Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Academic Work

Updated January 8, 2026

Introduction

The emergence of sophisticated artificial intelligence technologies presents both unprecedented challenges and remarkable opportunities for legal education. These tools offer the potential to enhance learning and efficiency, but also pose a significant risk to the core objectives of academic assessment and the development of genuine legal reasoning. This policy establishes a framework for the responsible integration of AI technologies within the Center for Transnational Legal Studies (CTLS), prioritizing academic excellence and intellectual rigor while preparing students for a legal profession increasingly shaped by technological innovation.

Section 1: Foundational Premise – The Escalating Challenge

This policy is predicated on a foundational premise: the capabilities of Generative AI are evolving at an unprecedented rate. The models available today represent the minimum baseline of this technology's potential; they are, in effect, the least sophisticated we will ever encounter. This escalating capability presents a fundamental and growing challenge to traditional methods of assessment. Consequently, ensuring the quality and authenticity of student work requires a proactive and evolving approach to academic integrity. It underscores the critical importance of assessment methods that can reliably evaluate unmediated student knowledge and reasoning, distinct from technologically-assisted performance.

Section 2: Foundational Principles

2.1 Institutional Commitment

CTLS recognizes artificial intelligence as an integral component of contemporary legal practice, especially in transnational and multi-lingual context. CTLS commits to fostering responsible AI literacy while maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity and ensuring that assessments accurately measure student-generated knowledge and analytical skill.

2.2 Scope and Application

This policy governs all AI technology usage within academic contexts, including but not limited to text generation systems, legal research assistants, and automated analysis tools. It applies to all staff and students of CTLS engaged in teaching, learning, and all forms of assessment activities. Section 3 prescribes student responsibilities and permitted uses and Section 4 details faculty responsibilities and best practices.

Section 3: Student Responsibilities and Permitted Uses

3.1 Fundamental Obligations

Students bear ultimate accountability for all academic submissions, regardless of technological assistance employed. The use of AI technologies does not transfer responsibility for the substantive accuracy, relevance, or ethical compliance from the student to the technology. At the same time, students who do not wish to use AI systems would neither be required to do so nor be penalized for not doing so.

3.2 Authorized Applications

Subject to course-specific parameters, students may employ AI technologies for:

- Preliminary legal research and concept clarification
- Draft review and linguistic refinement
- Comparative analysis for self-directed learning

- Idea development and analytical framework construction

3.3 Prohibited Conduct

The following constitute violations of academic integrity:

- Submitting AI-generated content as one's own unassisted work without explicit attribution
- Misrepresenting technological assistance as independent work
- Employing AI to obscure the origins of existing scholarly work
- Circumventing assessment objectives through undisclosed AI usage

3.4 Attribution Standards

Students must provide an AI declaration for all written submitted work. If no AI was used, they must attest to that. If AI tools were used, a description of the purpose of the use of AI, the iterative process, including a record of the prompts used to generate content must be provided.

Section 4: Faculty Responsibilities and Best Practices

4.1 Pedagogical Design Considerations

Faculty members shall clearly define and communicate course-specific policies on AI use in writing on the course canvas page, ensuring they align AI usage policies with course learning objectives. If a faculty member decides to limit or prohibit the use of AI, they shall provide clear instructions on what is permitted or prohibited, including use of AI for research, translation, presentations, background information or note taking.

4.2 Default Assumptions

Unless explicitly prohibited and enforced through supervised assessment conditions, students may reasonably assume AI tool usage is permissible for assignments, provided proper attribution is maintained.

4.3 Institutional Prohibition

Deployment of AI systems by Faculty members for student evaluation, automated instruction, or grade determination is not permitted at present.

Section 5: Academic Integrity and Enforcement

5.1 Evidentiary Standards

Given the documented biases and unreliability of current detection tools, automated detection systems purporting to identify AI-generated content shall not constitute determinative evidence in academic misconduct proceedings. Such tools may inform academic integrity investigations but cannot replace comprehensive evaluation of alleged violations.

5.2 Misconduct Classifications

Failure to acknowledge AI assistance when required constitutes plagiarism under existing academic integrity policies. The severity of the violation will be assessed based on the extent of the undisclosed use

and evidence of deceptive intent. Sanctions should be aligned with established procedures for comparable violations involving unattributed source material.

5.3 Safe Harbor Provisions

Good faith efforts to comply with attribution requirements, even if imperfect, shall be distinguished from deliberate misrepresentation. Students demonstrating genuine attempts at transparency merit educational intervention rather than punitive measures, distinguishing a learning opportunity from a deliberate act of academic dishonesty.

Section 6: Educational Philosophy and Professional Development

6.1 Competency Hierarchy

Students must recognize three distinct capability levels in AI utilization:

- **Foundational**: Delegating entire tasks to AI systems, resulting in work that may be comprehensive but hollow, and risks factual inaccuracies, hallucinated citations, and superficial analysis.
- **Intermediate**: Integrating AI outputs with, using AI as a partner to generate initial drafts or structure arguments, followed by substantial human analysis, verification, and refinement.
- **Advanced**: Critically evaluating AI-generated content for accuracy, bias, and strategic nuance, and mastering prompt engineering to guide the tool toward producing high-quality, reliable outputs. This level represents the standard required of competent legal professionals, which CTLS strives to encourage.

Students who rely excessively on foundational use bypass essential skill development and compromise their professional preparedness.

6.2 Technology and Access Equity

Recognition that premium AI tools may create disparate advantages but may also narrow linguistic and other gaps requires thoughtful course design. Faculty should consider accessibility when establishing AI usage parameters, avoid mandating tools that require paid subscriptions, and provide alternative pathways for students with limited technological resources.

6.3 Continuous Dialogue

This policy encourages ongoing conversation between students and faculty regarding appropriate AI tools and their integration in academic tasks. Questions about specific applications should be resolved through direct consultation with the course instructor or the Co-Directors rather than assumption.

Section 7: Implementation and Evolution

7.1 Effective Date and Transition

This policy takes effect immediately upon adoption, with recognition that specific applications may require iterative refinement as technologies and pedagogical understanding evolve.

7.2 Regular Review

Annual policy review ensures continued relevance amid rapid technological advancement. Feedback from all stakeholders informs necessary modifications.

Conclusion

This policy reflects CTLS's commitment to preparing students to harness the power of these new tools while maintaining the analytical rigor, ethical grounding, and professional judgment essential to academic integrity. Through thoughtful integration of AI technologies, we enhance rather than diminish the transformative and equalizing potential of legal education, upholding the timeless values of critical thinking and personal accountability.