; CIA; Registrar; DVC; Vice-Chancellor
	Auditing AI algorithms for bias in quality assurance	Regular auditing of AI algorithms to eliminate biases when used in quality assurance process	Implementation of auditing procedures and analysis of audit results to ensure AI algorithms used in quality assurance are unbiased	Quality Assurance Committee; Heads of Departments; Deans; Director, Academic, Planning; Director, CLR; Director, CSIS; Vice-Chancellor

	Transparency and accountability in evaluation	Ensure transparency in how decisions are made and accountability for outcomes when using AI in evaluation	Documentation of decision-making processes and outcomes, and mechanisms for accountability and transparency in evaluation	Quality Assurance Committee; Heads of Departments; Deans; Director, Academic, Planning; Director, CLR; Director, CSIS; Vice-Chancellor
	Data security for confidentiality	Ensure data security to protect the confidentiality of researchers or students and uphold trust	Implementation of data security measures and compliance with data protection regulations to safeguard confidentiality of researchers' or students' data	Director, CSIS; Director, CLR; Head, Academic Unit
	Enhancement of overall quality of education	Ensure that with AI integration, quality assurance enhances, rather than diminishes, the overall quality	Assessment of educational quality indicators and comparison with pre-AI integration to ensure AI integration enhances overall quality of education	The University Management

10.0 Conclusion

The policy indicates the commitment of Landmark University in promoting a culture of responsible and ethical usage of AI across all facets of its operations. Through this policy, the university aims to provide clear guidelines and principles that govern the acceptable use of AI in teaching, research, and community engagement initiatives while also emphasizing the importance of ethical considerations in all AI-related activities. To serve as a deterrent against unethical behavior, sanctions will be imposed on staff and students found to contravene its provisions. To uphold these guidelines, a full disclosure policy mandates transparency regarding AI usage in all its forms. Additionally, the policy outlined clear defined roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders to ensure effective implementation and adherence to the policy. Regular monitoring and evaluation will ensure continuous adherence to this policy and adaptation to the evolving landscape of AI. Overall, the policy aims to empower the university community to leverage the power of AI for positive outcomes while fostering an environment of responsible innovation.