



Part XXXVIII: Accreditation Guidelines for AI-Assisted Teaching and Assessment

Document No.: IAPUC/IQA/AI-2026-001

Version: 1.0

Effective Date: Pending Official Release

Formulating Institution: IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee, International Association of Private Universities and Colleges

Applicable Scope: All private higher education institutions holding or applying for IQA accreditation, together with peer experts participating in accreditation review.

Preface

Artificial intelligence is entering higher education with unprecedented speed and depth. Adaptive learning systems tailor learning pathways; generative AI gives immediate feedback on student writing; and AI proctoring tools detect anomalous behaviour in remote examinations. These technologies create new educational possibilities and new quality challenges. When AI participates in teaching and assessment, academic judgements and instructional decisions traditionally made by educators are transferred in part to algorithms. Without prudent governance, this transfer may erode academic standards, weaken teacher-student relationships, harm students' digital rights and even introduce discriminatory bias without awareness.

IAPUC neither promotes AI blindly nor rejects it categorically. Within the IQA framework, AI is regarded as a tool: one that may enhance educational quality, but must remain subject to human academic judgement and ethical boundaries. The central idea of these Guidelines is that however technology evolves, the core values protected by accreditation remain constant: academic integrity, authenticity of learning outcomes, respect for student rights and a culture of continual improvement. AI is not a technological exception to those values, but a new context in which more effective ways of realizing them must be explored.

These Guidelines provide accredited institutions with a clear, prudent and forward-looking quality-governance framework for exploring and applying AI-assisted teaching and assessment. They address AI in teaching and learning, AI-assisted assessment and academic integrity, AI governance and disclosure, and data and privacy, setting out IQA expectations and review considerations in each area. They integrate organically with the existing IQA framework: deepening quality requirements for intelligent learning tools based on distance-education standards; incorporating special considerations for AI-assisted assessment into the assessment framework of the Academic Quality Standards Manual; and extending forward-looking attention to AI ethics and data governance from the baselines in the Ethics Code and Digital Security Regulations.

Chapter I General Provisions

Article 1 Purpose and Basis

These Guidelines are intended to:

- (1) provide a principled framework and operational guidance for quality governance when accredited institutions explore and apply AI-assisted teaching and assessment;
- (2) state IQA's core position on AI in education: AI is a tool, human academic judgement is fundamental, and human-in-the-loop decision-making is an inviolable principle;
- (3) provide evaluation dimensions and points of attention for IQA experts reviewing institutional use of AI; and

(4) provide the accreditation system with a stable yet durable reference for quality evaluation amid rapid technological evolution.

These Guidelines are formulated on the basis of:

- the core requirements concerning curriculum design, teaching effectiveness and learning-outcomes assessment in the *IAPUC-IQA Academic Accreditation Quality Standards Manual*;
- provisions concerning online-learning technology and assessment ethics in the *Supplementary Standards for Quality Accreditation of Distance and Hybrid Education*;
- baseline requirements for data protection and security management in the *IAPUC Digital Security and Privacy Regulations*;
- the basic principles of academic integrity, transparency and accountability in the *IAPUC-IQA Academic Ethics and Conduct Code*; and
- the core principles of UNESCO's *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research* (2023) and *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence* (2021).

Article 2 Scope of Application

These Guidelines apply to institutional research and deployment of AI systems in:

- instructional design, content generation and recommendation of learning resources;
- learning-process analytics and adaptive learning pathways;
- assisted or automated assessment of assignments and examinations;
- monitoring of academic integrity and examination proctoring; and
- intelligent assistance for student support and learning guidance.

These Guidelines do not apply to institutional AI use in non-teaching areas such as administration, admissions marketing or campus security. Data-protection and privacy compliance in those areas shall nevertheless follow Chapter IV and relevant regulations by reference.

Article 3 Basic Principles

Principle	Core Meaning
Human in the Loop	A decision materially affecting a student's academic progress or achievement must ultimately be made by an appropriately qualified educator. AI outputs and recommendations inform but do not replace that decision.

Principle	Core Meaning
Transparency and Notice	Institutions must inform students and relevant faculty clearly how, to what extent and with what effect AI is used in courses and assessment. Undisclosed deployment is inconsistent with transparency.
Fairness and Freedom from Bias	Institutions must review AI systems for fairness and prevent algorithmic bias from causing disproportionate adverse effects on different student groups.
Privacy and Data Minimization	AI collection and use of data must follow data minimization. Students have the right to know how their data are used by AI systems.
Academic Integrity	AI use shall not undermine academic integrity. Institutions must define legitimate AI assistance and unacceptable misuse clearly.
Continual Review	The effects and impact of AI systems must be evaluated continually. Institutions shall approach their introduction with prudent experimentation, observing evidence and correcting bias promptly.

Chapter II AI in Teaching and Learning

Article 4 Role of AI in Learning Support

AI in learning support should enhance, not replace, meaningful teacher-student interaction. IQA encourages exploration of AI assistance in:

- intelligent practice systems helping students consolidate and self-test knowledge;
- preliminary feedback on grammar, structure and citation format in student writing; and
- recommendation through the learning-management system of supplementary resources suited to a student's progress and interests.

In these functions, AI acts as a scaffold that provides timely support even when the teacher is not present. It should not replace substantive academic guidance, especially when a student has a deep misunderstanding of a core concept.

Article 5 Standards for Use of Generative AI

Use of generative AI, including large language models, in teaching must comply with:

- (1) Clear definition of permitted uses: In the course syllabus or equivalent document, the educator must tell students which activities permit generative AI, which prohibit it and what restrictions apply when it is permitted.
- (2) Disclosure of method of use: When students may use generative AI in an assignment, they must disclose its extent and manner. The institution may establish a standard AI-use disclosure format.
- (3) Educator review of AI outputs: When an educator uses generative AI to prepare teaching materials, the educator must review the output for accuracy and make necessary corrections, retaining professional responsibility for final materials.
- (4) Development of critical thinking: Where student use is permitted, instructional design should guide students to examine critically the accuracy, bias and limitations of AI outputs rather than accept them passively.

Article 6 Governance of Adaptive Learning Systems

An institution deploying an adaptive learning system that automatically adjusts content, sequence or pace according to student performance must:

- (1) ensure that its knowledge model and recommendation logic are explainable to a reasonable extent, so educators and students can understand broadly why particular content is recommended;
- (2) preserve educator intervention in learning pathways, allowing educators to see and adjust the system's assessment and recommendations on the basis of professional judgement; and
- (3) evaluate periodically differences in effectiveness among student groups, ensuring equitable learning opportunities for all.

Article 7 Review Considerations

When reviewing institutional AI use in teaching, experts shall focus on whether:

- clear institutional policies and guidance govern AI in teaching;
- faculty and students have been informed adequately of the manner, scope and effects of AI tools;
- AI use substantively enhances the learning experience rather than merely replacing traditional teaching methods; and
- substantive teacher-student interaction remains safeguarded in an AI-assisted environment.

Chapter III AI-Assisted Assessment and Academic Integrity

Article 8 Boundaries of AI-Assisted Assessment

AI in assessment must observe the inviolable human-in-the-loop principle.

(1) Acceptable AI-assisted assessment includes:

- automated scoring of objective questions such as multiple-choice and fill-in-the-blank items;
- preliminary checking of surface features such as spelling, grammar and format in written work;
- assisting educators to identify textual similarity among submissions and potential plagiarism; and
- with educator confirmation, providing preliminary analysis of student writing, including length, structure and keyword coverage.

(2) Unacceptable substitution by AI includes:

- AI scoring that wholly replaces educator judgement of essays, project reports, portfolios or creative work and becomes an official grade without educator review; and
- a major decision such as course failure or expulsion based solely on automated analysis of student behaviour, such as clickstream data, without human review.

Scores generated automatically or with AI assistance must be identified as such in grade systems and records so reviewers can distinguish AI-generated from human scoring.

Article 9 Generative AI and Academic Integrity

Institutions must respond to the impact of generative AI on traditional definitions of academic integrity, moving from a sole focus on detection and prevention to a combined approach of integrity education and assessment redesign.

(1) Updating academic-integrity policy: Policy must expressly cover AI use, clearly define legitimate use and improper misuse, and provide specific operational examples for faculty and students.

(2) Proactive innovation in assessment: Rather than react passively to cheating risk, institutions should examine whether assessment relies excessively on work readily completed with AI; whether students can demonstrate authentic capability; and whether assessment genuinely measures higher-order capability difficult for AI to replace, such as critical analysis, original argument, practical application or oral defence.

(3) Prudent use of AI-detection tools: Before using a tool on student work, the institution must assess accuracy and false-positive rates carefully, particularly differential effects by language background. A detection report shall never be the sole basis for formally finding academic misconduct. An educator must review it together with writing patterns, attendance and consistency across the student's work.

(4) Guidance on legitimate use: Rather than treating AI solely as a threat, institutions should teach students to use it legitimately and transparently in academic work. AI-use ethics may form part of academic-integrity education and help students develop a healthy understanding of these tools.

Article 10 Ethical Boundaries of AI-Assisted Proctoring

In addition to Article 15 of the *Supplementary Standards for Quality Accreditation of Distance and Hybrid Education*, AI-assisted proctoring must satisfy these requirements:

- (1) conduct regular differential-impact assessments, checking disproportionate false-positive rates by race, gender, age and disability;
- (2) before deployment, provide students with a complete explanation and at least one ungraded technical trial so they can understand and adapt to the environment;
- (3) strictly limit student video, audio and screen data to ensuring integrity of the examination, and delete it within thirty days after the grade-publication period ends; and
- (4) never use biometric data gathered through AI proctoring, such as facial geometry, eye-movement patterns or voiceprints, to establish or expand a biometric database.

Article 11 Review Considerations

When reviewing AI-assisted assessment, experts shall focus on whether:

- areas where AI may assist and may not substitute are clearly separated;
- academic-integrity policy has been updated to address generative AI;
- assessment design has been proactively renewed in response to integrity challenges;
- deployment of AI proctoring has undergone ethical review and protects students' rights to information and privacy; and
- automated and AI-assisted scores undergo educator review through a documented process.

Chapter IV AI Governance, Data and Privacy

Article 12 Institutional AI Governance Structure

An institution introducing and deploying AI must establish governance proportionate to the scale and risk of its use:

- (1) Responsibility for AI governance: Responsibility must be defined internally. Decisions on AI in teaching shall not be made by the information-technology department alone; academic governance bodies must participate in approval and oversight.
- (2) AI-system inventory: Establish and maintain an inventory of systems deployed in teaching, assessment and student support, recording purpose, scope, data use and date of most recent review.
- (3) Pre-adoption assessment: A proposed teaching or assessment system must be evaluated prudently before adoption. Evaluation may consider alignment with educational purpose, expected effectiveness, impact on existing faculty and student practice, and compatibility with privacy, academic-integrity and quality-assurance frameworks.
- (4) Continuing monitoring: Monitor the effectiveness of deployed systems and review periodically whether unexpected effects or bias arise in operation.

Article 13 Data Governance

AI use of data must comply strictly with the *IAPUC Digital Security and Privacy Regulations* and additionally satisfy:

- (1) Lawfulness of training data: If student data are provided to a vendor for model training, they must be anonymized or students' prior informed consent must be obtained expressly. Academic data shall not be provided to a third party for model training without notice to students.
- (2) Data minimization: The system shall collect only the minimum student data necessary for its stated teaching or assessment purpose.
- (3) Retention and deletion: Student data processed in the system shall be retained no longer than necessary for the educational purpose and securely destroyed thereafter.

Article 14 Students' Rights to Information and Choice

- (1) Where AI is used to assess work, the educator must inform students before the course begins of the nature and extent of AI involvement.
- (2) For high-risk AI assessment materially affecting academic results, a student may require at least one human review.

(3) Where a student reasonably declines a particular AI tool for religious, ethical or privacy reasons, the institution should provide an alternative assessment method without reducing academic rigour.

Article 15 Review Considerations

When reviewing AI governance, experts shall focus on whether:

- governance is proportionate to the institution's level of AI use;
- pre-adoption assessment is sufficient; no prescribed template is required, but the institution should have considered educational effect, potential risk and compatibility with existing frameworks before deciding;
- students have been informed adequately of AI use in courses and assessment; and
- student-data use complies with requirements and privacy is protected sufficiently.

Chapter V Supplementary Provisions

Article 16 Relationship with Other Regulatory Documents

Document	Relationship with These Guidelines
<i>IAPUC-IQA Academic Accreditation Quality Standards Manual</i>	These Guidelines deepen and supplement its chapters on Curriculum and Teaching, Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes and Academic Integrity in the AI context.
<i>Supplementary Standards for Quality Accreditation of Distance and Hybrid Education</i>	On AI proctoring and learning-platform data, these Guidelines further extend relevant distance-education provisions.
<i>IAPUC Digital Security and Privacy Regulations</i>	Those Regulations form the legal baseline for AI data governance.
<i>IAPUC-IQA Academic Ethics and Conduct Code</i>	Its requirements for academic integrity and transparency are the basic principles for these Guidelines.

Article 17 Definitions

Term	Definition
Artificial Intelligence (AI)	A computational system capable through learning, reasoning and adaptation of performing tasks normally requiring human intelligence.
Generative AI	An AI system capable of generating new text, images, code or other content based on training data.
Adaptive Learning System	An intelligent system that automatically adjusts content, recommends a pathway or provides feedback according to an individual student's performance and characteristics.
AI-Assisted Assessment	A model in which AI provides an assessment reference or preliminary evaluation while the final academic decision remains with an educator.
AI Proctoring	Remote monitoring technology using AI software to analyse examinee behaviour and identify potential cheating.
Human in the Loop	The principle that final authority for a decision materially affecting a student's academic standing remains with an appropriately qualified educator.

Article 18 Interpretation and Amendment

(1) These Guidelines shall be interpreted by the IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee.

(2) Because AI evolves rapidly and review experience takes time to accumulate, IAPUC reserves the right to revise these Guidelines in light of technological development and lessons from accreditation practice. A revised edition shall be published after Board approval with an appropriate transition period.

Article 19 Entry into Force and Transition

(1) These Guidelines shall enter into force on the date of approval by the IAPUC Board of Directors.

(2) An institution already deploying AI teaching or assessment systems shall describe its AI-governance practice and progress toward these principles in the first annual report after the effective date. The Guidelines do not require retrospective review of academic decisions made using AI before that date.

Appendix A: AI Use Notice Template

The template shall include course name; an AI-use statement identifying activities in which relevant tools are used or permitted and describing use in detail; and a contact channel for questions or requests for alternative arrangements.

Appendix B: Brief Differential-Impact Assessment for AI Assessment and Proctoring Tools

The form shall include tool name and version; assessment period and sample coverage; dimensions disaggregated by gender, race, language background and disability; false-positive data and statistical significance of differences for each group; and a mitigation plan where differences are found.

Document Approval

Role	Name/Position	Date
Drafted by	IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee, AI and Educational Innovation Working Group	May 2026
Reviewed by	IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee	Pending
Approved by	IAPUC Board of Directors	Pending

Copyright Statement

The intellectual property rights of this document and the Accreditation Guidelines for AI-Assisted Teaching and Assessment contained herein belong to the International Association of Private Universities and Colleges (IAPUC). Without written authorization from IAPUC, no institution or individual may copy, modify or use this document for commercial purposes. Accredited institutions may freely use this document for self-evaluation and internal system development.